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This research explores the meaning, construction, representation, and function of Delaware ethnic identity during the 1820s. In 1821, nearly 2,000 Delawares (self-referentially called Lenape) crossed the Mississippi River and settled in Southwest Missouri as a condition of the Treaty of St. Marys. This dissertation argues that effects of this emigration sparked a vigorous reconsideration of ethnic identity and cultural representation. Traditionally, other Eastern Algonquian groups recognized Delawares by the metaphoric kinship status of “grandfather.” Both European and Colonial governments also established Delawares as preferential clients and trading partners. Yet, as the Delawares immigrated into a new “western” Superintendency of Indian Affairs in 1821, neither status was acknowledged. As a result, Delaware representations transitioned from a taken-for-granted state into an actively negotiated field of discourse. This dissertation utilizes numerous unpublished primary source documents and archaeological data recovered during the Delaware Town Archaeological Project (2003-2005) to demonstrate the social, political, and material consequences of Delaware ethnic identity revitalization. Utilizing Silliman’s (2001) practical politics model of practice theory, the archival and archaeological data sets of Delaware Town reveal the reinforcement of conspicuous ethnic boundaries, coalition-building that emphasized Delaware status as both “grandfathers” and as warriors, and also re-establishing preferred client status in trade and treaty-making. This study illuminates this poorly-known decade as a time where Delawares negotiated and exerted their ethnic identity and cultural representations to affect political, economic, and social outcomes of their choosing in the rapidly-vanishing “middle ground” of early-19th century Missouri.
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CHAPTER 1: THE DELAWARE TOWN ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROJECT

On the eve of April 17, 1826, Colonel Pierre Menard sent an express dispatch to his associate, Major Richard Graham, Indian Agent for the Delawares. The letter described a series of violent events reported to him by James Pool, a blacksmith assigned to the Delawares who resided near the James Fork of White River in Southwest Missouri. Pool feared the situation enough to flee with his wife all the way to Menard in Kaskaskia, Illinois. He reported that several Delawares had been murdered at an abandoned Piankeshaw village; additional Delawares were missing. Pool believed that a large group of Osage claiming to be Shawnee were the killers due to witnesses seeing them in the area the previous day. The Delaware villages on the James Fork were nearly empty due to the spring hunt and had been left defenseless. There was a real threat that the Osage would overrun the villages and burn them to the ground, just as a Delaware chief’s house had just been burned. Menard sent Pool back to the James Fork loaded with hundreds of gun flints, lead shot, and several kegs of gunpowder (Menard 1826a). The transcription of Menard’s letter is found in Appendix B-42. Tensions between the Osage and immigrant eastern American Indian groups, especially Delaware, Cherokee, Shawnee, Kickapoo, Piankeshaw, and Wea, escalated to such fervor that the territorial
governor General William Clark and his staff could do little to deal with the erupting violence on the Missouri and Arkansas frontier.

Pool's colorful account is just one of the many recorded complaints of violence against the immigrant native groups by the Osage, each of them recently granted lands by treaties in the late 1810s and early 1820s. The 1826 killings were not the first; several years earlier, one of Delaware Chief William Anderson's (Kikthawenund) sons, Sesocum (also spelled Sosecum), was reportedly killed by some Osages and a series of retaliatory killings ensued. The native responses to these threats are varied and poorly understood in the documentary record. Likewise, native responses to increasing social, political, and environmental competition require more consideration. These native groups forged strategic, intergroup alliances in response to the violence, some that would last long after the Delaware left Missouri while former alliances weakened. Additionally, there is evidence that factionalism within the main branch of Delaware was occurring at the same time as Chief William Anderson's policy of unifying all splintered Delaware groups in Southwest Missouri.

This dissertation focuses on the decade-long residency of Delaware peoples in Southwest Missouri, particularly at the locale known as Delaware Town in the documentary record and as 23CN1 in the Smithsonian trinomial system for recording archaeological sites. Archaeological site 23CN1 is referred to as "Delaware Town" in Kingman (1960); Rees et al. (2000, 2003); Eaton (2004, 2012); and Powell (2004, 2005). In the 1820s, Delaware Town was the second largest population center in the State of Missouri, surpassed only by the
burgeoning city of St. Louis. In primary documents related to this site, Delaware Town is also called Anderson’s Town, Anderson’s Village, Delaware Village, and the Delaware Towns on White River. For consistency, I will refer to 23CN1 as Delaware Town throughout this dissertation. Of course, it is important to note that there was a prior Delaware Town or Anderson’s Town in Indiana (as well as a separate White River), which can contribute to confusion when reading historical sources.

Research Objectives

The ten year settlement, ca. 1821-1831, when the main branch of Delaware peoples occupied lands in Southwest Missouri, was fraught with problems: horse thefts, killings, flooded crops, starvation, disease, squatters, illegal liquor sales, and constant threats of violent exchanges with Osage groups. However, little serious attention has been leveled at more thought-provoking issues that attempt to get at the roots of these events—namely the social and political configurations being negotiated in this new and troubling situation.

Specifically, this historical and archaeological study raises a complex problem: What was the functional utility of a Delaware identity at Delaware Town, how was it constructed through daily practice, and what could it be used to accomplish? In particular, the category of ethnic identity using an instrumentalist approach is a useful lens through which to examine these complex social and political relationships. The instrumentalist and historically contingent theory of ethnicity (Barth 1998[1969]; Comaroff 1987) provides many important insights into the strategies and goals pursued through the interaction of both competing and

In relation to the above research questions, this dissertation attempts to reveal that Delaware identity and its representations were a significant and salient factor in the negotiation of daily life and in regional politics at Delaware Town. Upon removal to Southwest Missouri, this Delaware group crossed into a new political jurisdiction in the form of the fledgling State of Missouri and the Central Superintendency of Indian Affairs headed by General William Clark.

Prior to migration into Missouri, Delawares held a distinctive position of “grandfather” by other native groups—a status that was recognized by European and American government political authorities. The fictive and symbolic kinship status can be viewed contextually as an important part of Algonquian woodland diplomatic relationships. Even today, this kinship status is only used as part of public, political, and diplomatic interactions (Brice Obermeyer 2013, elec. comm.). Ethnographic data suggests that the “grandfather” status was acquired prior to European contact as the ancestors of the Lenape- and Munsee-speaking peoples moved east and militarily conquered the Iroquoian (Newcomb 1956:20). After Contact, competition with the Five (later Six) Nations to establish the most favorable European diplomatic and economic relationships led to public contestation of Delaware status as “grandfathers.” As this dissertation argues in Chapter 3, the fight to retain this important diplomatic status led to a re-forging of
Delaware ethnic identity and representations in both the middle-18th and early-19th centuries.

Upon Delaware groups immigrating into Missouri, this preferred status as “grandfathers” and preferred clients meant little to the Indian Agents there who had deeper social and economic ties to Osage groups. As a result, a significant dialectic emerges wherein Delawares in Southwest Missouri intentionally and politically use their identity and cultural representations as Delawares to reestablish their cultural patrimony. Evidence of this exertion of status is most notably found in archival materials that reveal carefully crafted negotiations with the Indian Agency, other eastern native groups that also migrated to Missouri and Arkansas and, particularly with Miami groups (who were former neighbors) that remained in Indiana. In more subtle archaeological considerations at the site and household level, overt political identities are more difficult to grasp. However, the theoretical model of practice and the model of practical politics (Silliman 2000, 2001) permits daily, lived experiences to be interpreted in light of political implications, whether intentional or unintentional.

After a careful consideration of original documentary and archaeological research at Delaware Town, this thesis argues that Delaware leadership utilized special diplomatic language to reinforce their status as “grandfathers” with both the government and fellow eastern immigrant native groups. Additionally, the Delawares utilized numerous and conspicuous displays of material and practice to highlight their status as “Indians”, as hunters, trappers, and fur traders while de-emphasizing and rejecting Christianity and agricultural pursuits.
I was drawn to this site because Delaware Town (23CN1) was located in my home state and I knew that very little work concerning the historical archaeology of native groups had been done in this area. Some archaeological attention has been given to prehistoric sites, the Cherokee Trail of Tears, and the first white settlers into the area, but most historical archaeology in the area involves the Civil War era. When I read in the local Springfield, Missouri newspaper about the preliminary findings at Delaware Town, I was not surprised that the goal of the original survey was to find the location of a trading post. I quickly volunteered at this site for the next two field seasons. My further motivation for researching this site should begin with a fieldwork anecdote. Not long into the 2004 field season, our field school was visited by the project director, Neal Lopinot. While I was speaking with him, a student approached us, holding an artifact carefully in both hands, and asked if it was important. It was an archaeological find of a lifetime. It was a completely intact, unblemished “cottonrock” (a white or light grey, soft, fine-grained magnesium limestone) pipe that had been found toward the top of Feature 2, a trash pit situated in a cabin floor (Keller 1945:15). Of all things, why would someone leave this pipe behind when Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) guided his group to Kansas in 1830? Where did it come from? What importance did this item hold, and why was it discarded? These questions consumed me. I searched the archival records for more information about the network of social and political relationships that surrounded this site. The letters contained within led me to ask even more questions about reciprocal relationships, ethnic identity, cultural representations,
and warfare. In order to attempt an interpretation of Delaware Town, I continually revised my research questions and also needed to identify the most appropriate and useful theoretical models and interpretive methods.

Delaware Town is easily compared to other small scale studies like Stephen Silliman’s examination of native laborers during the Rancho period in California (2000, 2001), Lance Greene’s study of marginalized Cherokee families at Welch’s Town in southwestern North Carolina (2009) or Laurie Wilkie’s study of three African-American households in Louisiana (2000). In consequence of small scale and sample sizes, documentary sources and existing ethnographies are necessary to supplement the archaeological materials in interpreting these sites. The archaeology, likewise, supplements the written record by revealing the materiality of daily practice and choices in ethnic strategies. Together, these resources can help answer questions about the processes through which identity is formed, the manifestations of these various representations, and political ramifications.

This research contributes to the current literature of identity-as-practice archaeological case studies and connects Delaware Town more fully into the archaeological and ethnohistorical understanding of Delaware-speaking peoples. Furthermore, Stephen Silliman’s practical politics model for the interpretation of material culture of everyday life at Delaware Town, coupled with a consideration of more overt identity and political issues emergent and negotiated in the archival and archaeological research, will be fruitful methodology to examine these larger theoretical issues.
Theoretical Underpinnings: Identity and Practice

This dissertation draws from a growing theoretical perspective that links social identity with practice theory. Identity has been one of the core endeavors of archaeological investigations since the beginning of the discipline. Can someone "actually have an archaeology that is not concerned with identity? [emphasis in original]" (Insoll 2007b:1). Since the 1980s, identity has been a popular topic in archaeology. This dissertation draws from, and contributes to, the growing list of studies, compilations, and theoretical orientations associated with this orientation. This dissertation follows in the footsteps of key post-processual, interpretive archaeological studies of identity, especially the work of Stephen Silliman (2000, 2001, 2004), Laurie Wilkie (2000, 2009), Lynn Meskell (2001, 2002, 2007), Kent Lightfoot (2005), and Siân Jones (1996, 1997, 1999, 2007), that link aspects of identity such as gender and ethnicity to practice theory. Here, identity is defined as contextual, dynamic, and historically contingent (Díaz-Andreu et al. 2005; Jones 1996). More importantly, this dissertation utilizes an historical, instrumental, and interactionist approach to the formation of collective identity groups, especially ethnicities, as opposed to primordial or essentialist perspectives (Barth 1994, 1998[1969]; Comaroff 1987; Comaroff and Comaroff 1992).

Practice theory and the concept of agency used in this dissertation draws heavily from the writings of French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu and British sociologist Anthony Giddens. Through practice theory, especially Bourdieu's construct of the *habitus* and *doxa*, such an abstract and ephemeral concept as...
identity can be recognized in the material culture of the quotidian activities and choices of people in households and communities. However, *habitus* relates to the subconscious or unconsidered aspects of identity which recognizes the agency of social actors, but posits that agents act in accordance with the "dispositions" provided by the *habitus* (Bourdieu 1977). In other words, social agents act within the social structure and reproduce the choices and ideology (or identity) within that social structure. I also discuss additional concepts posited by Bourdieu such as *field*, *illusio*, and *collusio* that are part of practice theory, but have not been widely adopted in archaeology at this point (with the exception of Orser 2004) that I believe are useful in considering collective or social identities, especially in the realm of politics. Giddens' work is closely related to Bourdieu, except that Giddens' theory of *structuration* permits more dialectic between social actors and the structure in which they produce or reproduce (or modify or ignore) structure in their actions (1979, 1984). One archaeological model of practice theory that can be fruitfully applied to the Delaware Town study is Stephen Silliman's practical politics (2001). Using this model, the daily practices seen in the archaeology of households at Delaware Town and also in the documentary record permit an analysis of the political identity and its utilization in contests of power and social position.

**Archival Research**

In order to answer the above research questions, it was necessary to identify the tools available to inform this study. First, I studied the rich secondary historical and anthropological (including archaeological) data relating to Delaware
groups in order to place the decade-long occupation of Delaware Town into its
historical and ethnographic context (e.g., Adams 1905, 1906; Barnes 1968; Boyd
2005; Brinton 1960[1885]; Cranor [1990]; Cross 1940; Davis 1970; Farley 1955;
Ferguson 1972; Ferris 2011; Gipson 1938; Glenn 1992; Goddard 1973, 1974,
1966[1938], 1983[1921]; Haskins 2005; Hill 1957; Hunter 1971; Jennings 1963,
2001; MacLeod 1922; Maul 2001; McCord 2002; McCracken 1956; Melton 1977;
2005; Rees et al. 2000, 2003; Schutt 2005, 2007; Speck 1931, 1946; Stewart
Trenkwalder Schönenberger 1991; Venter et al. 2011; A. Wallace 1946; P.
Wallace 1958; Wepler 1980a, 1980b, 1992; Weslager 1941, 1944, 1947, 1972,

Second, I consulted many primary documents for this dissertation research. Several previously published sources exist, but they markedly do not include the period of Delaware residence in Southwest Missouri. These sources include official treaties (Kappler 1904), accounts and correspondence of fur traders (Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library 1774-1825, 1804-1826, [1804-1904], 1825-1834; F. Chouteau 1831a, 1831b, 1832a, 1832b, 1833; P. Chouteau 1831; University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign 1791-1910), Governor William
Henry Harrison of Indiana (Esarey 1922), Indian Agents in Ohio and Indiana such as *The John Tipton Papers* (Anderson 1827b; Anderson and Killbuck 1825; Anderson et al. 1825; Menard 1825a, 1828; Richardville 1827; Tipton 1827a, 1827b, 1829, 1942a, 1942b), John Johnston in the *Transactions of the American Antiquarian Society* (Johnston 1820[1819]) and Thornborough (1961), contemporary travelers and surveyors Thomas Dean (1918), Isaac McCoy (1830), Henry Schoolcraft (1821, 1853; Park 1955), John Treat Irving, Jr. (1835), Lewis Henry Morgan (1859), and missionaries including those from the Moravian Church (Bliss 1885; Conrad 1998; Deardorff 1946; Gipson 1938; Heckewelder 1820, 1881; Hultbert and Schwarze 1910; Loskile 1794; Wallace 1958), Quakers (Dean 1918), Baptists (Gowing 1912; McCoy 1840), Presbyterians (Beatty 1768; Dodge 1825, 1826, 1827; Graves 1949), and Mormons (Pratt 1874).

Many primary sources directly related to Delaware Town are not previously published by historians and are scattered in a myriad of archival collections, many of which I visited and transcribed from manuscripts for this dissertation. I transcribed more than 225 manuscript items for this project, including a few from 18th century French. Many of these important documents are transcribed and included in **Appendix B** at the end of this text. At the Missouri History Museum Archives in St. Louis, Missouri, I transcribed manuscripts primarily from the Richard Graham Papers (1795-1896), the Indian Papers (1694-1965), and the John Baptiste Charles Lucas Family Papers (1754-1843). At the National Archives at Kansas City, Missouri, I transcribed numerous microfilmed manuscripts from Record Group 75: The Records of the Bureau of
Indian Affairs, Microfilm Collections 15 (1820-1823, 1823-1824), 234 (1824-1826, 1824-1826, 1827-1828, 1829-1831), and 574 (1807-1904). Additionally, I consulted other records pertinent to the St. Louis Superintendency of Indian Affairs as part of the William Clark Papers at the Kansas Historical Society (1813-1831). I consulted two different Pierre Menard Collections at the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library in Springfield, Illinois (1774-1825, 1804-1826, [1804-1904], 1825-1834) and the Illinois History and Lincoln Collection at the University of Urbana-Champaign in Illinois (1741-1910). Other archival repositories included the Gilder Lehrman Institute for American History, the Land Survey Program of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources in Rolla, Missouri (Garrison 1835a, 1835b), the Missouri Valley Special Collections of the Kansas City Public Library ([1837]), and the Western Historical Manuscript Collections at Kansas City and Columbia, Missouri, respectively. These documents provide many important details into the everyday concerns, politics, tribalism, and strategies employed by government officials, military personnel, missionaries, fur traders, and the native groups they reported on and tried to manage.

I also accessed the probate records for four fur traders active at Delaware Town through the Cape Girardeau County Archive Center (Louis Lorimier, Jr. 1832), the Greene County Archives and Records Center in Springfield, Missouri (William Marshall [1998] and James Wilson 1999b), and the Missouri State Archives in Jefferson City (William Gillis 1873). Probate records related to traders operating in the vicinity of Delaware Town give a good indication of the consumption patterns of Delawares. These records can be compared to
inventories both before and after Missouri residency. Other trade related
documents include records of Menard and Vallé and the Missouri Fur Company
trading operations housed as part of the Pierre Menard Collections in Illinois, as
well as materials from the Richard Graham Papers.

Archaeological Fieldwork

Delaware Town (23CN1) was the first archaeological site recorded for
Christian County, Missouri; however, this designation was based solely on
historic maps and early histories of Greene County (of which Christian County
was originally a part) and not on archaeological data. Despite decades of
archaeological survey, there was a complete absence of archaeological materials
recovered dating to Delaware occupation in Missouri until this project. Over the
years, numerous archaeological efforts have identified dozens of archaeological
sites in this stretch of the James River Valley area. The site is located one mile
south of the Wilson’s Creek National Battlefield and only a few hundred yards
across the river from a prehistoric burial cairn (Marshall 1956). During the 1970s,
two separate archaeological survey projects conducted by the Center for
Archaeological Research at Missouri State University (formerly, Southwest
Missouri State University) intersected this area. The first was related to cultural
resource management to identify historical and archaeological resources that
would be affected by the Wilson’s Creek sewer line (Cooley et al. 1975). The
second survey was for The Missouri Township project that inventoried sites
throughout the township within which Delaware Town (23CN1) is a part (Cooley
et al. 1979). During these surveys, archaeologists identified dozens of sites with
prehistoric archaeological materials, but only one site (23CN3) with a few 19th
century materials, including a few ceramic sherds, iron fragments, and one piece
of dark olive glass (Cooley et al. 1975). At the location of 23CN1, only materials
from prehistoric time periods, primarily lithic tools and debitage, had been
recovered prior to 2003.

Located near the edge of an abandoned meander of the James River, on
land that has been almost plowed almost annually since the 1840s, there is no
part of the soil in James River floodplain in this area that is undisturbed, whether
due to natural or cultural transformative processes (Figure 1). The materials from
the Delaware occupation could have been plowed into oblivion or have eroded
into the James River long ago. In 1999 and 2000, the Center for Archaeological
Research at Missouri State University again investigated 13 sites in the area
surrounding Delaware Town in an effort to locate early-19th century sites related
to the Delaware occupation. Another look at 23CN3 revealed prehistoric and late-
19th century components, but nothing from the 1820s (Rees et al. 2000). During
the two field seasons, two other sites (23CN455 and 23CN571) uncovered
potential early-19th century components. At 23CN455, a small 20 m x 40 m area
near the tree line yielded three pieces of vessel glass and a glass button, two
pieces of iron from a harness, and an iron knife fragment (Rees et al. 2000:39).
The Maples homestead site 23CN571 contained 11 Pearlware shell-edged
ceramic sherds that could date to the early-19th century among other prehistoric
and more numerous late-19th century/early-20th century materials (Rees et al.
2000:51).
In 2003, a summer archaeological field school, conducted through Missouri State University and supervised by Gina S. Powell, once again attempted to identify early historic archaeological sites. The focus of this project was to locate the residential complex of fur trader William Gillis on the high terraces and ridges above the floodplain. Also, a systematic shovel test survey and metal detection occurred on the floodplain that yielded 15 test units. In the final two test units (TUs 14 and 15), the crew identified an intact cultural feature containing materials from the early-19th century Delaware occupation underneath the nearly 25 cm of plow zone. The Delaware Town archaeological site (23CN1) that formerly only existed on paper and in local history, finally had artifacts to support that identification. The next two field seasons (2004 and 2005), organized through Missouri State University and led by Gina S. Powell and A. Holly Jones, along with the materials located in 2003, constitute the archaeological database that will inform the interpretation of Delaware Town. During the two field seasons, the field schools excavated 56 test units, conducted two separate electrical resistivity surveys, metal detection, and shovel test units that revealed an 8 m x 3.5 m (26 ft x 11.5 ft) cabin floor that aligned on a north-south axis (Feature 3), a 2.3 m x 2.5 m sub-floor pit (Feature 2), cabin-related post (Posts 1 and 2), and other prehistoric and non-cultural features.

Delaware Town (23CN1) marks a significant place in Delaware/Lenape archaeology because it is the first site of definitive Delaware patrimony excavated since the Delaware removal out of Pennsylvania. There are several sites in southern New England and the Middle Atlantic regions related to
Delaware and Munsee peoples from the prehistoric and early Colonial period. Archaeologists of Delaware and Munsee sites in the Middle Atlantic include Herbert Kraft (1972, 1974, 1975, 1978, 1986, 1989, 1996, 2001), Jay Custer (1996), and Marshall Becker (1980, 1984, 1988, 1989, 1992, 1993). Other archaeological summaries include Grumet (1991, 1995), Venter et al. (2011), and Yann (2009). One of the most recently excavated Delaware archaeological sites is the Playwicki Farm site in Bucks County, Pennsylvania (Moore 2008; Stewart 1999). Yet, after immigrating to Ohio and Indiana, the archaeological presence of Delawares and Munsees virtually disappears until the Pratt Delaware Baptist Mission in Kansas (Kansas Historical Society 2012). Attempts to locate Delaware affiliated sites in Indiana returned no success (McCord 2002; Wepler 1980a, 1980b; Yann 2009). Likewise, Duncan Wilkie of Southeast Missouri State University surveyed 18% of the Apple Creek drainage north of Cape Girardeau, Missouri and identified 41 archaeological sites, but none related to Delawares or Shawnees known to reside there in the late-18th and early-19th century (Wilkie 1984). This large lacuna in the archaeological presence of historical Delawares between early-18th century Pennsylvania and mid-19th century Kansas provides an opportunity for Delaware Town (23CN1) to illuminate part of this void.

Lastly, archaeological data in Southwest Missouri hold a significant key to answering or contesting ideas about the use or prevalence of ethnic identity strategies at the household or village level because the material culture left behind bears little of the biases permeating the primary documents or the secondary sources. During the three intensive field seasons at the Delaware
Town site (23CN1), excavated archaeological data (especially as related to these questions of ethnic consciousness and its uses and strategies) provides a window into the daily life of a Delaware household. Viewing all of these resources through the instrumental theory of ethnic identity illuminates, in a new way, the nature of the complex social and political networks in play during the Delaware occupations of Southwest Missouri.

Chapter Overview

The initial chapter provides background information about the core details of this dissertation. This project focuses on the collective social and ethnic identity of Delawares residing at Delaware town (23CN1) in Southwest Missouri during the 1820s. The first chapter outlines the dissertation’s research objectives, an introduction to the theoretical perspectives involving identity and practice, and an overview discussion of the various historical and archaeological data used for this study.

Chapter 2 provides a more detailed discussion of the sociological, historical, anthropological, and archaeological definitions and theories that underpin and guide the analysis and interpretation of this research. The chapter begins by reviewing major trends in the social science literature regarding collective identity, especially ethnic identity, which situates this study within the existing body of social science research. The chapter continues by following trends in the study of ethnic identity as situated in the interactionist or instrumentalist approach rather than the primordialist or essentialist perspective. Lastly, practice theory and its use in archaeology, particularly Stephen Silliman’s
model of practical politics, is discussed as a framework for interpreting how identity politics and cultural representations are performed materially in the archaeological record. Recognizing identity as contextual, historically contingent, and oppositional is critical in this dissertation's understanding of the formation of a Delaware ethnic identity. I define this identity as situated within a local context in Missouri, where traditional status as "grandfathers" was no longer recognized by the new territorial governors, and also fluoresced in opposition to the Osages and pro-Osage administrators. Lastly, I discuss New Western and New Indian histories of the 1980s and 1990s (that revolutionized the studies of cultural, economic, and political exchanges occurring in frontier or borderland contexts) in order to make it clear how Delaware Town contributes to, and is informed by, this body of literature. Of special importance is the seminal work of Richard White's *The Middle Ground* (1992) that emphasizes "creative misunderstandings," exchange, agency, power, and new social forms. White's model of conceptualizing Indian-White relations is a key focus of building a narrative of Delaware Town in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3 builds upon both ethnographic and historical contextual narratives of Delaware peoples in prehistory and in early European contact that ultimately leads to Delaware Town and removal to Kansas in 1829-1830. The chapter leads with a brief discussion of ethnohistory and how this methodology pertains to this dissertation. Combining the critical use of ethnography coupled with both primary and secondary historical resources (the archaeological data set is discussed in Chapter 4) also situates the study of Delaware Town within one
more body of literature in the field of history. The first half of the chapter concentrates on summarizing and discussing major themes in Delaware history from pre-Contact to the Treaty of Greenville in 1795. This is the time period where Delaware historians tend to focus because of the generous amount of historical records. There are four themes I focus on in my analysis: 1) Delaware political structure and identity as "grandfathers," 2) the role of religion and religious movements, 3) the importance of warfare, and 4) the propensity of Delaware leaders to manipulate social, economic, and political situations for the maximum advantage as a form of social capital (Bourdieu 1986). The second half of the chapter explores these four themes as Delawares move from Indiana into Missouri and, finally, to Kansas. This latter half of the chapter is a narrative constructed from the original documentary data collection and analysis performed as part of this dissertation research.

Chapter 4 presents data from the three seasons of archaeological excavations at Delaware Town, or 23CN1, during 2003, 2004, and 2005. That field work provided the material culture data dating to the Delaware occupation of the site. This chapter discusses the soils, landforms, survey and recovery techniques, remote sensing, principal features, flora and fauna remains, and the artifact assemblages that will be used in the interpretation of Delaware Town in Chapter 5. I also describe and quantify four analytical artifact classes, Dietary Habits, Bodily Attire, Production, and Exchange, adapted from Stephen Silliman's model of practical politics (2001). Where possible, I link the archaeological data to existing Delaware ethnographic data. The end of Chapter 4 also briefly
presents archaeological conservation methods performed on a portion of
diagnostic iron artifacts. The division of the ethnographic, historical, and
archaeological data into two chapters should not be misinterpreted as a
preference or perceived superiority in one line of data over another. These two
bodies of evidence are equally important and fundamentally linked. In terms of
this dissertation, Chapters 3 and 4 form and organize the two databases of
ethnographic, historical, and archaeological evidence to be interpreted and
discussed in the final chapter.

Chapter 5 concludes with an overview of the findings and an interpretation
and discussion of the practical politics at Delaware Town using all of the
available data. In particular, this dissertation re-contextualizes the actions of
Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) and other Delaware leaders in terms of
socio-political relationships built on kinship-terminology, coalition building with
native groups, and exploiting the remoteness of landscape in Southwest
Missouri.

Considerations of Terminology

In the course of this dissertation, there are a few conventions and
terminology that need to be clarified at the outset.

Bracketed dates in citations. I use a non-standard in-text citation style for
reprinted primary sources. The reprint year is listed first and the year of the
original writing is listed in brackets (e.g., Johnston 1820[1819]).

Misspellings in primary documents. I retained all original spellings and
grammatical errors from primary documents that are directly quoted.
Nevertheless, I used the adverb [sic] or *sic erat scriptum* ("thus was it written") to identify misspellings and substantive grammatical errors. Generally, I did not mark British spellings of words. In some cases, I provided clarification within brackets.

**Phonetically-spelled personal names.** In the primary documents, there are multiple names that are misspelled and names that are spelled phonetically. Even today, there is no standardized writing system adopted for the Unami dialect, which consists of thirteen vowel sounds and thirteen consonants (Grumet 2001). In all cases of direct quotations from primary source documents, original spelling will be included. However, all phonetically-spelled personal names will be marked in bold. **Appendix A** includes a list of all variations of spellings for Delaware names found in the primary documents who lived at Delaware Town.

**Exonyms and Autonyms:** Throughout this dissertation, I will primarily use the term Delaware or Delawares to refer to the peoples that I am studying. This convention should not be taken to imply that Delawares were (or are) one uniform, homogenous group. I also recognize that this convention is an intentional choice to use an exonym, the terminology of an outsider. My rationale for doing this is to more closely match the language used in the primary documents consulted during this research. I recognize, however, that the use of autonyms is the preference. I would like to take this opportunity to delineate exonyms and autonyms for groups that are referenced in the primary documents consulted for this project (**Table 1**).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exonyms and Variations</th>
<th>Autonyms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaware, Loups</td>
<td>Lenape, Lenapi, Lenni-Lenape, Unami, Unalachtigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Munsee</td>
<td>Minisink, Minasinink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stockbridge</td>
<td>Muhheconnuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mohican, Mahican</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanticoke</td>
<td>Nentego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee, Mingo, Shawano, Sewanee, Savannah</td>
<td>Shawanwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kickapoo, Kikapoo, Kikapu</td>
<td>Kiwigapawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee, Tsalagi</td>
<td>Aniyunwiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Maumee, Twilightee</td>
<td>Myaamia, Mihtohseeniaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Piankeshaw, Piankishaw</td>
<td>Wayayaahatanwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wea, Ouatenon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>Onondowaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria, Illiniwek</td>
<td>Peewaalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaskaskia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewa, Ojibway, Ojibwe</td>
<td>Anishinaabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnebago</td>
<td>Ho-Chunk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potawatomi, Bodewadmi</td>
<td>Nishnabec, Nishnabek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek, Muscogee, Muskogee</td>
<td>Muscogee, Istichata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauk, Soc, Sac</td>
<td>Thakiwaki, Asakiwaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, Meskwaki, Mesquakie, Meskwahki</td>
<td>Meshkwahkihaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa, Ioway</td>
<td>Bâxoje or Bahkhoje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osage</td>
<td>Niukonska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas, Kansa, Kaw</td>
<td>Kanza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iroquois</td>
<td>Haudenosaunee, Kanonsionni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot, Huron</td>
<td>Wendat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comanche</td>
<td>Numimu, Nemene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawnee</td>
<td>Chahiksichahiks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 1. Map of Archaeological Sites in the Project Area. (Republic 7.5 minute Quadrangle, USGS 1975b; Courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.) 23CN1 or Delaware Town is identified by the dark circular shape. Most of the archaeological sites shown here are prehistoric.
CHAPTER 2: THEORIES OF IDENTITY AND PRACTICE

This chapter presents the key definitions, theoretical ideas, and interpretive models that underpin the Delaware Town Archaeological Project. This study brings together multiple bodies of literature that are directly relevant for a robust understanding of identity at Delaware Town. First, this chapter explores four concepts necessary to interpret this archaeological site: 1) collective identities, 2) ethnic identity as historically contingent and defined through interaction and opposition, 3) practice theory and the model of practical politics, and 4) “New Western” borderland studies. I discuss the major trends in these bodies of literature and present the key definitions and research models that contribute to the analysis of the documentary and archaeological record for Delaware Town.

The subject of this dissertation focuses on the construction, negotiation, and instrumental uses of an ethnic identity among the populations living at (and near) the Delaware Town site (23CN1), in Southwest Missouri. It is important to note that these communities were neither culturally homogeneous, nor isolated. Though it would be equally interesting to analyze the daily practice of identity for the traders, Indian agents and their employees, and/or other surrounding native groups, this study will focus on the identity configurations of Delaware peoples.
residing in Southwest Missouri. This group that settled in Missouri is part of a diverse, but disambiguated, language family that is often referred to as Delawares, Munsees, and Lenapes (self-referentially) (Hunter 1978). This tight ethnohistorical and archaeological focus permits two outcomes: 1) an in-depth, synchronic analysis of multiple layers of Delaware identity and 2) an ability to integrate this interpretation into the larger picture of Delaware political and social histories diachronically. The locally-based reactions at Delaware Town provide a basis for interpreting the manner in which Delawares understood their position in a web of socio-political connections and how symbols, structures, and daily practice expressed that position.

The Delaware Town Archaeological Project can help illuminate the usefulness of composite formations of identity in post-colonial settings. This is one of the major strengths of this study. At Delaware Town, I intend to move beyond the identification of ethnic markers to study material culture of social opposition and instrumentalism. Clearly, not every category of material culture is meaningful in regards to identity creation and negotiation. It is important to consider the processes by which collective feelings and relationships are produced and reproduced in society. These symbolic expressions can be ritualized, emblematic, or incorporated into everyday practice.

A careful understanding of the ethnohistorical and archaeological record is needed to identify areas where identity materializes and is used in overt and covert ways. Therefore, a comparative task must be performed in order to measure the manifestations of collective identity prior to arrival in Southwest
Missouri. In Chapter 3, I posit that a vital aspect to Delaware identity involves the politically important fictive kinship and diplomatic status as “grandfathers” among other eastern native groups. I also argue that during periods where Delaware peoples’ status as “grandfathers” is challenged, specific and material reactions become evident to re-exert such an identity. For example, while part of the Six Nations, the Delawares found themselves at odds, politically, with the Iroquois. This “feminization” of Delawares spawned considerable secondary literature (Miller 1974; Speck 1946; Trenkwalder Schönenberger 1991; Wallace 1946; Weslager 1944, 1947). After breaking with the Six Nations, groups of Delawares converged and united in many locales. They established collective identities as “Delaware” peoples with social and political organizations never seen before 1750. During this time, participation in nativist movements and the creation of the Gamwing (Big House Ceremony) can be viewed in light of the imagining of a collective identity. In particular, the Gamwing represents a revision and consolidation of several earlier rituals that may have been too costly to perform separately (Grumet 2001). Also, the Gamwing was part of a process of self-definition in terms of ritual participation (Miller 1994). For this study, I follow Barrett’s (1988) example and posit that both the ritualized and routinized artifact categories will be those related to bodily adornment, subsistence practices, religion, dress, and status.

Some of the most overt expressions of collective ethnic identity exist with action and materials that do not survive in the archaeological record. The ability to compare Delaware Town with other sites of Delaware patrimony is difficult.
While sites have been excavated in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania such as Minisink, Miller Field, Pahaquarra, and Playwicki Farm (Kraft 1975, 1986; Grumet 1995; Moore 2008; Stewart 1999), the archaeological sites occupied by Delawares immediately before and after occupations in Southwest Missouri have not been located (McCord 2002; Wepler 1980a, 1980b; Wilkie 1984). Fortunately, the ethnographic and historic records can inform specific processual changes in kinship terms referent to other groups, claims for damages or compensation through government officials, symbols and ideology not found in the material remains, and the use of warfare for political means. The archaeological presence at Delaware Town is very ephemeral, yet identity can be recognized in the personal and ceremonial artifacts (tinkle cones, silver ring brooches, stone pipes, wampum shell beads), number and distribution of trade goods, choices in diet (wild foods and native cultivation in contrast to agricultural goods and domesticated animal remains), and hunting techniques (extended hunts in the Plains, iron projectile cones, and gun flints).

**Concepts of Collective Identities**

In order to understand and explain how a Delaware identity is constructed and implemented (and for what purposes) at Delaware Town, it is important to delineate concepts in social science regarding identity and how it is used in archaeology. Michael Shanks elaborates that:

Identity is a complex concept, like culture, so essential and yet so difficult to specify. Of course, identity is about who we think we are. But like culture, identity is better treated less as a specific phenomenon and more as a field of discourse – something people
argue over and around precisely because they think it is important. (quoted in Maguire 2007:11)

The study of collective identity is not a new topic in anthropology or interpretive archaeology, although there are several different schools of thought and differing approaches. The past few decades experienced a rise in sophisticated considerations of identity as a complex and interwoven tapestry of multiple identities including gender, ethnicity, race, class, status, and age (Banks 1996; Barrett 1988; Bentley 1986; Brumfiel 2003; Deagan 1982; Delle et al. 2000; Díaz-Andreu et al. 2005; Eriksen 1996; Fesler and Franklin 1999; Horning 2000; Insoll 2007a, 2007b; Jones 1996, 1997, 2007; Jones and Graves-Brown 1996; Lawrence 2003; Lightfoot 2005; Lightfoot et al. 1998; Maguire 2007; McGuire 1982; Meskell 2001, 2002, 2007; Neiman 1999; Ruberto 2001; Shennan 1989; Schuyler 1980; Silliman 2000, 2004; Trigger 1986; Wilkie 2000). Of course, this dissertation intends to focus primarily on the expression of collective identity as it appears in ethnic groups, with the recognition that ethnic identity cannot be completely disentangled from other aspects of identity. It is also important to note that identities themselves are not static and are constantly redefined. Siân Jones defines ethnic groups as "culturally ascribed identity groups, which are based on the expression of real or assumed shared culture and common descent" (1997:84). It is made clear that ethnicity and identity are inexorably tied to a group's or individual's ability to self-ascribe; biological descent is not required. Elizabeth Brumfiel firmly asserts that identity is an important topic of study
because it is one of the structuring principles of both past and present societies (1994).

Despite the increased interest since the 1980s in anthropological theories of identity, there have been strong criticisms of its usefulness as a category of meaning. The most vocal and reasoned critique is summarized by Handler's paper "Is 'Identity' a Useful Cross-Cultural Concept?:

Groups are not bounded objects in the natural world. Rather, "they" are symbolic processes that emerge and dissolve in particular contexts of action. Groups do not have essential identities; indeed they ought not to be defined as things at all. For any imaginable social group – defined in terms of nationality, class, locality, or gender – there is no definitive way to specify "who we are," for "who we are" is a communicative process that includes many voices and varying degrees of understanding and, and importantly, misunderstanding. (1994:30)

In general, I agree with this critique, but argue that the last decade of identity studies in anthropology and archaeology move away from Handler's critique of identity in favor of seeing identity as a dialectical and constructed social process instead of a social fact (Hegmon 1998:272). I do not believe Handler's critique is relevant for the goals of this study. Upon careful examination of the extensive Delaware histories, it is clear that there has never been a unified group known as "the Delaware." Even the residents of Delaware Town cannot be said to have a singular political or social identity. Yet, this group is recognized as a group by others (imposed identity and/or self-ascribed) and is created through contestable and discursive processes in an oppositional contexts (Barth 1998[1969]; Trigger 1986; Whitehead 1992). This discourse is important because it instrumentally
shapes everyday practice and, through materiality, may be viewed in archaeological assemblages through an understanding of the processes by which specific identities shape and organize groups. Because identity "emerges and dissolves" in oppositional contexts, this concept permits us to utilize to archaeological data to locate those permutations and intersections.

In some ways, "identity" can be as troublesome to define as "culture" due to the fact that it is just one pervasive element of the human condition, yet so difficult to measure or even quantify. Maguire commented that the concept and definition of identity should be subject to debate because it is identity that shapes actions and behaviors (2007). Anthropological interest in identity is closely correlated with the problems of the modern globalscape and the resultant crises of identity brought about by rapid social change (Giddens 1990, 1991). This issue of crisis posed by Giddens is reflected in another characteristic of identity posed by Michael Rowlands:

> Whether it is the effect of an experience of emigration and immigration... or fears of the threat of cultural homogenization or the doubts cast on the unity of the self due to fears of anomie, alienation, and loneliness, identity has become the keyword to describe a sense of loss. (2007:61)

I agree with Rowlands and Giddens that loss (or fear of loss) is a driving social force in the negotiation of identity, especially in the enforcement of group mores, group boundaries, emblematic symbols, cultural conservatism, rites of intensification, or revitalization movements. Historically-contingent loss had a profound impact on the structure (and to a lesser extent, the content) of identity politics.
With identity negotiation, change, or crisis is expressive in material ways and everyday practices; thus, it can be applied to the archaeological record. As such, identity is of primary relevance to this study because the early-19th century is a period of rapid social and political change for Delaware-speaking peoples. During the tight chronological context of Delaware Town, it is possible to see collective identity managed, created, and practiced in reaction to hardships, successes, and interactions while in Missouri. By looking at the dimension of ethnicity (and ethnic identity), anthropologists can study, simultaneously, persistence and change, the group and the individual, and the relationship of a group/individual with other groups or and with hegemonic, external entities. It is important to note, however, that identity is dynamic and contextual, not inherent, monolithic, or static.

**Defining Ethnic Identity**

At this point, it is necessary to discuss the several major trends in the anthropological literature related to the study of ethnicity and, by extension, all collective identities in order to indicate the definitions and assumptions utilized by this research. Of course, one of the central questions to this discussion revolves around the different ways that anthropology explores ethnicity as a concept. The term *ethnicity* is not a value-free expression and is subsumed with considerable misconception, poor definition, and historical and political baggage. “[C]ulture and tradition, place of origin, common ancestry and history (whether real or imagined), and diverse physical attributes all combine to forge one’s ethnic identity” (Fesler and Franklin 1999:5). This dissertation agrees with this

An interpretive archaeology informed by theories of identity sprouted from post-processual and post-colonial reactions against the “New Archaeology” of the 1960s. “New Archaeology” focused primarily on ecological and economic explanations of human behavior, whereas the major avenue of post-processual approaches attempt to examine complex interactions of social actors and groups (Meskell and Preucel 2004). Many archaeologists recognized, however, that the distributions of archaeological types viewed as representative of an ethnicity did not exactly coincide with actual groups (Hodder 1978). During the 1980s, archaeologies of ethnicity focused on three key aspects: 1) ethnicity, 2) race, and 3) gender (reviewed in Jones 1997; Díaz-Andreu et al. 2005). Significant problems arose when trying to separate the factor of ethnicity from other aspects of identity (see Insoll 2007a, 2007b; Jones 1996, 2007; Jones and Graves-Brown 1996). Further problems arose in archaeological and prehistoric settings that could not easily associate an ethnic group with a language group (MacEachern 2001; Silverstein 1998; Terrell 2001; Wells 1992, 1999), or could not disentangle one aspect of identity from another constituent element, such as gender, socio-economic status, race, age, etc. (Fesler and Franklin 1999; Neiman 1999; Wilkie 2000). As such, many varieties of ethnic studies emerged, emphasizing a composite and hybrid notion of ethnicity (Horning 2000; Jones 1996, 1997, 2007; Lawrence 2003), especially in pluralistic and creole settings (Brumfiel 2003;

In recent anthropology, there are two primary frameworks characterizing ethnicity that are important to delineate: the isolationist/primordial view and the interactionist/instrumentalist view (Banks 1996). The former theory emphasizes ethnic and cultural differences as innate and natural and not as the result of interaction or historical factors (Berdan et al. 2008; Brumfiel 2003; Cohen 1978; Dietler and Herbich 1998; Hegmon 1998). Primordialism is a socio-biological perspective that values kinship bonds, psychological aspects of identity, and emphasizes the emotive connections and potent symbols negotiated between people and families/territories/nationalism (Geertz 1963a). Under this school of thought, different ethnic groups could be defined based on a set of binding characteristics, artifacts, or customs, such as language and appearance (Eller 1999; Geertz 1963a, 1963b; Shils 1957). This perspective heavily influenced the early professional history of archaeology that tended to track the history of “ethnic groups” and constructed archaeological units called “cultures” using artifact typologies (Jones 1996; Dietler and Herbich 1998). However, there are numerous errors of interpretation possible in only using this line of questioning. On top of romanticizing and reifying the concept of ethnicity (or relating ethnicity as static, idealized, and deterministic), primordial standpoints turn the subject of ethnicity into one of human nature, removed from historical and environmental contexts (Jones 1997:66-72).
As part of the isolationist or primordial perspective, ethnic groups, "cultures," or nations form independently and in isolation. In many regards, this school of thought is closely bonded with evolutionary theory because of the emphasis on biological factors, inheritance, and geographical isolation. Ethnicity was conceptualized as the core or the essence of geographically and culturally distinct entities and subsequent variations from a normative style were ignored or regulated to diffusion. These discrete cultural cores implied uniformity across space, but faced disruptions on boundary zones with other cultural cores due to the diffusion of cultural traits. Moreover, the primorialist view of cultures or nations that could be seen as "unified, monolithic, wholes, with unilineal and continuous histories" did not hold up well in multi-cultural contexts where cultural diffusion and creolization blurred the lines (Jones 1996:62; Trigger 1986). In many models using the primordial perspective, groups coming into contact would only trigger significant conflict leading to eventual and wholesale assimilation.

The primorialist/isolationist view of ethnicity has largely been abandoned as overly simplistic and not theoretically sophisticated enough to deal with the nuanced, complex, fluid, contested, and contextual nature of ethnic identity. Although it is important to recognize that much of the social phenomena traditionally associated with primordialism, such as place, memory, kinship, and language, are not typically addressed in the interactionist theories despite their importance in a study like Delaware Town. Still, the primordial/isolationist platform is not useful in a situation like Delaware Town where many different ethnic groups sustained contact for some time while maintaining separate
identities. Also, this school of thought does not accommodate the questions I want to explore about a politicized ethnic identity.

**Ethnic Identity in Interaction**

In contrast to the primordialist and isolationist view of identity, most archaeological research since the 1960s ceased viewing ethnic groups as discrete monolithic entities and began examining the construction of group boundaries, agency and practice, and inter-relationships between and within groups in multi-cultural settings. This perspective, known as the interaction or instrumentalist view, characterizes ethnicity as cultural differences that are not monolithic and essentialist, but as dynamic, fluid, culturally and historically contingent. As a result, interactionist and instrumentalist perspectives have been the benchmark for studying ethnicity in anthropology for more than four decades, making ethnicity situational, in flux, and strategic. This is the definition of ethnicity utilized in this research.

The interactionist definition of ethnicity was presented in a seminal series of essays in Fredrik Barth's *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. This collection shifted the focus from recognizing cultural differences to looking for ethnic affiliation and group identification by identifying the social boundaries between groups (1998[1969]). Barth departed from traditional isolationist ideas about ethnicity and group identity by recognizing the foundational importance of interaction between groups, allowance for an individual dimension of ethnicity, and an understanding of group boundary permeability. Moreover, the ethnic group's consciousness was internally defined and the criteria for membership
were not static or unchanging (Naroll 1964). Barth focused on the self-ascription (and ascription by others) of group membership as a primary reason for the existence and persistence of groups. Thus, ethnicity and ethnic affiliation becomes the organizational process by which cultural diversity is promoted through some significant embodied, practiced, and material representations. His idea was a notable break from previous philosophies because he considered ethnic groups as a created idea rather than a natural entity. Through studying interactions with other groups, or the social boundaries of the groups themselves, the effectiveness of ethnic groups as social organizations can be assessed.

Within Barth’s interactionist/instrumentalist model, specific cultural features can be recognized as embodied identity, and some of those features can be observed in material culture of everyday practices. Other cultural features may be downplayed, ignored, or have nothing to do with identity.

Barth’s interaction approach also included the significant aspect of instrumentalism that emphasizes people as social actors who negotiate their own identity for their own means (Barth 1998[1969]; Enloe 1980; Jones 1997). Ethnicity (and ethnic identity) can be identified as the processes by which “some interest groups exploit parts of their traditional culture in order to articulate informal organizational functions that are used in the struggle of those groups for power” (Cohen 1974:91). Therefore, the process of group formation is reliant on the interests of people working toward both individual and collective goals. This is known as the instrumental notion of identity. “In the instrumental view, ethnicity is a social and political resource used to define group identity, regulate group
membership and boundaries to make claims (especially of the state)” (Castles 2004:1). Barth’s interactive view of ethnicity emphasizes certain political, social, and economic advantages when viewed in oppositional terms of “us” and “them.” The relative “fitness” or gain from the strategic use of ethnic affiliation works well with the instrumentalist notion, but makes little sense for groups whose inclusion is a large disadvantage.

Yet, a major criticism of the interactionist and instrumentalist approaches is that this school of thought tends to be reductionist and usually defines ethnicity as specific behaviors in particular situations. Interactionism also tends to neglect important factors related to kinship, memory, and place (all of which are very important in modern Native American identities) and does not take psychological factors into consideration (Jones 1997:79). For this reason, it is not a surprise that the application of instrumentalist investigations into ethnic identity has not been widely applied to cases of post-Contact Period American Indians, particularly those communities separate from Euro-American settlements (Lightfoot 2005; Lightfoot et al. 1998; Lightfoot and Martinez 1995; Rubertone 2000; Silliman 2000, 2004; Thomas 1991). Because Delaware Town is a post-Contact native settlement largely separate from Euro-American settlements and influence, using the interactionist and instrumentalist approaches to ethnicity provides a good opportunity to demonstrate the usefulness of this concept in historic Native American communities. Instrumentalist approaches have clear utility in anthropological theory because of their focus on relationships and usefulness in Contact studies and inter-ethnic interactions. It is within these
contexts that strategy, using culture and ethnicity as tools to navigate through interaction and environment, best interact with practice theory.

More recently, John Comaroff’s important paper “Of Totemism and Ethnicity” (1987) provided a useful bridge between the relatively non-historical interactionist and instrumentalist approach of Barthian ethnicity and factors of ethnicity previously only studied in the primordialist fashion. Comaroff explicitly delineates the necessity to consider Boasian historical particularism in the construction of ethnic consciousness by incorporating kinship, language, memory, place, and history. In this important work, Comaroff reminds historical ethnographers that ethnicity is constructed in both structural and cultural ways as well as out of specific historical forces (1992:50). This historically contingent instrumentalist theory is the most relevant to the questions I am interested in answering at Delaware Town because I want to more fully examine why and how ethnicity is being produced and used (and to what ends) by the Delawares in the 1820s. This perspective examines identity with the understanding that all identities are social constructs, flexible, dependent on historical and situational factors, and multi-dimensional (more than simply gender, class, age, and ethnicity).

The political and power dimension of ethnicity has been emphasized recently by Brumfiel (2003), Comaroff (1987); Meskell (2002), Rowlands (2007), and Silliman (2000, 2001, 2004). In particular, Comaroff specified that ethnicity “had its origins in the asymmetric incorporation of structurally dissimilar groupings... [that] structure relations of inequality between discrete social
entities" (1992:54-55). This power differential is essential to the central argument of this thesis that Delaware ethnic identity as "grandfathers" is of primary importance in this group's self-definition in interaction with other eastern immigrant groups as well as European and American government entities. Asymmetrical power as part of ethnicity is especially evident among Delawares being referenced as "grandfathers," in both pre-Contact woodland diplomatic contexts and as first among all other native groups in dealings with French, British, or American government agents. This position afforded Delawares quite a bit of political and financial latitude, historically.

In a way, Delaware ethnic identity as "grandfathers" can be construed of as social capital. As defined by Bourdieu (1986):

Social capital is the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition – or in other words, to membership in a group – which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectively-owned capital, a 'credential' which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word.

However, in Southwest Missouri, this laurel of respect as "grandfathers" was visibly losing its power. Also, the power and domination theories of ethnicity rely heavily on the role of prejudice and negative stereotyping of subordinate groups to legitimize inequality (Comaroff 1987:54). At Delaware Town, these phenomena are visible in the historical records (and are less obvious in the archaeological assemblages). More importantly, the power, domination, and
hierarchy evident in this case study of Delaware Town can certainly be examined and explained in terms of the instrumentalist and interaction theories of ethnicity.

Identity in Practice Theory

One additional derivation of the instrumental/interactionist approach to ethnicity is that “ethnicity does not simply exist; it is something that people do” (Hegmon 1998:272; Ortner 1984). This active, self-conscious performance of identity builds upon the framework of practice theory and provides an excellent theoretical framework to underpin this dissertation. If material culture plays an active role in the construction and negotiation of identity, archaeologists must pay careful attention to the social actors who create, use, and discard these items. Likewise, the subconscious, routine structure of daily life must be viewed in light of instrumental intent of social actors. Traditionally, the debate over the place of individuals (social actors) within societies spans a continuum with the place of structure at one end and the place of agency at the other (Barrett 1998, 2000, 2001; Bentley 1986, 1991; Bourdieu 1977, 1990; Comaroff and Comaroff 1992, 2001; Giddens 1984, 1990, 1991). Practice theory, as outlined by French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu and British sociologist Anthony Giddens, is where the intersection occurs between routinized, subconscious, embedded structural identity and the intentional, negotiated, practiced identity of social actors. While the social boundaries between ethnic groups are instrumental in such a group’s creation and existence, practice theory is an effective explanatory model to view and understand both group and individual actions, especially in terms of materiality in archaeological data (Bentley 1986). Practice theory, despite being
an idealist theory, is relevant in the interpretation of the archaeological record because it involves the daily actions and routines of people, which can be seen, materially, in the ground. Barth’s notion of ethnic groups and boundaries informs us of the structure and creation of ethnic groups while practice, “anything people do,” informs us of the daily embodiment of this organizational difference in materiality (Hegmon 1998; Ortner 1984:149).

At this point, it is important to look closely at the use of practice theory as it is applied to instrumentalist notions of ethnic identity. The following section will first present a summary of Giddens’ theory of *structuration* and “practical consciousness,” followed by a more lengthy discussion of Bourdieu’s theory of practice, before discussing how these concepts have been used in archaeological inquiry.

British sociologist Anthony Giddens’ theory known as structuration attempted to bridge the perceived dichotomy of agency and structure and emphasizing the interdependence between the two in defining and shaping social action (1979, 1984). Giddens focuses more on the individual actor in the structure/agent duality and permits a more active role for the social actor in interfacing with the structure. As Giddens defines his theory in *The Constitution of Society*:

> The basic domain of study of the social sciences, according to the theory of structuration, is neither the experience of the individual actor, nor the existence of any form of social totality, but social practices ordered across space and time. Human social activities, like some self-reproducing items in nature, are recursive. That is to say, they are not brought into being by social actors but continually recreated by them via the very means whereby they express
themselves as actors. In and through their activities agents reproduce the conditions that make these activities possible. (1984:2)

Individuals both produce and reproduce social structures through action and are, simultaneously, constrained and enabled by the organization of the social structure (Giddens 1984:162). To Giddens, though, social acts not only perform culture through habit and routine according to socialized rules, but social actors can also consciously reflect upon their motivations and actions (Giddens 1979). This concept is known as "practical consciousness." "Practical consciousness" includes "all the things that we know as social actors, and must know, to make social life happen, but to which we cannot necessarily give discursive form" (Giddens 1979:59). What makes Giddens' theory so attractive to post-processual archaeologists is that it enables individual social actors to discursively act, with reflexive consciousness, in the face of powerful social structures and institutions. Alone, however, structuration is an extremely broad concept that is very difficult to directly apply to a discipline bonded so closely to material culture. This is why Giddens' structuration and practical consciousness is often coupled with Pierre Bourdieu's theory of practice. Bourdieu's theory also bridges the agency/structure duality, but is more applicable to observable behaviors in the archaeological record.

Practice theory, as defined by French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1977, 1990), is a powerful model, but it grants practically no conscious reflection to social actors, to explain the action of cultural agents through *habitus*, or the structuring mechanisms within social agents that are learned through
socialization processes. In fact, Brumfiel (1994) suggests a more agent-centered approach to practice theory than permitted by the structure-centered theories of both Giddens and Bourdieu. Bourdieu's definition of *habitus* is lengthy:

[S]ystems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles of the generation and structuring of practices and representations which can be objectively "regulated" and "regular" without in any way being the product of obedience to rules, objectively adapted to their goals without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary to attain them and, being all this, collectively orchestrated without being the product of the orchestrating action of a conductor. (1977:72)

Bourdieu's circular language when describing *habitus* expresses its extremely dialectical nature. The *habitus* is learned and shared by individuals through socialization, predisposes people to act in certain ways, and is reinforced through everyday routines. Thus, the *habitus* is part of the unconscious and is reinforced and recreated through daily action of social actors. Yet, the *habitus* is not static. It is "a dynamic relational phenomenon which is both an historical product and agent" (Dietler and Herbich 1998:247). The focus on quotidian routine is why practice theory and *habitus* have been such powerful methodological and conceptual tools in archaeology. Material culture becomes "active," historically contingent, and is produced semi-consciously by cultural agents, both guided by, and contributing to, cultural ideals and norms. Thus, material culture and the role of the agent are instrumental in negotiating identity and achieving goals which can be viewed through empirical evidence (Preucel and Mrozowski 2010:131).
Moreover, the “durable dispositions” of *habitus*, for the most part, remain unconsidered and seem “natural” to the social actors. Bourdieu coined the term *doxa* to describe this phenomenon:

Every established order tends to produce... the naturalization of its own arbitrariness. Of all the mechanisms tending to produce this effect, the most important and the best concealed is undoubtedly the dialectic of the objective chances and the agents’ aspirations, out of which arises a *sense of limits*, commonly called the *sense of reality*, i.e., the correspondence between the objective classes and the internalized classes, social structures and mental structures, which is the basis of the most ineradicable adherence to the established order. Systems of classification which reproduce... the objective classes, i.e., the divisions by sex, age, or positions in the relations of power productions... by securing the misrecognition, and hence the recognition, on which they are based... This experience we shall call the *doxa*... [emphasis in original]. (Bourdieu 1977:164)

Of course, *doxa* can be challenged during a time of crisis. When social agents recognize the arbitrariness of what once existed in the *doxic universe*, it moves into an active field of discourse or opinion (negotiating between *heterodoxy* and *orthodoxy*) (Bourdieu 1977:168-169). Compared to *habitus*, *doxa* and the *doxic universe* are rarely used in archaeology (an exception is Silliman 2001:194).

While the vast majority of archaeological studies that utilize a practice theory combine Bourdieu’s *habitus* and Giddens’ *structuration*, there are several more conceptual tools as part of Bourdieu’s practice theory that are left “on the table” despite being potentially useful in considerations of collective agency and group or ethnic identity: the concepts of *field* and *collusio*. “In analytical terms, a *field* may be defined as a network, or a configuration, of objective relations
between positions” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992:96-97). In fact, Charles Orser rebukes archaeologists who have adopted Bourdieu and omit these concepts:

The biggest oversight of most archaeologists who have employed Bourdieu’s concept of *habitus* is that they have often failed to include his idea of *field*. This omission is unfortunate because it is essentially impossible to understand Bourdieu’s theory of practice without comprehending fields. *Fields* are the location of all social practice. (2004:136)

*Habitus* (the subjective) is acted out within the *field* (the objective), which Bourdieu describes as arenas of struggle for particular forms of cultural capital (social, political, symbolic, or economic) (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992:96). In essence, the *field* conditions the *habitus* and the *habitus* constitutes the *field* (1992:127). David Swartz illustrates four important points about using Bourdieu’s concept of *field*:

1. Fields are arenas of struggle for legitimation.
2. Fields are structured spaces for dominant and subordinate positions based on types and amounts of capital.
3. Fields impose specific forms of struggle on the actors.
4. Fields are structured by their own internal mechanisms and are thus somewhat but not entirely autonomous from the external environment. (Swartz 1997:122-29; Orser 2004:137)

The way all of these concepts, *habitus*, *doxa*, and *field* work together is illustrated by Bourdieu and Wacquant through the analogy of a game where the participants compete for forms of cultural capital through various strategies and collusion with other players. *Doxa* is the understanding that the game is worthwhile. *Illusio* is a person or group’s investment or interest in the game. The bounds of the *field* are fluid because they are at stake and the players develop a feel for the game and
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act in a way that makes sense to them (the *habitus*) (1992:98-100). This game analogy meshes quite well with the instrumental/interaction approach to the study of ethnicity.

There is one additional tool from Bourdieu's theory of practice rarely used in social science that is pertinent to a study of collective and instrumental uses of identity. Terry Rey brings attention to Bourdieu's concept of *collusio*, which is a kind of collective *habitus* that represents the immediate and unconscious agreement among members of the same social group (2007:87-88). Because these shared factors shape particular groups, *collusio* is very useful in discussing identity, especially race, ethnicity, class, and religion.

Combining the agency theories of Bourdieu (*habitus*) and Giddens (practical consciousness) permits archaeologists to view social structure as both constraining and enabling to the actors. This approach has been fruitful in archaeological contexts because material remains can be used to answer questions stemming from how material culture was perceived by the people who interacted with them (Barrett 1988; Hodder 1982; Pauketat 2001; Shanks and Tilley 1987). Additionally, because actors imbue objects with meaning, they do so from a societal, situational, and individual perspective. Thus, material remains can reflect multiple, layered, and embedded meanings and should be considered using a contextual approach (Hodder 1991). Practice, as utilized in contemporary archaeology, is not quite as simple as synthesizing the ideas of Bourdieu and Giddens. Barrett (1988), who links the concepts of *habitus* and "practical consciousness" and applies them directly to archaeology, notes that in practice,
unequal power and status relationships are produced, utilized, appropriated, exchanged, and consumed. Domination, economy, and ethnicity cannot be separated out from other aspects of the creation of society. However, using a model proposed by Bentley (1986, 1991), practice theory can be applied effectively to studies of ethnic identity by emphasizing the materiality of daily life and how rituals and routines shape meaning and facilitate a dialectical relationship between social structure and agency that also considers politics, power, and cultural capital.

Silliman (2000) reviewed recent archaeological inquiry using this combined practice theory model and discussed two lines of thought. One emphasizes agents or actors as “rational maximizers” (Blanton et al. 1996; Joyce and Winter 1996; criticized in Barrett 2000; Gero 2000). The other embeds the actions of social agents with meaning and in the context of historical and social circumstances (Barrett 2000; Dobres and Hoffman 1994; Dobres and Robb 2000; Greene 2009; Hodder 1991; Johnson 1989; Pauketat 2000; Silliman 2000; Thomas 1991; Wilkie and Bartoy 2000). This contrast reveals a duality of both intention (creative, goal-oriented, and motivated action) and routine (including unexpected outcomes and consequences) during the production of the archaeological record. The nature of the archaeological record reveals which side of this debate will be more easily applicable to the data sets. The lived, daily routine is much easier to retrieve from the ground than rational thoughts, which might be more visible in the documentary record. I agree with Silliman (2000, 2001) in utilizing the second version of the above dichotomy in practice theory in
archaeology. This permits an interpretation of practice theory that allows for social agents to create and negotiate identity (both creatively and with intention) as part of habitus (collusio) in quotidian practices.

Practice theory also helps to solve an additional conundrum about archaeological studies of identity. Michelle Hegmon proposed an extremely useful way to bridge the gap between Barth’s instrumentalist and interactionist approach and the primordialist view by using practice theory:

[E]thnicity can be understood in terms of the interaction (or dialectic) between, on the one hand, existing (but not immutable) structures or ethnic groups, and, on the other hand, the strategies of actors in a given social context. To put it in other terms, habitus, which molds – often at the subconscious level – what people are, contributes to the creation of apparent ethnic differences (the primordialist view). Ethnic symbols are open to manipulation (the instrumentalist view) though they did not come into being simply for manipulative purposes. Finally, the habitus is reproduced and potentially changed by the actions of those people, whether or not ethnicity is purposely altered. (1998:273)

Thus, practice theory, as it is used in this study navigates the middle ground between the primordialist and instrumentalist views of ethnic identity by focusing on the use, manipulation, and reproduction of cultural symbols, including quotidian practices, within the context of existing (not reified) social structures called ethnicity.

Identity as Political: Practical Politics

Furthermore, I intend to apply Silliman’s model of practical politics (2001) to combine practice theory and instrumental identity in everyday practices at Delaware Town. Practical politics refers to “the politics of social position and
identity in daily practices” (Silliman 2001:194). The definition of the political is expanded here because politics are not always "explicit, consequential, or even contested in the world of everyday conduct” (Silliman 2000:21). He argues that politics are deeply embedded in practice because people are constantly surrounded by the political world. Ortner emphasizes that the "most important forms of practice are those with intentional or unintentional political implications" (1984:149). Of course, politics are discursive like identity: constructed, dynamic, and situational. Various “parameters of action,” the barriers, limitations, and alternatives within contexts, can be analyzed effectively in archaeological settings (Wobst 2000:41).

Practical politics examines parameters of action using another practice theory tool, doxa. This concept represents the subconscious, goes-without-saying, taken-for-granted parts of a “natural” culture and ideas that are not part of the realm of discourse (Bourdieu 1977:166). As contexts change, concepts within the doxic universe pass into the realm of the contestable where aspects of identity and daily practice are transformed before returning to the subconscious realm of the doxic universe (Comaroff and Comaroff 1992; Jones 1997). Bourdieu’s notion of habitus and Giddens’ idea of “practical consciousness” both entwine with doxa as a way of structuring actions, while they also allow for intentionality (Silliman 2001). Yet, it is important to note that Silliman slightly changes his use of the term doxa in his model to reflect “a quality of particular circumstances, materials, or social relations” (2001:193). Doxic relations can be assessed in the archaeological record because “[material culture] production –
while contingent on histories of actions and representations – is an enactment or an embodiment of people’s dispositions, identities, and traditions” (Pauketat 2001). Because *doxa* represents shared and unquestioned principles, the emergence of alternative practices, *heterodoxy*, is part of a political process. Silliman emphasizes that the “key is to investigate the *changes* in practical politics and in the boundaries of *doxa* at moments of social transformation, not only as they comprise change, but also as they envelop daily experience” (2001:197). This theory has been applied successfully at Rancho Petaluma where the use of continuity of lithic tool-making represents actual social change related to politics (Silliman 2000, 2001) and (slightly modified) at an Apache scout camp (Laluk 2007).

In his treatise on the “practical politics” model, Silliman outlines six social behaviors that would exhibit *doxic* qualities in certain contexts. These behaviors include dietary habits, bodily attire, burial practices, production, exchange, and sexual relations (2001:193). This study adopts these categories, although burial practices and sexual relations are more difficult to find in the documentary and archaeological records. One potential criticism of Silliman’s “practical politics” model is that it vaguely functional in the same vein as Stanley South’s functional categories used in processual archaeologies (1977). Yet, in using an instrumental view of ethnicity as related to practice, certain artifacts and behaviors will, necessarily, have functional aspects to their acquisition, use, modification, and disuse.
At Rancho Petaluma, Silliman (2001) viewed the seeming continuity of traditional lithic technology as the active political and social processes reflective of heterodoxic choices being made on the fringe of the doxic universe. Applying this theory to Delaware Town will be a fruitful interpretive model of the practice-as-politics of everyday life. In particular, practical politics will help formulate explanations for the presence of lithic tools, the continuation of traditional sexual division of labor in subsistence, differences in material culture use between men and women, the constitution of the flora and fauna remains, the exercise of amassing symbolic and cultural capital, and other material aspects negotiated in the process of exercising collective identity.

**Contributions from/to “New Western” and Borderlands Studies**

In an attempt to answer my questions about the social and political uses of ethnic identity at Delaware Town using an instrumentalist and practice-based viewpoint, I am specifically searching for evidence of Barth's ethnic “boundaries” that may include geography, quotidian practices, linguistic patterns, inter-group alliances, intra-group divisions, and conflicts in response to various pressures. In addition, I aim to evaluate social relationships between group leaders, subsistence pursuits, and diplomatic posturing. Barth’s notion of ethnic boundaries deserves to be elaborated on because this “boundary” or social borderland forms an essential context that informs this research project. Boundary, here, is a multivalent term that refers to the periphery of society, social bounds of interaction, obstacles of interaction, and structured social boundaries (Barth 2002). Certainly, the “core” of a group should not be overlooked because
non-marginal actors often perform symbolic behavior in significant spaces, and these performances are used in instrumental ways to maintain and negotiate those boundaries (Barth 1994). As social actors, people can highlight or conceal their group membership, depending on the situation. In this way, the flux of the borderlands will also lead to a flux in strategies for expressing and creating collective and individual identity. More importantly, the boundary serves as a structural and structured process where, through interaction, identities are performed, reproduced, transformed, and understood. In this way, the two models being used for this dissertation (identity and practice) can be bridged.

Subsequently, I also recognize that the term “boundary” possesses two meanings in this dissertation. First, as discussed above, there is an ideological and social boundary related to ethnic group membership. Second, there must be a consideration of a geographical (and still social) boundary at play in the interpretation of the Delaware Town Archaeological Project. Some of these boundaries are best identified in historical records, while others reveal themselves more exclusively in archaeological data. The active role of material culture in the formation and maintenance of socio-political identities in oppositional context can be more fully explored while reviewing archaeological remains from the Delaware Town (23CN1) site. Also, this project illuminates the physical and geographical boundaries that place Delaware Town in a shifting borderland or frontier. This is one of the strengths of the Delaware Town study: while no single resource is all inclusive, there is adequate coverage of the topic when combining primary and secondary sources and archaeological data
effectively using a theoretical model flexible enough to deal with the weaknesses of the data sets. The combination of documentary and archaeological evidence enables an illumination into daily practice and identity in the web of social and political relationships.

This dissertation is informed by and can contribute to an additional body of literature in the social sciences that exists at the intersection of New Western history’s re-conceptualization of frontier interactions and New Indian history’s emphasis on a place known as the “middle ground” from the seminal work by Richard White (1992). This field opens up Delaware Town to a much larger comparative framework in terms of social interaction, identity formation, economic interdependence, and other contested terrains both in the United States and across the globe. Traditional regional or temporal categories used by historians to organize and compartmentalize patterns in United States history tend to leave Delaware Town in a virtual limbo. Delaware Town in the 1820s is too early for Indian Removal Era history and antebellum history and too late for Contact Period, Colonial, or Revolutionary War era histories. Likewise, the location of Delaware Town, while certainly in the “backcountry,” is too far west for the majority of New Western histories which are focused east of the Mississippi River and too far east for the more traditional Western Frontier or “Indian Country” studies. Indeed, even within the local histories of Missouri or Greene County, Delaware Town exists and is abandoned at least a decade before these histories “begin,” despite Missouri statehood in 1820. By examining Delaware Town in the context of the interdisciplinary New Western and borderlands
studies, this archaeological site becomes comparable to many sites and time periods that cross the traditional divisions that separate them.


New Western history and borderlands studies now define frontiers as complex, permeable, and internally dynamic zones of interaction that no longer rigidly delineated borders, overemphasized cultural/economic/political differences, or rendered subordinate groups as passive or invisible (notable studies include Berkhofer 1981; Cayton and Teute 1998; Clementi 1994; Ethridge 2009; Faragher 1998; Lightfoot and Martinez 1995; Merritt 1995; Miller and Steffen 1977; Parker 2006; Parker and Rodseth 2005; Perkins 1998; Savage
and Thompson 1979; Teute 1998; Thompson and Lamar 1981a, 1981b; Weber and Rauch 1994; White 1991). One of the most significant reconfigurations is the realization that “frontier names a ‘thing’ that is really a set of processes, a busy field of intersecting forces” and opening up the notion of frontiers and borderlands (Parker and Rodseth 2005:4). While they must be studied in their specific social and historical contexts, frontiers can be compared to other global, and international processes like the research on “borders, diasporas, and contact zones” (Parker and Rodseth 2005:4).

Recently, Parker articulated an effort to standardize the terminology used in frontier studies for use in cross-disciplinary research (Parker 2006; Parker and Rodseth 2005). In this model, he defines borders and frontiers as opposite ends of a “boundary” spectrum that established borders as linear, rigid, and impermeable while contrasting frontiers as zones of interaction that are non-linear, fluid, and permeable (Parker 2006). A different way of looking at this contrast is to imagine borders as “frontiers of exclusion” and frontiers as “frontiers of inclusion” (Faragher 1998; Weber and Rausch 1994). Parker’s spectrum of frontiers and borders closely reflects an earlier configuration posed by Adelman and Aron (1999). In their paper “From Borderlands to Borders,” Adelman and Aron set up a tripartite organization to the studies of frontier. They defined frontiers as a frontier place without borders, borderlands as the “contested boundaries between colonial domains,” and the transition into “bordered lands” when geographic and cultural borders become more rigidly defined (1999:815).
One of the most influential books about borderlands that continues to impact New Western history studies (as well as "New Indian History") is Richard White's seminal study *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (1992). This study examines the *pays d'en haut* as a world of in betweens as Europeans, Algonquians, and others "sought to accommodate each other's interest in order to further their own" (Cayton and Teute 1998:8). This dynamic process of accommodation led to "creative misunderstandings," agency, cultural mixing, new cultural and symbolic meanings, and numerous economic and social exchanges (White 1992). Yet, toward the end of the book as the 19th century approaches and the United States becomes the dominating force in the *pays d'en haut*, the creative collaborations and frontier of inclusion changes into a frontier of exclusion where accommodation ends (White 1992). A similar process is described in the inclusive frontier of St. Louis and Ste. Genevieve in Missouri and the more rigid and exclusionary practices of the Americans towards native groups in the early-19th century (Adelman and Aron 1999; Aron 2005; Faragher 1998).

It is clear that the reformulation of frontier/borderland studies as active and fluid zones of interaction where people act as social agents articulates nicely with both the Barth's notion of ethnic boundaries and the practice theory as purported by Bourdieu and Giddens. The Delaware Town Archaeological Project can certainly contribute further to "New Western" history and borderlands studies. More importantly, a borderlands perspective informs many of this dissertation's research objectives because the frontier as a symbolic "zone of interaction"
contributes to the formation and instrumental uses of a Delaware ethnic identity. The documentary record, as well as the archaeological record, should reveal the impact of frontiers and borders in terms of the heterogeneity in interactions and material traditions (similar to Lightfoot and Martinez 1995). Specifically, I am curious about how Delawares' and outsiders' perception of their position of the Delawares at the frontier zone, the dynamic of the formalized State of Missouri and zones that are neighboring territories (Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas), the role of the nascent Cantonment/Fort system, the role of the Santa Fe Trail, and to how the close proximity to the Plains affects social and political relationship as well as Delaware ethnic identity.
The historical presence of Delaware peoples dates back to the earliest years of European colonization of the East Coast. Thus, the historic literature pertaining to this group is considerable and must be taken into consideration when looking at Delaware occupation in Southwest Missouri more than five or six generations after European contact. The most complete overviews of Delaware history can be found in the works of Ferguson (1972), Grimes (2005), Grumet (1989, 1995), Goddard (1978), Kraft (1974, 1986), Olmstead (1991, 1997), Schutt (1995, 2007), and Weslager (1972, 1978a), although a brief summary is included here. Original inhabitants of the present-day states of New Jersey, Delaware, southeastern New York, and eastern Pennsylvania, the Delawares (also called the Lenape or Lenni Lenape "original people") were among the first native groups to come into prolonged contact with Dutch, Swedish, and English colonists (Dowd 1992; Lineström 1925; Myers 1912, 1970; Newcomb 1956; Weslager 1972).

In addition to the significant historical presence of Delaware peoples in the historical and documentary record, there is also considerable ethnographic data that is relevant to establishing the cultural context of Delawares in early-19th century Missouri. Before Delaware residency in Southwest Missouri, the only
ethnographic data available is from missionaries, politicians, and documents crafted by outsiders. Yet, professional ethnographic considerations of Delawares spans four generations of anthropologists dating well after Delawares migrated out of Missouri. The earliest professional ethnographic descriptions of Delawares dates Lewis Henry Morgan’s kinship-related observations from the late 1850s when the main body of the Delawares already migrated as far as Kansas and had settled there for almost thirty years (1859). In the next generation, a new wave of interest in Delaware peoples sparked from Mark R. Harrington’s salvage work on religion and customs with Delawares living in Ontario during the early-20th century (1913, 1966[1938], 1983[1921]). During the middle of the 20th century, numerous ethnologists worked with Delawares living in Oklahoma to record newly-lost cultural and linguistic patterns like the Gamwing or Big House Ceremony (Speck 1931; Newcomb 1955, 1956; Goddard 1974; Miller 1979, 1980, 1997). Now, the next generation of Delaware ethnographies is beginning and is focused on modern Delawares' interactions with U.S. policy, tribal sovereignty, and the complicated relationship with Cherokees (Michael 2010; Obermeyer 2003, 2009a, 2009b). This dissertation draws from relevant ethnographic data to help illuminate Delaware ethnic identity and cultural processes at work in Southwest Missouri.

In this chapter, I develop the historical and ethnographic contexts necessary to situate and interpret Delaware Town (23CN1) in the broader framework of Delaware/Lenape migrations. This task involves examining multiple levels of political relationships between European and American colonial
governments, eastern immigrant native groups, certain bison-hunting Plains natives, and local social exchanges with fur traders and different bands of Delaware/Lenape peoples. I argue that it is essential to formulate an understanding of the political position of the people of Delaware Town relative to the fur trade, the neophyte Missouri government, other eastern native groups, and the Office of Indian Affairs in order to contextualize this study of ethnic identity and practice through the model of practical politics.

By focusing on a case study such as Delaware Town, this dissertation can address new perspectives on the contradictions, ambiguities, and negotiations that characterize the (re)conceptualization and maintenance of collective Delaware identities and the daily practice of these identities at the local level. In order to grasp the grand narrative of Delaware/Lenape history, many primary and secondary sources, detailed below, provide insights into the actors and political maneuverings occurring immediately before Delaware migration into Southwest Missouri and after their departure into eastern Kansas. It is important to note, however, that the standard histories poorly address the Delawares' tenure in Missouri. For example, Clinton Weslager's history of the Delawares includes only five pages related to Delaware occupation at Delaware Town (1972:363-368). In order to illuminate the historical context of this decade, this dissertation sought out numerous primary sources and transcribed materials from several manuscript collections and archives in order to understand Delawares from multiple angles and in multiple scales. Unfortunately, some key records have been lost in the passage of time, such as the business records of fur traders William Gillis and
William Marshall. Also, the number of sources that are clearly attributed to Delaware authors are few, and many of these sources and texts have already been filtered and processed through an interpreter via the context of complicated political milieus. For this research, I identified 27 speeches or letters generated by Delawares residing at Delaware Town and 2 letters from other Delaware (or closely-related groups) voices outside of Delaware Town in previously published literature or transcribed from manuscripts deposited in archival collections consulted for this project (Table 2).

**TABLE 2**

**PRIMARY DOCUMENTS CREATED BY DELAWARE AUTHORS USED IN THIS STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Number of Speeches/ Documents</th>
<th>Source or Archive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief William Anderson (Klkthawenund)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Richard Graham Papers, Missouri History Museum Archives, St. Louis, MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Record Group 75, Microfilm 234, National Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The John Tipton Papers, Indiana Historical Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief William Anderson (Klkthawenund) with other Delaware Chiefs/ Captains</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Richard Graham Papers, Missouri History Museum Archives, St. Louis, MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pierre Menard Collection, Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library, Springfield, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Record Group 75, Microfilm 234, National Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The John Tipton Papers, Indiana Historical Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killbuck and others of the Wolf “Party”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pierre Menard Collection, Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library, Springfield, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Patterson (Meshaquowha)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>William Clark Papers, Kansas Historical Society, Topeka, KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suwaunock and Natcomin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Record Group 75, Microfilm 234, National Archives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first half of this chapter is situated in a broad, roughly chronological, narrative of Delaware history from the proto-historic periods up to the Treaty of Greenville in 1795. This is the time period upon which where most Delaware histories are focused. In addition to this section being a summary of the considerable historical literature pertaining to Delaware peoples, this section will also integrate elements from existing ethnographies. The second half of the chapter follows the main branch of the Delawares that moved to settlements within the territory of the Miamis on the White River in Indiana, their removal after the signing of the Treaty of St. Marys in 1818, the Delaware occupation in Southwest Missouri (especially at Delaware Town), and their subsequent removal to Kansas. The second half of the dissertation is substantive and constitutes the bulk of the original archival and documentary research conducted in this study.

Most of the standard Delaware histories lose focus after the Treaty of Greenville in 1795 and do not reestablish focus on Delawares until the 1840s and 1850s in Kansas. Therefore, researching the period of time immediately prior to Delaware removal to Missouri until after resettlement in Kansas required substantial primary document research in numerous archives (detailed in Chapter 1). As the historical narrative approached Delaware residency at Delaware Town in southwestern Missouri, I consulted state and local histories of
Delaware occupations in Indiana (e.g., Ferguson, Glenn, Grimes, Wepler, and Yann), Missouri (e.g., Ayers, Escott, Fairbanks and Tuck, Faragher, Houck, Melton, Morrow, and Tong), and Kansas (e.g., Grimes, Farley, Joy, McCracken, Miner and Unrau). I attempted to follow the four themes I established of social and political identity, religion, warfare, and exercising Delaware identity as social capital to obtain favorable benefits, contracts, and relationships into Missouri.

Much of the second half of this chapter is organized based on thematic (primarily) and chronological (secondarily) structures. The themes I chose include the uncertainly of location, remoteness, hardships due to food shortages and horse thefts, relationships with traders, conflicts with the Osages, negotiations with the Miamis for blood repayments, intense negotiations to effect Delaware removal to Kansas, the hardships of unassisted removal, and building relationships with the Pawnees once in Kansas. The focus of this dissertation’s examination of primary sources ends in 1833.

Likewise, when examining Delaware ethnographic data, it is important to understand that most of the ethnographic data pertaining to Delawares before the 1850s is extrapolated and inferred through written accounts of culture, such as reports made by missionaries, or from archaeological data. The first professional ethnographic data about Delawares was obtained by Morgan (1859) in the late-1850s decades after this group of Delawares resettled onto lands in Kansas and were joined by some Delaware groups who never resided in Southwest Missouri. As such, seemingly “pristine” ethnographic accounts about Delaware beliefs and kinship patterns observed by Morgan cannot take into
account extensive and significant impact of post-colonial culture change. As such, the ethnographic data gleaned from early-19th century historical accounts is a valuable way in which this dissertation is informed by and adds to Delaware ethnography.

During the second half of this chapter, when much of the data relies on primary sources transcribed for this project, I opted to include block quotes or excerpts from speeches, letters, business documents, and treaties that are essential to this thesis. Many more transcribed letters and documents are included in Appendix B and are summarized in this chapter's historical narrative. An extensive bibliography of primary sources can be found at the end of this dissertation. I placed more thorough analysis and discussion of the themes and specific documents relevant to this dissertation's primary thesis and theme of Delaware ethnic identity and practice theory in Chapter 5.

Defining Delaware Ethnic Identity

I consulted the standard Delaware histories and ethnographic data proffered by historians, anthropologists, and linguists, especially historians (Richard Grimes, Francis Jennings, Amy Schutt, and Clinton Weslager), anthropologists (Robert Grumet, Jay Miller, Lewis Henry Morgan, William Newcomb, Brice Obermeyer, Frank Speck, and Melburn Thurman), and anthropologist-linguists (Ives Goddard and August Mahr). This multi-disciplinary data set is woven into a contextual narrative in Chapter 3 that highlights the key themes and debates in understanding the broad scope of Delaware culture and history.
Some of the key themes I determined as relevant to understanding Delaware Town involved the establishment of a distinct Delaware ethnic identity after gaining independence from the Six Nations. This identity partially entailed a respected metaphoric kinship status as “grandfathers” of other eastern Algonquian groups that was used for political and diplomatic purposes. Another aspect of this kinship-based identity involved the triumvirate of three phratries that were involved together in Delaware leadership, even after the addition of the Principal Chief. A second theme I established concerns the role of religion, including Christianizing efforts and social and religious revitalization movements, such as the establishment of the Big House Ceremony or Gamwing. The third theme that I gleaned from a close reading of the historical sources illuminated the importance of warfare and the Delawares’ ability to engage in warfare. More importantly, understanding how Delawares utilized warfare during one conflict (including its outcome) and how it affected their manner of involvement in the next war. Lastly, a striking feature of Delaware ethnic identity is to carefully use their social and political position to attempt to extract a maximum amount of benefit. This likens ethnic identity as a form of social capital, as coined by Bourdieu (1986). This propensity manifests in Delawares playing both sides during times of war, building or eschewing allegiances, or trying to manipulate outcomes for economic advantage by leveraging their identity. Thus, this dissertation attempts to define Delaware ethnic identity in order to uncover the ways in which it was being used instrumentally to achieve desired political, diplomatic, and social goals.
Ethnohistorical Methods

Historical archaeology utilizes multiple lines of data, including documentary and archaeological sources, therefore, it is important to define one common methodology, ethnohistory, used to read and analyze these textual artifacts. Ethnohistory is less of a discipline and more of a methodology utilized by anthropologists and historians to understand the documents of colonialism and of minorities through an *emic* (or insider's) perspective (Axtell 1979, 1981, 1988). The ethnohistoric approach utilizes documents, artifacts, maps, artwork, oral history, and ethnology as pieces of evidence to understand the recent past (Picha 2009). By using documents largely created by colonizers and colonial powers about native peoples, the ethnohistorian must be wary about replicating misunderstandings held by outsiders as well as replicating the "official" record of colonial powers (Comaroff and Comaroff 1992:34). Ethnohistorians must look to language used in the documents, for "silences," and for alternative and indigenous perspectives of the past (Deagan 1982; Wood 1990). It is with these cautions in mind that I approached the primary sources transcribed for this research.

W. Raymond Wood insists that, just as historians evaluate primary sources, the ethnohistorian must also analyze a source for authenticity and accuracy (1990). While none of the primary source documents utilized in this research project are of dubious authenticity, some of them contained inaccuracies such as incorrect dates, facts, and even translation errors. Of course, a more serious concern common to analyzing historical documents is
that documents, by nature, contain selective and biased information. It is important to analyze who the author was, who the audience was, what the purpose of the document was and its intent. Because the residents of Delaware Town are poorly represented in the surviving documentary record, the material or archaeological record can assist in interpreting the everyday life of people living in Southwest Missouri who are "invisible" in the documents.

Some standard primary source documents used in ethnohistory were not available for use in this research project. For example, newspapers are useful tools for historical research, although they rarely involve the lives of ordinary people. Yet, no newspapers or photographs dating from the 1820s exist concerning Southwest Missouri; the earliest Springfield, Missouri newspaper dates to 1844 and the earliest photographs date from the Civil War era. Likewise, the area surrounding Delaware Town was not surveyed and platted until 1835, well after Delaware removal to Kansas. The 1835 GLO surveyor's notes were utilized in this research. Additionally, there are no tax records for Greene County, Missouri until after Delaware removal, but there are a few early probate records from James Wilson and William Marshall who lived near Delaware Town. Primary sources utilized in this research include local history books (which post-date the 1820s), probate records, Census records, personal letters, journals, official Indian Agency correspondence and recordkeeping, government treaties, and business ledger books. While there is some oral history recorded by Lewis Henry Morgan (1859) related to the Delaware residency in Kansas in the 1840s and later, none of the oral historical records extend to the 1820s in Missouri.
Lenape Prehistory and the Contact Period

Prior to the arrival of Giovanni Verrazzano in 1524, marking the early Contact period, the only way to understand the demographics, social behaviors, foodways, and lifestyles of people living in the Middle Atlantic region prior to contact is to study archaeological sites. An additional alternative is to use the ethnohistorical, or direct historical, approach to trace known groups into the past, via linguistics and material culture. It is by using these methods, especially archaeology, that we can understand the ancestors of Delawares, also known self-referentially as Lenape ("people") or Lenni Lenape ("real people"), before written records. Within the Middle Atlantic region lies Lenapehoking, the "land of the Lenape," which comprises an area surrounding the Delaware, Lehigh, and Schuylkill River Valleys, the lower Hudson River Valley, western Manhattan Island, the area surrounding Delaware Bay, and the Delaware Water Gap (Dean 1978; Kraft 1986, 2001).

Lenape peoples, subsequently called Delawares in honor of the Governor of Virginia Lord de la Warr, consist of people from two closely related Eastern Algonquian dialects, the Unami and the Munsee languages. Munsee speakers (also called Minisinks) resided in the northern third of Lenapehoking. The southern two-thirds consisted of northern Unami speakers, southern Unami speakers, and the poorly known Unami-Unalachtigo dialect south of them (Figure 2). It is important to note that these four linguistic sub-groups did not correlate to four polities in the early historic period; they were not "real" social or political entities, despite linguistic relationships. Moreover, there was never a
single, unified “tribe” of Delawares, though a large group came together and began identifying themselves as a group well after the Contact period (Goddard 1978).

The Unami comprised the largest group, known as the Lenape/Delawares after 1750 (Goddard 1978; Kraft 1974). All four dialects are mentioned by missionaries in the historical record and can be reconstructed to (at least) a minimal extent (Gipson 1938). The Unalachtigo dialect of Unami disappeared from the documentary records after the late-17th century (Goddard 1978:215). The other Unami dialects, which constituted the majority of the Delaware speakers in the 20th century is now extinct, although there are efforts to revitalize the language through the work of Jim Rementer (Delaware Tribe of Indians 2012). Munsee is a severely endangered language with just a few remaining living fluent speakers in Canada.

Archaeologists call the period before European arrival in the Middle Atlantic region the Late Woodland Period, which spanned A.D. 1000-1600. This time period is generally marked by an increase in semi-sedentary groups due to increased reliance on horticulture, although not all groups in the region made this switch (Custer 1996:263). As a result, many groups increased their cultivation of maize, beans, squash, pumpkins, and tobacco, while supplementing their diet with hunting and gathering on group hunting grounds (Wallace 1947; Weslager 1972). The dominant prehistoric settlement pattern of the Middle Atlantic region during the Late Woodland consisted of small, dispersed, unfortified farmsteads organized around river terraces (Boyd 2005; Kraft 1986:122). Material culture

The earliest known European contact with Delaware ancestors occurred in 1524 when Giovanni Verrazano sailed into New York Harbor, but there were certainly previous encounters with Spanish ships prior and subsequent to this date (Goddard 1978:220). More substantial written accounts accompany Henry Hudson of the Dutch East India Company in 1609 as part of his trading explorations. A Dutch trading post and permanent settlements sprung up shortly thereafter. Of course, most early European explorers left behind travel accounts or cultural descriptions that are inconsistent and ethnocentrically biased, if there is any mention of the natives at all. Literate observers seemed to be too engaged in trying to survive and prosper in the new environment of the Middle Atlantic, or were more concerned about political disputes between the Swedes, Dutch, and the British than about American Indian lifeways or affairs (Kraft 1974:iv). In the 1970s, historians Clinton Weslager and Herbert Kraft bemoaned the paucity of scholarly information about Delaware peoples. This push for more information led to the Delaware Indian Symposium in 1972 that brought together experts in trade relations, key historical figures and events, linguistic and ethnographic information, and archaeological investigations (Kraft 1974).
The Unami and Munsee Delaware bands, politically autonomous groups linked by kinship that shared hunting territories, numbered close to 11,000 people in 1600 A.D. (Goddard 1978:214). Extended families lived in large long houses framed with bent saplings and covered in bark (Kraft 1986; Stewart 1998). Chieftaincy was essentially a “first among equals” that had very little political power beyond persuasion, mediation, ceremonial duties, and guidance (Weslager 1972:63). The leadership structure separated a main peace chief or sachem (sa k i ma) and war “captains” who had distinct roles, which may have occasionally overlapped (Thurman 1978; Weslager 1972). One key political role for sachems involved the settling of blood disputes resulting from murders. Perpetrators were hunted down or paid atonement through wampum (Goddard 1978:216). Instead of chiefs exercising unilateral power in decision making, sachems also enlisted the input of most adult men at council (Goddard 1978:216).

Not long after contact, colonial powers made political plays to change the nature of leadership among native groups in several acts of king-making in an attempt to turn natives into loyal subjects of European crowns and in formulations of peace treaties, alliances, and land sales. Initial land sales among the Delaware were likely misunderstood as sharing rights to use the land rather than permanent sale (Weslager 1941), but major treaties with the British quitting Delaware claims to their lands began with the Great Treaty with William Penn in 1682 (Myers 1970; Weslager 1972). Penn worked with one Unami leader, Tamenend, from 1683 to 1697 and recognized him as a principal chief of his
group (Myers 1970:24-25). This relationship opened the door for Pennsylvania governors to grant chiefs or head men power and authority never seen before in Delaware groups.

The first half of the 17th century is marked by three major trends: 1) the fur trade, 2) an influx of settlers, and 3) violence. All three of these patterns are interconnected. It did not take long for beaver populations to decline due to overharvesting. As a result, beaver pelts, the primary source of payment for trade goods with the Dutch, grew scarce and led to tensions with neighboring native groups also involved in the fur trade. Further encroachment and population influxes of European settlers contributed to the regional pressure for resources. All of this aggravated and culminated in a series of violent conflicts known as Kieft's War (1643), the Peach War (1655), and the Esopus Wars of 1659 and 1663. Susan Goodall recently detailed these conflicts in her master’s thesis (2006; see also Goddard 1978:221). In response to these conflicts, land sales, population and resource pressures, many Unami and Munsee Delaware groups voluntarily moved or were otherwise displaced by the time the British took over the colonies. Displacement forced many Delawares to consolidate once-separate bands into increasingly fewer villages and smaller territorial areas. Many Munsees moved to the Susquehanna River, northern Unamis removed into the Lehigh Valley (also known as the Forks area), and groups of southern Unamis relocated to the Schuylkill River and on to the upper Brandywine River (Goddard 1978:222; Weslager 1972:174-193).
When the British took control of the colonies, the relationships between Delaware ancestors and Europeans quickly changed. Laws prevented the trade of firearms or related items, or even the repair of a firearm belonging to a native person, without a properly issued license from an English governor (Weslager 1978a:138). The change in leadership rendered old (or not so old) treaties and agreements between Delaware band leaders and the Dutch or Swedes worthless. Furthermore, the new administration placed additional strict restrictions on the sale of alcohol and regulated land purchases from natives.

The problem of control and purchase of land occupied by Delawares centered on a lack of clear authority and power invested in a single chief. Early land sales between the Pennsylvania provincial government and local chiefs were signed without consent from other Delaware communities and without the chief having power to speak for all of the three phratries and other Delaware bands (Grimes 2005:6). Political leadership was decentralized, which was not a pattern that Europeans were used to dealing with. Swedish explorer Peter Lindeström reported that each of the six Delaware towns had six or seven chiefs that commanded different groups of people (1925:171). Even when a group of Delaware sachems (sa k i ma) presented William Penn with a wampum belt of peace in November 1682 as part of the Great Treaty, Penn referred to sachems as “kings.” As part of Penn’s “Holy Experiment,” Delawares had a favorable relationship with the Pennsylvania government. Most importantly, this relationship granted Lenape groups a special status over all other Pennsylvanian native groups that lasted well beyond Penn’s death in 1718.
In order to exert control over the Delawares, the Pennsylvania government’s first act of king-making was in their policy of only dealing with a local band leader, Sassoonan (also known as Alumapees), by providing him with gifts to distribute to his peoples in order to bolster his esteem among them (Weslager 1972:176). Although recognition as titular king of the Delawares was easily negotiated at Sassoonan’s residence and leadership at Tulpehocken on the upper Schuylkill River, the title was difficult to transfer to other Delaware groups on the Brandywine and at the Lehigh/Forks communities. Alcoholism and gifts made this “king” subject to the machinations of the Pennsylvanian government and further problems arose after the death of Sassoonan. As Jennings elucidates, legitimate inheritors of the title either declined the opportunity or were found unacceptable by the colonial authorities, which resulted in many years with no “king” (1965). The lack of a singular native authority quashed major land acquisitions and war allegiances, but the fact remains that there was no singular Delaware community that followed one leader. Of course, the de-centralized political strategies employed by the Lenape/Delaware bands led to further complications when considering their relationship with the Iroquois and the Covenant Chain.

The Covenant Chain and the Six Nations of Iroquois

After European contact, many Delawares moved west into the lands of the Iroquois and many communities came under the authority of the Five Nations. This was a reversal of the power relationship between these two groups prior to European Contact where the Delawares were recognized as “grandfathers.” By
1694, Delaware groups paid tributes of *wampum* to the Five Nations as part of social and political reciprocal relationships as part of the Covenant Chain (Jennings 1973; Weslager 1972:180). In the years leading up to the push for Delaware tribal consolidation around 1750 A.D., orchestrated displacement movements, like the infamous Walking Purchase land fraud of 1737 which was endorsed by the Iroquois, forced a majority of Delawares further from their homelands and more directly into the political purview of the Five Nations (Jennings 1970; Newcomb 1956). This political pressure led to the further consolidation and reorganization of disparate Delawares into collective tribal groups in response to colonialism (Goddard 1978; Newcomb 1956).

In 1677, Governor Andros united with the Five Nations to implement the Covenant Chain of Peace linking European Colonies and the Five Nations (Six Nations after 1722, also known as *Haudenosaunee* “people of the longhouse” and the League of Iroquois), including tributary people, which included Delaware ancestors. The Covenant Chain was a set of treaties and cooperation understood between the Five Nations and the colonial authorities that involved trade, protection, and friendship (Becker 1992; Jennings 1973). The British used this alliance to reduce conflicts with neighboring natives groups as well as a way to counter and block the French presence in the north. To the Five Nations, the Covenant Chain represented economic and political dominance, and a degree of enfranchisement, as well as protection from violent conflicts in the south and west.
The Delaware groups who were displaced on Iroquois lands became subjects to the Six Nations, but their degree of subjugation or quasi-independence fluctuated depending on power relationships with the colonials and geographic location of Delaware bands. During the first half of the 1700s, several major concentrations of Delaware existed on the landscape, with groups in Pennsylvania along the Susquehanna River, Brandywine, and Lehigh rivers, and others who followed a group of Shawnees into the Ohio River Valley who established the village of Kittanning on the edge of the Five/Six Nations’ political sphere (Weslager 1972; Zimmerman 1974). Although the Five/Six Nations considered the Ohio lands theirs by right of conquest, they had difficulty exerting control over Delawares and Shawnees living there (Weslager 1972:204-206).

The Delawares’ relationship with the Six Nations during this time resulted in the “feminization” of the Delawares that has spawned considerable secondary literature as to its meaning (Jennings 1973; Grimes 2005; Miller 1974; Speck 1946; Trenkwalder Schönenberger 1991; Wallace 1946; Weslager 1944, 1947). The Iroquois bestowed the metaphorical title of “women” to the Delawares, which implied a degree of subordination, including the inability to go to war, sell land, or engage politically with colonists (Goddard 1978:223). The metaphor also represents an important aspect of Delaware social identity during the early Historic period. As described by Trenkwalder Schönenberger, the Delawares long embraced an ethos of “pacifist resistance,” resulting from a lack of centralized political direction to guide a robust force of warriors as embodied by the Iroquois (1991:243). So, instead of concerted warfare, Delawares leaned
toward pacifist strategies. Thus, Delaware pacifism correlated to role of peacemakers, a “female” role. So, while the Iroquois used the female terminology as a claim of dominance, the Delawares embraced the term as a badge of respect and as recognition of a special “female” role in the Covenant Chain (Grimes 2005:18). More detail on this debate is discussed later in the next section. Again, this symbolic subjugation of the Delawares by the Six Nations threatened the long-held symbolic and diplomatic kinship relationship as “grandfathers.”

As power relationships between the French and English threatened the Covenant Chain, the Six Nations scrambled to exert control over their native dependencies by soliciting war allegiances. The Delawares residing in the Ohio Valley fell into a dramatic power struggle because of their peripheral position in the Six Nation’s sphere and the increasing entrenchment of the French military and traders in Ohio lands. Weslager details the Six Nation’s efforts to recall the Ohio groups back to the Susquehanna River through the “king” of the Delawares, Sassoonan (1972). The Shawnees and Delawares in Ohio ignored the “king,” threatening the power relationships orchestrated by the Covenant Chain and led the Pennsylvania authorities to search for a new, more authoritative, “king.” After the death of Sassoonan in 1747, no suitable replacement stepped up and was approved of by the colonial government for nearly half a decade (Jennings 1965, 1973). Two leaders rose during this time: Shingas in the Ohio Valley and Teedyuskung, a Moravian convert, at the Susquehanna River settlements.
Thus, the complicated relationship between Delaware peoples and the Six Nations represents an upheaval of the social and diplomatic relationships between these groups that extends back prior to European contact. Melburn Thurman and others posited that the Delaware-speakers were recent newcomers to the Atlantic coastal region as compared to Iroquoian groups and that the Delawares demonstrated martial superiority over the other groups in the East (1956). As such, Delaware village leaders most likely exacted tributes and political respect as "grandfathers" from the surrounding Algonquian groups, as well as Iroquoians. Yet, after European contact, competition over trade and diplomatic relationships upset this political balance and favored the Covenant Chain of the Five (later Six) Nations. As a result, this upheaval represents the first major challenge to the Delawares' symbolic and political status as "grandfathers", leading to major social realignments that led to the clear emergence of a Delaware ethnic identity in the mid-18th century.

**Delawares as "Women"**

When Pennsylvania officially joined the Covenant Chain in 1732, the balance of power dramatically shifted in favor of the Six Nations. First, the Six Nations negotiated or supported land claims that pushed Delawares out of their settlements on the Lehigh River, and elsewhere, further into the lands of the Iroquois on the Susquehanna River (Jennings 1973; Thomson 1867[1759]). Living on Iroquois lands, Delaware groups on the Brandywine and Schuylkill rivers moved after the influx of German and Christian settlers, coupled with severe decline of game (Weslager 1972:187). Also, the Six Nations modified the
metaphor of Delawares as women away from peacemaker and into a pejorative
title. The government of Pennsylvania requested the Six Nations to intervene on
their behalf in a matter regarding Delawares not recognizing land cessions
agreements. At the Iroquois-Delaware Grand Council in 1742, the following
speech was delivered to the Delawares:

Cousins, Let this Belt of Wampum serve to Chastize [sic] You; You
ought to be taken by the Hair of the Head and shaked [sic] severely
till you recover your Senses and become Sober; you don’t know
what Ground you stand on, nor what you are doing.... We
conquer’d [sic] You, we made Women of you, you know you are
Women, and can no more sell Land than Women. Nor is it fitt [sic]
you should have the Power of Selling Lands since you would abuse
it. This land that you Claim is gone through Your Guts. You have
been furnished with Cloaths [sic] and Meat and Drink by the Goods
paid you for it, and now You want it again like Children as you
are.... For all these reasons we charge You to remove instantly. We
don’t give you the liberty to think about it. You are Women; take the
Advice of a Wise Man and remove immediately... Depart the
Council and consider what has been said to you. (Iroquois Chiefs
1742)

Thus, the political, economic, and symbolic domination of Delaware groups on
Iroquois lands drove many Delawares to action, whether to remove to the Ohio
Valley or to resist in other ways.

There is considerable academic literature published regarding the status
of Delawares as “women.” Delaware leaders returned the war wampum and
refused the call to war issued by Iroquois leaders in 1694. This action resulted in
a strong rebuke from the Five Nations calling into question Delaware masculinity
as warriors (Grimes 2005:19). Because Iroquois women could not sell land,
Sassoonan argued for the right for Delawares to sell their own lands, despite their status as women (Jennings 1973).

There are two general perspectives on what the “feminization” of Delawares meant. The first position describes a power relationship where the Delawares were subject to, and under the protection of, the Iroquois. This subordinate position limited Delawares to only be able to pursue subsistence agriculture, possess no war-making powers, have no authority to negotiate treaties, and could not sell lands (Weslager 1972:180-181). Certainly, the Delawares treated Iroquois differently than other eastern groups in kinship terms. Delawares referred to the Six Nations as ‘uncles’ (mother’s brother) while the Iroquois addressed Delaware groups as ‘cousins’ (sister’s children) (Trenkwalder Schönenberger 1991:239; Weslager 1972:181).

Another perspective on the Delaware as women is based more directly to the observations of contemporaries. “According to Moravian missionaries, the Lenape voluntarily accepted the title of women, since female status gave them the rights and privileges of neutral moderators, peacemakers and non-combatants” (Trenkwalder Schönenberger 1991:238; also Heckewelder 1820, 1881; Loskiel 1794; Miller 1974; Speck 1946; Wallace 1946). Women did have the power to sell land, but more importantly “produced the symbols or ceremonial objects of peace [pipes and wampum]” (Trenkwalder Schönenberger 1991:179). This position was coveted by the Delawares and their voluntary status as women, and associated negativity ascribed by the Iroquois, was likely due to Delawares’ refusal to join the Six Nations in war activities.
Despite efforts to get the Ohio Valley Delawares back under the control of the Six Nations, the western Delawares effectively ended their dependency on the Covenant Chain. Different trading partners, political allegiances with the French, and cultural changes toward a more centralized socio-political system empowered a stronger and more unified regional identity. The Delawares also reclaimed their "masculinity" and engaged in warfare. When the Six Nations sent word to Shingas to lead his people into war against the French, the Ohio Valley Delawares and the Shawnees attacked the British (Weslager 1972:227). Back in Pennsylvania, Teedyuskung also led warriors against the British, but later led the Susquehanna Delawares to peace talks separate from the Six Nations (Weslager 1972:233). Other Delaware groups fled into northern New York State or remained in Pennsylvania under the control of the Six Nations and the British, including Sassoonan; growing multi-ethnic communities ultimately absorbed many of these groups. Some distinctive Lenape communities maintained an identity, although separate and different from the western Delawares. These groups include the Brotherton reservation on Edgepillock (Indian Mills) Creek who later moved into Wisconsin and merged with the Stockbridge Mohicans (also spelled Mahican and Mohegan) and a different Brotherton mission group (Goddard 1978:222).

The political and diplomatic break from the Six Nations and the reclaiming of Delaware identity as peacemakers and warriors is the series of events that many ethnohistorians recognize as the emergence of Delawares as a distinct and somewhat-unified ethnic identity (Grumet 1995; Weslager 1972, 1978a).
One way to interpret the forging of this markedly conspicuous realignment of identity is through Barth's notion of ethnic boundaries (1998[1969]). As the Delawares defined their ethnic identity, they also established clear symbolic, material, and behavioral boundaries in contrast to the Six Nations. Yet, it is important to recognize that not all of the disparate Delaware groups were part of this initial act of ethnic "rebranding." The definition and expression of Delaware ethnic boundaries continued as these groups moved further west away from the purview of the Six Nations.

Tribal Consolidation and Nativist Efforts in Western Pennsylvania and Ohio

By 1750, more Unami Delaware and Munsee-speaking groups migrated into western Pennsylvania and the Ohio River Valley away from the Six Nations, settlers, and disease. Because of new political and social empowerment resulting from their independence, increasingly consolidated Lenape groups emerged as a recognizable ethnic identity. Other native groups immigrated west of the Allegheny Mountains to settle among or beside Delawares and Shawnees and a multiethnic society formed, including several distinct ethnic boundaries and identities. This is also a time when the Delawares exerted or re-exerted an important symbolic position among all Eastern Algonquian groups (and some others). The Delawares generally held an esteemed political and diplomatic position in regards to neighboring native groups that is reflected, even today, in fictive kinship terms. This broad relationship network plays out in references to Delawares as "grandfathers" and in their addressing other groups as "nephews," "cousins," etc. (Weslager 1972:180). While under the symbolic and political
domination of the Six Nations, the Iroquois relegated Delawares to “cousins” and conquered women, but after exerting independence, the Delaware identity of “grandfather” returned (Grimes 2005:86).

In the Ohio Valley, ancient social divisions into clan-like phratries persisted and morphed into more distinctive political and ethnic identities (Grimes 2005:37). Delaware social organization during the late Contact period developed into three phratries or extended clan systems termed Turtle (puk uwańku), Turkey (pale), and Wolf (tukwsi t) comprised of matrilineal descent groups (Goddard 1978; Grimes 2005; Kraft 1974; MacLeod 1922; Thurman 1956, 1978). These three phratries have been mistakenly confused with the three language-based lineages because Moravian missionaries Zeisberger and Heckewelder aligned Turtle to Unami, Turkey to Unalachtigo, and Wolf to Munsee (Barnes 1968; Miller 1974). There has also been mention of totemism related to the animal phratry names, but this idea remains in contention (Miller 1974).

Leadership of the three phratries unified in the figurehead of a civil chief of each phratry, advised by war captains and advisors of the same kinship group. After tribal consolidation in the Ohio Valley, principal leaders typically came from the Turtle group, although there seems to be instances where the traditional matrilineal succession was supplanted by cases of patrilineal succession during the 18th century (Goddard 1978:216; Kinietz 1946). This new unified and formalized phratry structure becomes evident in early-18th century correspondence. Grimes describes an unpublished manuscript document issued in 1732 from the Allegheny or Ohio Delawares to Governor Gordon that
concludes with a pictographic drawing of the three animal phratries with corresponding signatures, or marks, under the respective columns (2005:38). This new political and symbolic unity exemplifies the character of the newly emerging Delaware ethnic identity.

Although trading and allying with the French, Ohio Delawares maintained relationships with the Six Nations and Pennsylvania in order to maximize their economic and political goals. Delawares and Shawnees living west of the Allegheny Mountains in the Ohio Valley (as early as the 1720s), however, found themselves out of the political sphere of the Six Nations and far enough into the "backcountry" to avoid the influx of settlers. Yet, they were not outside of the political influence of European nations. Despite their appearance to have broken with the Covenant Chain, the Allegheny Delawares still maintained some of the tributary and other reciprocal relationships with the Iroquois and rejected only political intrusions such as the selection of leaders (Grimes 2005:43). At the town of Kittanning, Delaware political power coalesced as relatives of Sassoonan, including Shingas, Tamaqua, and Pisquetomen, moved there. Because of the matrilineal nature of political leadership, these three men had traditionally legitimate claims to a seat of leadership among the reconstituted polity of the western Delawares. Both Pennsylvania and the Six Nations rejected these leaders as representatives because of their remoteness and their autonomy (Jennings 1965). The Pennsylvania government attempted to tap another sachem, Lappapitton, to be the diplomat of the Delawares, but he refused. This interregnum silenced Delaware participation in Pennsylvania politics until 1752.
As colonial interests expanded further west, lands in the Ohio River Valley came into question. The Ohio Land Company of Virginia sent delegations to Logstown during the summer of 1752 in order to get access to unsettled land and also to get permission to build forts along the Allegheny and Monogahela rivers. During these talks, the Six Nations attempted to re-exert hegemonic control over the independent groups in Ohio by chastising war excursions against the Cherokees. As "tributaries," the Delawares had been engaging in warfare without the permission of the Six Nations. Also, the Six Nations went so far as to assign a "King" to the Delawares. The appointed "king," Shingas, was not present at the meeting, but was represented by his brother Tamaqua (Jennings 1965). This choice of leader was a boon for the Delawares because Shingas was no puppet or client of neither the Six Nations nor the British and this designation actually worked in favor of the political autonomy of Ohio Delawares and indicated the decline in political authority of the Six Nations, especially in the years leading up to the French and Indian War.

Warring between British and French forces resulted in both Europeans powers soliciting Delaware (and Shawnee) aid as part of the Seven Years' War/French and Indian War. The French, who entered the Ohio Valley years earlier, successfully contested the territorial rights claimed by both the Six Nations and the British. When the French and their native allies defeated the British forces at Fort Necessity in 1754, the Delawares living nearby found themselves in an interesting position. During the French and Indian War, Shingas' group initially sided with the British, but switched in favor of the
generous French after being alienated by the British (Thomson 1867[1759]). The French strategy to recognize the sovereignty of native groups and their lands, in addition to the diplomatic practice of generous gift giving, led many Ohio Indians groups to break favor with the British. Moreover, *Shingas'* group had better access to supplies and traders from the French after the British pulled back from the region (Weslager 1972:214).

On October 16, 1755, about 700 Delaware warriors (and members of other native groups), led by *Shingas* and *Pisquetomen*, began raiding British settlements, including Penn's Creek, Mahanahy Creek, and Berks County and the Forts McCord and Granville (Sipe 1929). The lack of British military in the area and the support of the French enabled numerous victories and resulted in the retreat of British settlers and forces out of the Ohio Valley area. The British made peace with the eastern Delawares on the Susquehanna River, led by *Teedyuscung*, and implored that the Six Nations exert their dominance over the Ohio Indians. They were unwilling and unable to do so. As a result, the British sent the more compliant eastern Delaware sachem *Nutimus* instead of *Teedyuscung* to entreat the Ohio Delawares to return to the Covenant Chain (Thomson 1867[1759]). This division between the eastern Delawares, clients and tributaries of the Six Nations, and the Ohio Delawares widened the cultural gaps between eastern and western groups and forged regional ethnic distinctiveness. The Six Nations displayed their dominance over Susquehanna Delawares in an attempt to subvert the autonomy and independence of Ohio Delawares.
On April 14, 1756, Pennsylvania declared war on the Delawares and put up bounties for their scalps (McConnell 1992). In September 1756, Lieutenant Colonel John Armstrong led a small force of 300 into the town of Kittanning and burned it (Sipe 1929; Weslager 1972). After this raid on Kittanning, Delaware leaders were hesitant to leave their settlements unprotected and violence in the Ohio Valley slowly diminished (Sipe 1929). It was at this time that factionalism arose among the Ohio Delawares. Tamaqua replaced Shingas as sachem of the Turkey phratry while Netawatwees (also called Newcomer) assumed leadership of the Turtle phratry, both of whom supported the British (Hunter 1978). The western Delawares essentially remained uncommitted to either side (or were playing both sides) for the rest of the French and Indian War. Peace between the British and various Delaware sachems was secured by the efforts of Moravian missionary Christian Frederick Post (Grimes 2005:70). After the Easton Conference of 1758, the Covenant Chain was restored, but the Iroquois lost the authority to speak for the Ohio Delawares.

After the conclusion of the war in 1759, the British refused to protect the restored Indian lands from settlers, which had been a concern of the Ohio Indians since the Logstown talks (Thomson 1867[1759]; Weslager 1972). As a result, Delawares left settlements on the Allegheny and Beaver rivers and moved west to the Muskingum River Valley at the invitation of the Wyandots (Goddard 1978; Heckewelder 1820). It was on the Muskingum River that further consolidation of Delaware people and identities took place as previously separated groups, especially Munsees, moved west. Further strife erupted when
the British ceased the French practice of giving gifts and also heavily restricted trade, especially in items that could be used as weapons (Grimes 2005; White 1992). Now that there was no longer a second colonial power such as the French to politically and economically play against the British, the Delawares had few alternatives to this new scenario (Adelman and Aron 1999; Aron 2005; Parker and Rodseth 2005).

Under the crushing economic situation, spiritual and cultural revitalization movements emerged as one strategy to deal with and take control of this new circumstance. Four major revitalization or nativist movements emerged in Ohio through the spiritual leadership of Papounhan, Neolin and Wangomend (also Wagomen) and the political unification strategies of Netawatwees (Hunter 1971; McConnell 1992; Newcomb 1956; Wallace 1956). Animosity toward the British continued with the onset of Pontiac’s War, inspired by a revitalist movement calling for removal of whites (Cave 1999; Dowd 1992; Hunter 1971; Miller 1994; Trenkwalder Schönenberger 1991; Wallace 1956, Weslager 1972, 1978a). The earliest expressions of nativist movements among the Delawares fall into two divergent lines (Hunter 1971:41). One avenue was initiated by the preacher Papounhan and a band of Munsees who attempted to return to ancient customs and manners practiced by their ancestors. This particular movement is notable because of its extreme form of Quaker-influenced pacifism. The second trend of nativist movements involves the use of an “Indian Bible,” or chart, outlining a way of life, spirituality, and morality. There were two manifestations of the “Indian Bible.” One version was attributed to the “Old Preast [sic]” at Asinsing and the
other version belonged to Wangomend at Goschgosching, although these two individuals may be the same person (Hunter 1971:43). Neolin, the Delaware prophet, also utilized an Indian Bible to encourage a return to the ancient ways in 1762 (Cave 1999). The impact of these early nativist movements led to an “Indian nationalism” that focused anti-European sentiment, the eschewing of trade goods, and resulted in the revival of (supposedly) ancient rituals (Hunter 1971:46). This series of revitalization movements in the 1760s is known as the “Indian Great Awakening” (Dowd 1992:23-46).

Many Delawares joined Pontiac’s War, which emerged in response to the crushing new British trade restrictions. A pan-Indian resistance attacked thirteen British forts and took control of ten of them (Dowd 1992). Key Delaware leaders such as Tamaqua, Shingas, and William Anderson (Kikthawenund) opposed Delaware participation in Pontiac’s War, but their authority could not keep all Delawares out of the conflict (Grimes 2005:92; Sipe 1929). The raids against British forts were ultimately unsuccessful and the hostilities ceased in 1764.

In the decade leading up to the Revolutionary War, the Great Council of the Delawares (Lupwaaenoawuk) emerged (Weslager 1972:288-290). All three phratries had a principal civil chief and a war captain, a system that emerged in around 1755, but this system formalized and emerged into a more powerful, national, political identity. On the Muskingum River, a Delaware nation coalesced as a triumvirate of Turtle (Netawatwees), Turkey (Tamaqua), and Wolf (Custaloga, also known as Pakanke) with the Great Council House erected at Geklemukpechunk (later called Newcomerstown). As the British negotiated with
the Delawares for the release of prisoners, leaders from all three phratries presented themselves and were recognized by the authorities (Grimes 2005). In addition to the release of prisoners, the Delawares were reintroduced to the Covenant Chain and new trade policies were affected. The defeat of the pan-Indian forces in Pontiac War also initiated the Susquehanna River Delaware group’s removal from Pennsylvania into the Ohio Valley after 1764.

In the decades leading up to the American Revolutionary War, historical evidence reveals that the boundaries and expressions of Delaware identity continued in Ohio and western Pennsylvania. In particular, the nature of Delaware political structure re-aligned in a more powerful Great Council that utilized traditional phratry divisions in a triumvirate structure. Yet, the Delawares and other groups were also swept up in war between European colonial powers and native groups often chose sides based on economic advantage. After the defeat of the more generous French policies by the more restrictive British government, Delawares participated in numerous nativist movements that emerged in response to social change caused by the British and American regimes.

Missionaries, Praying Towns, and the Revolutionary War

Beginning in the 1740s, the encroachment of Moravian (United Brethren) and Quaker missionaries put additional cultural pressures on Delaware groups (Conrad 1998; Deardorff 1946; Gipson 1938; Heckewelder 1820, 1881; Hulbert and Schwarze 1910; Loskiel 1794; Maul 2001; Olmstead 1991, 1997; Schutt 1995, 2007; Wallace 1958). Even so, the presence of those same missionaries
provides historians with the most detailed, albeit biased, written descriptions of eastern Delaware (Unami) and Munsee lifeways, including new manifestations of political and social identity.

In 1740, David Zeisberger founded Bethlehem on the Delaware River and Moravians, subsequently, established praying towns at Gnadenhütten, Shamokin, and Friedenshütten on the Susquehanna River (Olmstead 1991). By 1749, a polyglot community of more than 500 Mahicans, Delawares, and Wampanoag lived at Gnadenhütten. By the late 1760s, Zeisberger crossed the Allegheny Mountains and established Goschgoschunt and Friedenstadt. The majority of Christian Delawares at this time were Munsee-speakers and not the Ohio Unami Delawares. One of the largest concerns of Zeisberger and his assistant John Gottlieb Heckewelder was the poorly regulated sale of alcohol and its effects on the Munsees (Olmstead 1991).

During the early years of the Revolutionary War, Delaware population dwindled to 3,500 from more than 11,000 estimated at the time of contact, revealing the considerable strain of disease, movement, and warring (Becker 1989; Goddard 1978; White 1992). In the resulting stress of population decline, Wolf phratry sachem Custaloga blamed the devastating disease epidemics on witchcraft and hoped to use Christianity as a curative measure, as an adjunct to their own religion and healing techniques (Heckewelder 1820). Delaware sachems White Eyes (Koquethagechton) and Custaloga invited the Moravian missionaries to establish missionary towns in Ohio. While the Delawares initiated this invitation as a ward against disease, the Moravians’ mission was conversion
and assimilation. Yet, these divergent goals contained an important commonality, stability, which led to a reciprocal relationship between Delaware leaders and missionaries. The Moravian doctrines of order, progress, and neutrality coincided with the agenda of Delaware leaders in terms of economic prosperity and a return to peacemaking (Grimes 2005:106). Other denominations' effort to proselytize among the Delaware largely failed in comparison to Moravian missions, but there were traditionalist factions amongst the Munsee that resisted the cessation of ritual behaviors.

In 1772, the Great Council seemed to modify the triumvirate polity by elevating one civil sachem above the other two. One of the most powerful expressions of this was stated in 1775 at the Fort Pitt Conference when White Eyes told the commissioners that there were three phratries (or extended matrilineal clans) of Delawares with leaders and a chief "spokesman" (Thwaites and Kellogg 1908:88). Prior to this, the first of these council-recognized principal chiefs, Netawatwees, met with Zeisberger and granted the missionaries lands on the Muskingum River. During the same year, Zeisberger established Schoenbrunn and a new Gnadenhütten (Weslager 1978a:27). During the next decade, Moravians established other praying towns, including Lichtenau, New Schoenbrunn and Salem (Olmstead 1991, 1997). Christian Delawares in New Jersey and Christian Munsees moved west into these towns and their mannerisms and practices had striking differences from those of Ohio Delawares (see Loskiel 1794:57).
Although Delawares seemed to accept the Moravian missionaries while eschewing Presbyterians, Quakers, and Jesuits, significant doctrinal differences existed between Moravians and Delawares. Olmstead described Zeisberger's disgust and criticism for certain Munsee religious practices centering on a purging ceremony (1997:150-151). This ceremony, conducted after a great hunt in the summer, consisted of sweat baths and feasting, followed by purging. As alcohol was introduced to this ritual, the gorging of meat was often replaced by binge drinking. The Moravians and Delawares also differed in terms of leadership style. Moravians encouraged leaders who held power as decision makers, rulers, and judges (Schutt 1995:96). Delaware leadership, traditionally, had been more decentralized and even 18th century civil chiefs (sachems) strove for consensus and group decision making. Also, the shaman Wangomendid changed his stance from his initial acceptance of Moravians into perceiving them as dangerous. As a result, factionalism among Munsee groups further alienated Zeisberger's missions (Schutt 1995:130).

The tenant of pacifism in the Moravian church also correlated to the Delawares' traditional role as peacemakers and alliance makers (Schutt 2007). For example, Delaware sachem White Eyes used the tribal role as peacemakers to mediate conflicts during Dunmore's War between the Shawnees and Virginia (Grimes 2005:111). So, in the time leading up to the Revolutionary War, most Ohio Delawares and nearby Christian Delawares exerted neutrality. In prior conflicts, such as the French and Indian War, Delawares - like most of the native groups - sided with colonial powers that were the most economically and socially
advantageous and often retained some positive relationships with other parties, just in case. Yet, during the Revolutionary War, this tactic largely changed to a policy of Delaware neutrality due to the influence of Moravian missionaries. Other native groups in the Ohio, such as the Shawnees/Mingos and Wyandots/Hurons, sided with the British.

The stance of the Delawares to remain neutral during the Revolutionary War caused both internal and external strains. Just before the war began, White Eyes, the chief of the main Delaware political body, was pro-American. His efforts to negotiate the Fort Pitt treaty in 1778 with the fledgling United States included provisions for a 14th state for Native Americans and corresponding Congressional seats, to be led by the Delawares, although White Eyes was likely mislead in order to obtain his allegiance (Grumet 1989:64; Weslager 1972:305). The membership of the Delaware Great Council at this time was Killbuck of the Turtle phratry, Captain Johnny of the Turkey phratry and Captain Pipe as the head of the Wolf phratry with White Eyes as the principle civil chief (Thurman 1973:99-100).

Another provision in the Fort Pitt treaty established a second fort to protect nearby Delaware villages in Ohio from the British. Partially allying with the Americans, White Eyes maintained neutral in the Revolutionary War. Yet, when the American General McIntosh attempted to coerce Delawares into capturing Fort Detroit under the threat of extermination, relationships with the Americans soured (Kellogg 1916, 1917; Olmstead 1991; Weslager 1972). Compounding the problem, the peace treaty at Fort Pitt explicitly outlined Delaware participation in
conflicts against the British and their allies, despite Delaware leadership insisting on provisions of neutrality. Such a miscommunication was blamed on insufficient or deceptive interpreters, obstructing Delaware leadership attendance at the treaty talks, and making false promises to ensure agreement (Kellogg 1916:277). Such a misunderstanding further hampered Delaware-American relations. The new stance of Delaware neutrality caused issues that had not been experienced in prior colonial conflicts. The British suspected the Delawares were pro-American and the Americans viewed the Delawares as enemies. During one meeting between Delaware leaders and Congress, the Americans criticized the Delawares openly for their neutrality instead of allying with the United States (Kellogg 1916:341-342).

In 1778, many of the Delawares of Captain Pipe’s (also called Konieschquanoheel and Hopocan) faction and a faction led by Buckongahelas (also called Pachgantschihilas and Petchnanalas) finally broke neutrality to side with the British who established a “permanent” border for Indian lands in addition to offered protection (Hunter 1954; McConnell 1992; Tanner 1975[1969]; Thwaites and Kellogg 1908, 1912; Weslager 1972; White 1992). Captain Pipe of the Wolf phratry attempted to change the cultural trajectory away from White Eyes’ emphasis on diplomatic neutrality, peacemaking, and pacifism toward an emphasis on fostering the role of warriors and a formidable military force (Grimes 2005:145). One of Captain Pipe’s targets was the Moravians. Captain Pipe aimed at banishing the missionaries to further decouple the pacifism philosophy (Loskiel 1794:86-87). As such, 1782 marked
the end of the Moravian mission activities amongst the Ohio Delawares (Schutt 1995:11). Pro-British Delawares and Wyandots (Huron) raided Moravian praying towns on the Muskingum and the British, who were concerned that missionaries would sway the Delawares to the side of the Americans, ordered all Moravians be seized and removed to Detroit (Heckewelder 1820:275). Salem, Gnadenhütten, and Schoenbrunn were all plundered in the summer of 1781 by a contingent of British loyalists and pro-British Delawares, Munsees, and Wyandots (Huron). The massacre of almost 100 Christian Delawares at Gnadenhütten by Pennsylvania militiamen in March of 1782 dramatically changed the relationship between Delawares and both the Americans and Moravian missionaries (Weslager 1972:317).

Overall, the inability of the Continental Congress to fulfill treaty provisions, the lack of protection provided by Americans for Delaware villages against marauders, murders of native leaders (notably White Eyes, as reported by Indian Agent George Morgan), and the massacre of more than 100 Christian Delawares at the Moravian towns of Salem and Gnadenhütten marked further internal discord and distrust of outsiders (Gipson 1938; Kellogg 1916, 1917; Newcomb 1956; Tanner 1975[1969]). In fact, many Delawares believed Christianity's goal in American expansion was to soften up converts so they could be easily defeated and could not defend themselves from the upcoming slaughter (Miller 1994; Trenkwald Schönenberger 1991; Wallace 1956; Weslager 1972).

Although Captain Pipe and Buckongahelas led pro-British factions, White Eyes' successor Killbuck (Gelelemend) was pro-American. Killbuck's faction lost
prominence after the Americans failed to live up to their promises of trade goods and protection that led many Delawares to take up arms with the British. Leaders of the Turtle phratry Killbuck and Tetapachksit and of the Turkey phratry Machingwi Puschis (The Big Cat) found it more difficult to counter the rising anti-American and anti-neutrality push of Captain Pipe, Buckongahelas, and Turtle war captain Wingenund (Grimes 2005:147; Heckewelder 1820:251, 327). As a result, Killbuck led an important raid against pro-British Delawares at Detroit. He also sacked his former village of Goschachgunk (also called Coshocton) before retiring to Fort Pitt in exile. Later, he converted to Christianity (Weslager 1972:313-314). Also, the Wolf phratry and the Munsees siding with the British did not foster good will with the Americans after the conclusion of the conflict, especially as all Delawares were held accountable for the opposing hostilities. The withdrawal of British support at the end of the war affected the Delawares politically and financially because most Delawares fought for the losing party and the British defeat resulted in the sudden end of competing diplomatic gifts (Grumet 1989:77).

At the end of the Revolutionary War, three trends in Delaware leadership became apparent. First, the rise of the Wolf phratry corresponded with an emphasis on a warrior role in contrast to the peacemaker role that had been championed by the Turkey and Turtle phratries. Second, the influence of Moravian missionaries among the Delawares ceased after the massacre at Gnadenhütten, further eroding the role as pacifists and peacemakers. Lastly, there was a growing schism in between Delaware groups and the United States.
government. The relationship between the Delawares and the Americans was poor due to Americans being unable to fulfill treaty provisions, supply Delawares with trade goods, and being responsible for the Salem and Gnadenhütten massacres, as well as other violent actions against Delawares. Yet, the Americans also viewed Delawares as enemies for attempting to remain neutral and then having a portion of the Delawares side with the British, despite the actions of Killbuck and the aid and hospitality provided by the Christian Delawares. So, as the war concluded, Captain Pipe attempted to smooth the relationship by making conciliatory gestures to the Americans (Grimes 2005:152).

After the Revolutionary War, the new American government’s eye turned toward Ohio territory and immediate efforts to expand there were seen as a right of conquest. The Treaty of Paris of 1783 marked the Mississippi River as the western boundary of the United States and did not account for any interests of American Indian peoples (Calloway 1987:6-7). Furthermore, the British (in Canada) offered very little support except for lip service to the pro-British Indians who fought with and for them during the Revolutionary War (Calloway 1987:8). Delaware leadership felt abandoned and at the mercy of Americans, generally viewed as malevolent and untrustworthy. War leader Buckongahelas, in particular, denounced Americans as “bad” people and condemned slaveholders (Heckewelder 1881:81).

Many Delawares were driven from the Muskingum and Tuscarawas rivers and scattered to a variety of places immediately following the end of the
Revolutionary War. The Treaty of Fort McIntosh in 1785 ceded lands in the
Muskingum region and was signed by Wolf leader Captain Pipe and Turtle leader
Wingenund despite protests by other Delaware leaders, especially
Buckongahelas (Kappler 1904; White 1992:437). The Shawnees signed a
similar treaty at Fort Finney. Many Delawares went to the Lower Sandusky
region on Lake Erie; others went west to the Mad River bordering Kentucky
territory, the Maumee River region at the mouth of the Auglaize, and along the
Miami River in Ohio. Other Delawares moved to the White River in Indiana to live
among others of their nation who had already been invited by the Miamis to
remove there during the Revolutionary War period. Also, a band of Delawares
and Shawnees moved to the Apple Creek drainage near Cape Girardeau in
Missouri at the invitation of Baron de Carondelet (White 1992:413-468; Weslager
1972:319). After the end of the Revolutionary War, the American Indians in Ohio
generally lived in multi-tribal/multi-ethnic polyglot villages that fostered a regional
confederacy focused on a common cause (Tanner 1986:87-89; White 1992:414-
415).

The Northwest Indian Confederation that included bands of Delawares,
Wyandots (Hurons), Ottawas, Chippewas (Ojibwas), Shawnees (also called
Mingos), Miamis, Weas and Potawatomis met in December 1786, nullifying and
denouncing the treaties of Fort McIntosh and Fort Finney for being made without
confederation consent (Grimes 2005:166). The main target for this nullification
involved the land cessions made in these treaties. Yet, the United States
government upheld these treaties and passed the Northwest Ordinance of 1787
that opened up the Ohio territory to settlement. Quickly, game grew scarce and crop failures resulted in starvation (Bliss 1885:373-374). After Delawares appealed unsuccessfully with the Iroquois and the Wyandots (Huron) for more land, the Miamis invited more Delawares to settle with them at the Miami and Wabash rivers in Indiana (Bliss 1885:373-374; Grimes 2005:168).

In 1789, the United States, under the leadership of George Washington, seemed to temporarily change its stance in dealing with the native groups living in the Ohio territory away from the initial "right of conquest" ideology of military force and began paying out substantial gifts, payments, and annuities. At treaty negotiations at Fort Harmar, the Governor of Ohio Territory, Arthur St. Clair, provided more than $6,000 dollars in gifts in order to verify land sessions made by the Six Nations at Fort Stanwix and by other natives living in Ohio at Fort McIntosh (Kappler 1904). Still, the confederation of native groups in Ohio rejected this treaty since many of the signers did not have the authority or consent to participate (White 1992:446-447). The United States government soon realized that the American strategy of peaceable acquisition of lands was being continually resisted and that territorial encroachment by settlers required military intervention and protection against its own citizens. The U.S. strategy quickly changed again toward ethnic cleansing of the Ohio region (Grimes 2005:172).

The American hunger for land resulted in thirty-five native ethnic groups banding together to block those efforts. This conflict is known as the Northwest Indian War, the Ohio Indian War, and also Little Turtle's War, which lasted a
decade until 1794. Delaware warriors, led by war captain Buckongahelas, defended their villages and attacked settlers. The confederacy permitted Moravian missionaries and Christian Indians to reside within the boundaries, but their pacifism was not permitted under threat of death (Heckewelder 1820:493). The Northwest Confederacy, supplied by the British, won key battles in 1790 (the Harmar Campaign) and 1791 (the Battle of the Wabash Valley) (Dowd 1992). The American government moved to quash the native confederacy, replacing Arthur St. Clair who was defeated at the Wabash Valley with Major General Anthony Wayne in 1792.

Many refugee Delawares resettled in the Auglaize River valley within multi-ethnic communities (also called the Grand Glaize towns) (Tanner 1975[1969], 1986). After a failed diplomatic attempt for peace at Maumee Rapids in the summer of 1793, more military campaigns ensued. Forces led by General Wayne attacked the Auglaize communities which ultimately led to the defeat of the Northwest Confederacy at the Battle of Fallen Timbers in August 1794. The resistance was eventually defeated and the remaining leaders traveled to Greenville in 1795 to engage in treaty talks. More than 1,100 Northwest Confederation Indians belonging to the Delawares, Wyandots (Hurons), Shawnees, Ottawas, Chippewas (Ojibwas), Potawatomis, Miamis, Kickapoos, and Piankeshaws attended. The major leaders of the Delawares included Turtle leader Tetapachksit the “Grand Glaize King,” Wolf leaders Buckongahelas and Hockingpomska, and Turkey leader William Anderson (Kikthawenund) (Kappler 1904; Tanner 1986). Other prominent Delaware signers included
Lemantaquis (Black King), Maghpiway (Red Feather), Peekeelund, Kishkopekund (Captain Buffalo), Amenahehan (Captain Crow), and Queshawksey (George Washington). The Treaty of Greenville ceded considerable territory in Ohio to the United States and, as a result, large numbers of Delawares moved into Indiana to live among the Miamis while a smaller group of Delawares sought sovereignty through Spanish land grants and moved into southeastern Missouri, Arkansas, and later to Texas and western Oklahoma (Hale 1987; Haskins 2005; Houck 1908a, 1908b).

Delawares among the Miamis: Life in Indiana

It is important to recognize that some Delaware groups lived in Indiana prior to the Treaty of Greenville. In the 1760s, the Piankeshaws made a large tract of land in southern and central Indiana available to Delawares and immigration commenced throughout southern Indiana in the 1770s and along the White River in the 1780s (Wepler 1980b:3-5). The Treaty of Greenville led to a further splintering of Delaware groups out of Ohio. Some pro-British Delaware factions moved to Canada between Lakes Huron and Erie on the Thames River while others Delawares who were dissatisfied with Americans joined Delawares and Shawnees on Apple Creek between Ste. Genevieve and Cape Girardeau in Missouri (Faragher 1998). By 1800, after the Treaty of Greenville, the largest group of Delawares formerly living in Ohio settled on the west fork of the White River in Indiana on lands owned by the Miamis (Davis 1970; Ferguson 1972; Gipson 1938; McCord 2002; Wepler 1980a, 1980b; Weslager 1972, 1978a; Yann 2009). Additionally, Christian Delawares were invited to live in Indiana and
Moravian missionaries John Kluge and Abraham Luckenbach followed these immigrants to White River in 1801 (Gipson 1938:29-31).

In addition to missionaries, trading posts (also called factories) set up and run by Americans emerged near American Indian settlements. Although trading houses and factors had been involved in the exchange of goods and furs since the earliest years of colonization, most of the factories had been run by private traders or the agents of governments including the Dutch, France, Britain, and even Spain. On the western edge of American settlement, the failure of the American-run and sponsored trading system led to distinctive breakdowns in relationships between American Indians and the fledgling United States. The inability of Americans to supply even the neutral Delawares with trade goods during the Seven Years War and the American Revolution led to groups siding with the French or British who could (and did) provide well-outfitted factories and presented gifts to leaders to foster these economic and political relationships. The United States government recognized the issue of trade, even after winning the Revolutionary War and began using legislation (such as the Indian Intercourse Acts) and government programs (such as appointing a Superintendent of Indian Trade) involving economics to build relationships with American Indians.

The focus on more regulated and continual trade likely emerged out of ideas espoused by President Thomas Jefferson in a letter to William Henry Harrison, the Governor of the Indiana Territory concerning the nation's Indian policy:
To promote this disposition to exchange lands which they have to spare and we want for necessaries, which we have to spare and they want, we shall push our trading houses, and be glad to see the good and influential individuals among them run in debt, because we observe that when these debts get beyond what the individuals can pay, they become willing to lop them off by a cession of lands. At our trading houses too we mean to sell so low as merely to repay cost and charges so as neither to lessen or enlarge our capital. This is what private traders cannot do, for they must gain; they will consequently retire from the competition, and we shall thus get clear of this pest without giving offence or umbrage to the Indians. In this way our settlements will gradually circumscribe and approach the Indians, and they will in time either incorporate with us as citizens of the United States or remove beyond the Missisipi [sic]. (Jefferson 1803)

The goals presented in this letter clearly emulate the earlier, although brief efforts at cultural accommodation and assimilation attempted by the Washington administration just before the Indian Wars in Ohio. This new social and economic policy dealt with more than American Indian groups, but also French, British, and even American fur traders, who encouraged hunting and trapping lifestyles for American Indians, which required vast tracts of land, hunting territory, and mobility. To effect American Indian sedentism and land sessions, larger scale food production was necessary to support the populations. If groups did not choose agriculture through cheap trade, that same trade would encourage staggering debts so that a switch to agriculture would be necessary after being removed to much smaller tracts of land to pay off those debts. Agriculture and trade goods were, to Jefferson, the instruments of assimilation (Jefferson 1803).

The United States did not completely abolish trading and instead opted to heavily regulate traders. According to the Trade and Intercourse Acts, all traders
had to be bonded and licensed as well as having to agree to uphold the various trade restrictions. The government-owned factories, often called Forts, were stationary, and it was necessary to travel to them or settle near them in order to take advantage of the better deals. However, the licensed private traders often lived at or very near existing Indian settlements, intermarried with the groups they were trading with, and established stronger social ties in the communities.

William Anderson's (Kikthawenund) father was reportedly a Swedish trader in Pennsylvania (Cranor [1990]). In Indiana, numerous traders had been licensed to do business exclusively at Delaware villages. One notable trader in Indiana was William Conner, who settled at Connerstown, just four miles from Anderson’s village of Wapiminskink (Ferguson 1972:56). Connor married a Delaware woman Mekingees, the daughter of William Anderson’s second wife Achechelingunaqua and her former husband Twehullahlah, who lived in Anderson’s household (Cranor [1990]). While in Indiana, Mekingees and Conner had six children, two of whom would be significant figures among the Delawares in Kansas. Conner’s partner William Marshall also married a Delaware woman Elizabeth or Wilaquenaho (also called Eliza, Betsy, and Priscilla) (Greene County Archives and Records Center [1998]).

Although the trade of alcohol to American Indians was nothing new to Indiana, the staggering amount of trade in alcohol along the White River was noted in missionary reports. Gipson reported that Hockingpomska’s village had a large supply of whisky available used for sorcery, witchcraft, sacrificial feasts,
and revelries (1938:12, 23, 151, 196, 199, 455, 611). Likewise, the Moravian missionaries characterized natives as constantly drunk (Gipson 1938).

For nearly thirty years (1780s-1800s), scattered Delaware groups lived between the White and Ohio rivers in Indiana. The settlements from earlier Delaware migrations lived further south and the post-Treaty of Greenville natives headed north for the White River. However, the newly-formed Indiana Territory struggled to claim lands along the Ohio River to facilitate transportation and trade to the Mississippi River and the Louisiana Territory that was purchased by the United States in 1803. Shortly after the Ohio Delawares relocated to Indiana, multiple treaties between the United States and the Miamis, Delawares, and Piankeshaws ceded lands in southern Indiana along the Ohio River, forcing more Delawares to remove to White River. The treaties at Fort Wayne in 1803 and 1809, Vincennes in 1804, Fort Industry in 1805, and Grouseland in 1805 sold lands at the Forks of White River, between the Buffalo Trace and the Ohio River, almost all lands outside of Indiana, and all lands south of the east fork of White River (Wepler 1980b:6-7). Important Delaware settlements along the west fork of the White River include Anderson’s Town, Killbuck’s Town, Wapicomekoke, Hockingpomaska’s Town, and Lower Delaware Town (Gipson 1938:11, 16; McCord 2002; Wepler 1980a; Yann 2009).

The Delawares did not officially own the land they occupied in Indiana, which caused considerable frustration between the Delaware villages and their Miami and Piankeshaw hosts. The Delawares likely shared the American definition of ceded land, which was arguably a concept that Miamis only
perceived of as a right of occupancy. Delaware rights to sell land were disputed in land treaties with the government, but the Miamis later acknowledged the equal right of Delawares to the White River lands through an 1809 land deal where monies were distributed among both groups (Weslager 1972:340).

Tecumseh advocated for the joint ownership of land where land could not be sold or ceded without the consent of all joint owners (Esarey 1922:45, 122, 460). These same ideas of pan-tribal confederation persisted in Indiana even though the strategy failed in Ohio. Yet, this difference of opinion over land ownership would continue to cause significant inter-tribal disputes between the Delawares and Miamis after the signing of the 1818 Treaty of St. Marys in which Delawares traded lands in Indiana for lands in Missouri. Lands that the Miamis still laid claim upon.

By 1801, approximately 900 Delawares settled on the White River in Indiana. The number of villages reported range from 11 (Gipson 1938:11) to 15 (Thomson 1867 [1759]:196-205), although some of these villages have been described as multi-tribal with Shawnee, Mohican, Nanticoke, Potawatomi, and Miami contingents (Gipson 1938; Hill 1957). Further involvement of Moravian and Baptist missionaries in Indiana, despite general Delaware suspiciousness of them, coupled with rampant alcoholism, and the encroachment of white settlers, formulated a time of increased cultural stress (Ferguson 1972; Gipson 1938; McCoy 1840; Newcomb 1956; Weslager 1972). Environmental disasters in the form of disease and crop-destroying floods in 1806, interpreted as bad omens, increased discomfort and uncertainties (Weslager 1972:342). In, 1802, many
Delawares died of contagious disease (Yann 2009:45). The associated cultural crisis led to a renewal of nativist strategies that reached their pinnacle during this time (Gipson 1938; Miller 1994, 1997; Postern-Zielinska 1988; Thompson 1937).

One important prophetess was the Munsee woman baptized by Moravian missionaries as Beata (also Beade). She experienced visions in 1805 and 1806, demanding that Delawares and other native groups return to traditional ways and forbade evil, drinking alcohol, sexual promiscuity, stealing, and murder (Gipson 1938:194, 262, 620). Beata also led the Delawares on a revitalistic quest culminating with the reimagining of the Big House Ceremony or Gamwing, a return of the traditional style of sacrifice, and the use of special wooden spoons to serve sacrificial food (Gipson 1938). In 1805, some Wyandots approached Beata to help identify who was responsible for a “poison” that had killed “all good men and children” (Fur 2012:152). Shortly after eight days of sacrifice to ensure a good corn harvest, Delaware leader Buckongahelas, who supported Beata’s reforms, died in May 1805 (Miller 1994:253). In January 1806, Beata began acting as a prophetess and judge, but quickly relinquished the role and disappeared from the historical record (Miller 1994:253).

Through revitalization movements, the Delawares attempted to modify their ideology in order to exert agency in the negotiation of their own fates, culture, and history. Change occurred on many levels, including alterations in subsistence, settlement patterns, and incorporation of non-native material goods. One way of adapting to an increasingly mobile existence led to further development of trade networks that permitted better access to goods and
exploitation of an increasingly unstable environment (Glenn 1992; Martin 1978; McCord 2002; Wepler 1992). Cultural stress related to social and environmental uncertainties also led to religious revolutions. One of the most important religious revolutions involved the (re)emergence of the Big House Ceremony or Gamwing by 1805 (Brinton 1885; Grumet 2001; Harrington 1983[1921]; McCracken 1956; Miller 1997; Newcomb 1974[1955]; Speck 1931; Weslager 1972). One of the most comprehensive volumes describing the Gamwing in detail is Voices from the Delaware Big House Ceremony by Robert Steven Grumet (2001). This celebration permitted the combination of traditional religious celebrations into one 12 day ceremony in October (Grumet 1989:77; Miller 1994; 1997). The Gamwing likely represented a revision of numerous earlier, and simpler, rituals occurring among Delaware groups before and around the time of contact (Weslager 1972:69). It was also the combination of several rituals that Delaware groups no longer had the time or wealth to celebrate separately (Grumet 2001). The Gamwing also represented an effort among Delawares to seek tribal integrity by "defining themselves in terms of participation in a ritual" of thanksgiving (Miller 1994:246). Beata expanded the role of women in the Gamwing ceremony by expanding women's roles as prophets and visionaries (Fur 2012:153).

Another significant native revitalism movement emerged parallel to the visions of Beata. Brothers Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa (also known as the Shawnee Prophet) exerted political leadership through attempting another pan-tribal confederation as well as a prophetic revitalization movement in 1805 and 1806. Like Beata, the Shawnee Prophet also preached against alcohol and a
return to traditional ways. Additionally, he told the Delawares to eschew trade goods, non-traditional clothes, poison, metal implements, domesticated animals, money, private land ownership, and polygamy (Yann 2009:47).

Prophets and prophetesses and their revitalistic messages eventually led to violent consequences in the form of witch hunts in 1806 (Cave 1995, 1999; Ferguson 1972; Gipson 1938; Miller 1994, 1997; Newcomb 1956; Trenkwelde Schönenberger 1991; Thompson 1937; Wallace 1956; Weslager 1972). Witches bore the blame for all bad omens, cultural discomforts, and the many difficulties that occurred during this stressful period. "[P]eriodic witch-hunts have an obviously inhibiting effect on acculturational and other cultural changes" (Miller 1994:248). Suspicion of witchcraft was leveled onto American-supporters and Christianity converts, resulting in the torture and murder of Moravian converts Kaltas (Ann Charity), Joshua, Billy Patterson, and the elderly Delaware Chief Tetapachksit (Grumet 1989:78). Hockingpomska and many others were also condemned, but not killed during the witchcraft purge (Miller 1997:260). "The witch hunts facilitated the purging of deviants who were beyond the pale of the newly defined tribal community whose loyalties were to the Gamwing and to the ‘purity’ of ancestral traditions" (Miller 1994:247). It was after this witchcraft purge that William Anderson (Kikthawenund), the grandson of the first principal chief Netawatwees, rose to the position of Principal Chief of the Delawares.

Missionary Nathaniel B. Dodge provides one of the best descriptions of Principal Delaware chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) during a visit dating to early January 1824:
The chief [William Anderson Kikthawenund] is a grave and venerable character, possessing a mind which, if cultivated, would render him probable [sic] not inferior to some of the finest statesmen of our country. He had much silver hanging to his breast. His ears were cut in strings and loaded with silver, and to his nose hung a large jewel, which, for an ornament, must have been very uncomfortable. His wife was very busy filling a gown with small silver brooches, set in close rows. It will probable [sic] require some thousands to complete it. (Graves 1949:137-138)

It is unclear who William Anderson’s wife is at this point. His second wife Ahkechlungunaqua died in 1805; it is generally believed that he never remarried. Likewise, a description of William Anderson in Mormon missionary Parley Parker Pratt’s journal also includes descriptions of multiple wives (1874). It is possible that Dodge and Pratt both could have mistaken one of Anderson’s daughters or sons’ wives for a wife. Or, Anderson may have remarried by 1824, although no mention of a third wife exists in any of the genealogies.

William Anderson (Kikthawenund) is a tremendously important figure to the Delaware Tribe of Indians today that many of the important Delaware leaders from the mid-to-late-19th century and 20th century are traced through him (Obermeyer, pers. comm., 2012). Anderson’s lineage was documented by Ruby Cranor [1991], although the accuracy of some of the genealogical links is heavily contested. For example, the famous Connor brothers (John and James Ahlahachick) were the sons of Mekingees, a woman who is often incorrectly attributed to being a biological daughter of William Anderson. Her parentage is more likely as a daughter of Captain Ketchum (Twehullahlah) and Ahkechlungunaqua, who became the second wife of William Anderson at a
later time. In fact, documentary evidence suggests that Mekingees and her children did not live in the same community as William Anderson while in Southwest Missouri, residing at the nearby community with the Turtle Phratry, including the two Captain Ketchums (Twehullahlah and Tawhelalen).

The Treaty of Fort Wayne in 1809 ceded more land in Indiana and Illinois to the United States. In response, brothers Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, also known as the Shawnee Prophet, aligned a multi-tribal force to resist American expansion and missionary activities (Thompson 1937). Governor Harrison was legitimately concerned over the Shawnee Prophet and he wrote many letters to tribal leaders to stem their involvement with the "imposter" (Esarey 1922). Together, the brothers aligned another multi-tribal confederacy that was defeated by Governor William Henry Harrison's forces in the Battle of Tippecanoe in 1811 (Thompson 1937:62). The principal chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) maintained Delaware neutrality during these conflicts and during the War of 1812 (Ferguson 1972; Weslager 1972, 1978a). The Conner brothers (including William Conner, married to Mekingees) also acted in important advisory roles keeping the Delawares disengaged from Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa's uprising (Cave 1995; Ferguson 1972; Thompson 1937). One motivation to maintain neutral stemmed from the possibility of losing annuity payments promised by the Treaty of Greenville (Thornbrough 1961). Again, Delaware neutrality resulted in vulnerability to attacks from American forces who did not distinguish neutral from hostile natives and many Delawares were forced to flee their villages as refugees.
in the West, move into Shawnee Towns in Ohio, or live among the Miamis (Davis 1970; Esarey 1922; Thompson 1937).

When the native coalition resistance forces were defeated at Tippecanoe and the British-native contingent at the Battle of the Thames (1813), at which Tecumseh was killed, Indiana gained statehood in 1816. The absence of a native alliance resulted in quick and further removal of native groups west of the Mississippi River at the six Treaties of St. Marys, Ohio in 1818 with the Wyandots (Hurons), Senecas, Shawnees, Ottawas, Potawatomis, Weas, Delawares, and Miamis. The St. Marys Treaties included more than $3,000 in annuities for Delawares (Ferguson 1972; Kappler 1904; Weslager 1972, 1978a). Delaware populations in Indiana at that time were estimated between 800 and 1,000, but may have been as much as 1,700 when considering a multi-tribal conglomerate (Morse 1822; Thompson 1937). The Piqua, Ohio Indian Agent John Johnston estimated that there were 1,050 Delawares on the White River and 45 on the Sandusky River in 1816 (Hill 1957:92-93). The Louisiana Purchase accommodated Delaware removal because there was newly available land that was formerly used in Spanish land grants in addition to the 1808 Treaty of Fort Clark forcing Osages to cede lands in western Missouri (Houck 1908a, 1908b; Kappler 1904). The Osages, however, maintained a claim to hunting right to the lands after resettlement by eastern native groups, which set the stage for conflict with the emigrating Delawares and other eastern groups (Foreman 1946, 1953).

Article 3 of the Treaty of St. Marys, Ohio (1818) agreed to pay the Delawares the full value of all land improvements ceded in Indiana, 120 horses, a
number of perogues (shallow boats for river crossing), assistance to ferry across
the Mississippi River, and provisions for the duration of their journey (Kappler
1904). The Delawares had three years to move, were also guaranteed a
government-paid blacksmith, and an annual annuity of $4,000, in addition to
annuities from earlier treaties. In order to persuade Delaware leaders to sign this
treaty, the United States government had to agree to two additional conditions.
The first condition involved paying all Delaware debts to fur traders, including
William Conner, totaling $13,312.25 (Kappler 1904). Additionally, a secret
provision for “private” annuities to chiefs William Anderson (Kikthawenund,
Figure 3) ($360) and Lapanihilie (Big Bear) ($140) facilitated the treaty. These
private annuities are not mentioned in the wording of the official treaty, but are
mentioned in numerous pieces of correspondence (Anderson 1826e; Calhoun
1821c; Delaware Agency 1825; Graham [1821]c, [1822]j, 1824b, [1826]n;
Menard 1822a).

Not long after the signing of the Treaty of St. Marys, Delaware Indian
Agent John Johnston wrote about the emigrating Delawares in a letter to Caleb
Atwater, the President of the American Antiquarian Society, dated 17 June 1819:

Attempts have been made without success, particularly by the
Moravians, to introduce Christianity and the habits of civilized life
among them [the Delawares]. At present, they are more opposed to
the gospel and the whites, than any other Indians with whom I am
acquainted.... They have sold their country without any reserve, at
the treaty of St. Mary’s of last year, and the United States have
engaged to remove them west of the Mississippi [sic]; to provide
them with territory there, and have guaranteed to them its
peaceable possession. Their peculiar aversion to having white
people for neighbours, induced them to remove to the westward.
(Johnston 1820[1819])

Johnston's letter succinctly summarized much of the animosity directed toward white settlers and religion, which is part of the impetus and the methodology for their relocation into a remote region in southern Missouri.

Because of the three-year timeline for removal, Delawares in Indiana did not begin moving until at least the summer of 1820. When Baptist missionary Isaac McCoy traveled through the White River area in December 1818 and June 1819, the villages had not initiated removal (McCoy 1840:53-58). In fact, Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) reported regret to McCoy: "I think that the men who made the bargain with us have done wrong, and that they had not been authorized to purchase our country; and I hope the transaction will not be approved by Congress" (McCoy 1840:58). A significant cause for hesitation was likely due to the unclear nature of the land promised to the Delawares west of the Mississippi River. In the Treaty of St. Marys, Delawares ceded nearly six million acres (9,375 square miles) of land for an unknown and un-delineated area of land of unknown quality. To offset this level of uncertainty, William Anderson (Kikthawenund) attempted to negotiate a secure title to specific lands as early as 1818. He told McCoy, "I have written to the great council of the Seventeen fires [Congress] to send me a paper that will give us a sure title to the land to which we are going, so that the white people may no more disturb us" (McCoy 1840:59; see Kraft 1974; Morrow 1981; Royce 1899). No title to land was ever
granted. In fact, Delaware removal from Indiana was well underway before the land was designated for them in Southwest Missouri.

The reality is that the government’s knowledge of the region of Southwest Missouri was extremely poor. The detailed report of Louis and Clark’s expedition (1804-1806) was mainly confined to the Missouri River. Likewise, Henry Rowe Schoolcraft’s expedition from Potosi, Missouri to the James Fork of White River in Missouri, the area where the Delawares would be relocated, took place over the winter of 1818-1819 and was not published as Journal of a Tour into the Interior of Missouri and Arkansaw until 1821. There are no major rivers connected to the Missouri River that penetrate south into the Ozark Mountains (the closest tributary of the Missouri River to Delaware Town is the Pomme de Terre River, a branch of the Osage River), which necessitated arduous travel by foot or horse through the stony country.

**Apple Creek Delawares**

It is important to make a brief comment about groups of Delawares (and Shawnees) that moved into Missouri prior to the group led by William Anderson (Kikthawenund). As early as the 1780s, Spanish Governor Francisco Cruzat encouraged native resettlement along the western side of the Mississippi River, partly to act as a buffer between the Americans and Osages (Faragher 1998:306; Houck 1908a:218-219). Using Spanish land grants as incentive to move, by 1787 around 1,200 Shawnees and 600 Delawares immigrated into settlements along Apple Creek, south of Ste. Genevieve, Missouri (Morrow 1981:150; Weslager 1972:353). Together with French Canadian trader Louis Lorimier, this force of
Shawnees and Delawares fought against British-allied Osages who were invading the Boone's Lick region near surrounding Franklin, Missouri. The Apple Creek groups also fought both against, then with, Americans (Faragher 1998:308). By 1817, the Indian Census of Missouri Territory reported:

Delleways [sic] 800 [total], 350 [children living in] 3 [towns spanning] 120 [miles] on Apple Creek and Black River. Those people are scattered, fond of Liquor, decreasing. They live on corn[,] wild meat and by little trade & some stock. (Western Historical Manuscript Collection 1817)

By 1820, the U.S. Census counted 66,586 white persons living in the Missouri Territory (which was considerably larger than the State of Missouri) of which just over 10,000 lived in St. Louis (U.S. Census Bureau). The second largest town was Ste. Genevieve at 2,000, Franklin at 1,000 and only four towns (Cape Girardeau, Jackson, Potosi, and St. Charles) contained populations larger than 500 (Parrish 1971:34).

Many of the Apple Creek communities had been abandoned by the early 1820s and the residents moved into Arkansas Territory and the area around the Verdigris River in modern Oklahoma. Yet, notable Apple Creek Delawares immigrated into Southwest Missouri to join William Anderson’s group. Some Apple Creek Delawares that moved to Delaware Town include *Meshaquowha* (Captain Patterson), a Ketchum (probably *Twehullahlah* who was married to Patterson’s sister), *Lapanihiilie* and *Tawhelalen* (two sons of *Twehullahlah*), and *Natcomin* (Cranor [1990]; Rees et al. 2000:10; Weslager 1972). Historian Mark Farahger (1998) and historical geographer Walter Schroeder (2002) provide more detailed historical coverage of Apple Creek Delawares (and
In late 1825, efforts were being made by Superintendent of Indian Affairs William Clark to remove the Apple Creek Shawnees and Delawares to a 50 square mile allotment west of Missouri (Figure 4). Although the treaty ceding these lands was signed by the Apple Creek Shawnees on 7 November 1825, there was some local resistance to the removal. In a letter dated 6 August 1825, Samuel G. Hopkins, a resident of New Madrid County, wrote a letter to Indian Agent Richard Graham on behalf of the Apple Creek Shawnees and Delawares. Mr. Hopkins spoke on behalf of his neighbors and expressed alarm at the proposed removal of the natives living on the St. Francis River because the Shawnees and Delawares provided an outlet for valuable trade (Appendix B-1; Hopkins 1825). Yet, not all residents supported the continued presence of Delawares in southeastern Missouri. Some residents complained about Delawares' cutting down trees (Clark 1826e). A few months after Hopkins' letter was written, a treaty extinguishing claims to land in Missouri was signed by the Shawnees living between Ste. Genevieve and Cape Girardeau, Missouri. No Delawares or Muskogees are mentioned in that treaty (Kappler 1904). Hopkins' account of the area as swampy and un-navigable was accurate and it took more than a century before massive drainage programs could turn the area into arable farmland.

Yet, there were still lands in New Madrid County that had been legally granted to Shawnees and Delawares as part of land grants from Baron
Carondalet. It was not until 1833 when claim to those land grants was extinguished by Delawares removed to Kansas and none of the Apple Creek Delawares signed the treaty (Kappler 1904).

Typically, historians draw a boundary between the Apple Creek Delawares and the “main” Western Delawares who moved into Southwest Missouri in the early-19th century. After all, many of the descendants of the Apple Creek Delawares (formerly called “Absentee” or “Western” Delawares) are now settled in western Oklahoma as part of the federally-recognized Delaware Nation headquartered in Anadarko. This is a separate group from the federally-recognized Delaware Tribe of Indians headquartered in Bartlesville, Oklahoma which would be the descendant population of many of the Delawares who lived in Southwest Missouri. It is important to note, however, that during the early-19th century, the boundaries between these two groups were relatively fluid. There is clear documentary evidence that these groups exchanged members throughout the 1820s, which will be documented below.

Moving to Delaware Town on the James Fork of White River

The Treaty of St. Marys permitted three years for the Delaware westward migration into Missouri. The majority of removal took place in the late summer and winter of 1820-1821. Explorers to the region reported the presence of Delaware bands in the area as early as 1818, but it is difficult to assess whether identifying these groups as Delawares is correct (Houck 1908a, 1908b; Park 1955; Schoolcraft 1821, 1853). The majority of the White River, Indiana band of Delawares began movement westward during the winter of 1820-1821 by
passing through Fort Kaskaskia in Illinois. The cost of transporting and provisioning emigrating Delawares amounted to a significant sum over a three-year period as different waves of families moved to Delaware Town on the James Fork of White River in Southwest Missouri.

In 1820, 1,346 Delawares and 1,499 horses arrived at Kaskaskia, Illinois to cross over into Missouri (Foreman 1933, 1953; Weslager 1972:361). The expenses directly related to Delaware removal into Missouri (not including annuities and salaries) totaled $525 in ferry passages and provisions (Menard 1821f). **Table 3** details the expenses related to the Delawares in Missouri for 1820. The amount of $100 in salt annuity from the 1803 treaty is not present in the records. During this first year of resettlement, records indicate that most of the expenses relate to Indian Agency personnel salaries. The newly-appointed head of the western Superintendency of Indian Affairs was General William Clark (1770-1838). His tenure as Superintendent is detailed by Jay Buckley (2001, 2008). For the Agency overseeing the Delawares, the largest salary went to Sub-Agent Colonel Pierre Menard, who was in charge of all emigrating native groups from the east, not only Delawares (**Figure 5**). The Indian Agent Major Richard Graham’s annual salary was $1,300 (Delaware Agency 1825). Richard Graham (1780-1857) was a veteran of the War of 1812 who lived in St. Louis. Graham served as Indian Agent in charge of the Osage Agency (which included Delawares and other groups prior to 1825) and Delaware Agency (established in 1825). During the winter of 1829-1830, Graham was replaced by Captain George Vashon (1785-1835). Vashon was quickly replaced with Major Richard W.
Cummins, an obscure figure in the documentary record, who took charge once the Delawares moved to Kansas. It was Vashon who facilitated the treaty ceding Delaware lands in Southwest Missouri. Graham's professional and personal correspondence is archived in the Missouri History Museum Archives in St. Louis. The Indian Sub-Agent assigned to the Delawares was Major John Campbell (who died 1837). John Campbell is another relatively obscure historical figure best known as a city father to the town of Westport in western Missouri.

The government-appointed blacksmith was James Pool (also spelled Poole) who lived among the Delawares with his wife Phoebe and at least one son Peter (who served as an assistant and striker) during the entirety of the Delaware occupation of Southwest Missouri (Gillis 1829; Pool 1826). In May 1825, Pool delivered an invoice for services rendered to Peter A. Lorimier, which not only provides a picture into the types of activities and pricing, but also that Pool's labor was available outside of his duties as government-paid blacksmith:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May 1825</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Septtember [sic] 3
To Suing [sic] one horse[e] [§]1.00
putting cold steel on one ax 1.50
3 hashas [sic] and 6 stapals [sic] 0.75
meadeal [sic] and gun saws [0].25

[total] [§]15.25

(Pool 1825a)

Pool accompanied the Delawares to Kansas upon their removal in 1829 and
continued to work for them until 1858 (Pool [1858]). The Treaty of St. Marys
stipulated to pay the salary and supplies for a government blacksmith to the sum
of $940 a year.

The interpreter James Wilson (who died in 1834) was married to at least
one Delaware wife. Nathaniel B. Dodge described her as such in 1824:

This man [James Wilson] has an Indian wife, who is quite a cleanly
and decent housekeeper... As a specimen on the female attire, the
interpreters wife, after breakfast, arrayed herself as follows: Her
hair neatly folded in a piece of plaid silk, fastened with a silver
band; her gown bandana silk, with 32 brooches on it of various
sizes, some the weight of a dollar, her shroud of scarlet,
embroidered with deep blue, pale blue, white and black ribbons.
(Graves 1949:137-138)

Wilson was subsequently fired as Delaware interpreter in 1825 and lived along
Wilson's Creek just north of Delaware town (a waterway named after him) until
his death. James Wilson's probate is one of the earliest in the Greene County
historical records (Greene County Archives and Records Center 1999b).

TABLE 3
ESTIMATED EXPENSES RELATED TO DELAWARE REMOVAL TO
MISSOURI, 1820

(derived from Graham [1822])
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Annuities
- 5,600 Permanent annuities
- 500 Chiefs' private annuities

Salaries
- 1,300 Indian Agent [Richard Graham]
- 2,000 Indian Sub-Agent [Pierre Menard]
- 500 Indian Sub-Agent [John Campbell]
- 500 Blacksmith [James Pool]
- 400 Interpreter [James Wilson]

Other Expenses
- 1,000 Sundries (from Calhoun 1821a)
- 800 Transportation of annuities
- 525 Provisions and Ferry Passage (from Menard 1821f)

In 1821, four sums had been submitted for reimbursement directly related to emigrating Delawares: $2,748.46 (United States Indian Department 1821), $3,341.66 (Calhoun 1821b), $4,494.34 (Menard and Vallé 1821b), and $6,021.00 (Calhoun 1821b). This sum did not include an additional $5,727.80, totaled from seven receipts submitted by the trading company Menard & Vallé for the purchase and transportation of additional provisions to the Delawares living on the west fork of the Current River located in present-day Shannon and Carter Counties, Missouri and also those living at the Embarras River, a western tributary of the Wabash River in Illinois. Table 4 details the expenses related to the Delawares in Missouri for 1821.

TABLE 4
ESTIMATED EXPENSES RELATED TO DELAWARE REMOVAL TO MISSOURI, 1821

(derived from Calhoun 1821b; Graham [1822]; Menard 1821a, 1821b, 1821c, 1821e, 1821g; 1821h, 1821i; Menard and Vallé 1821a, 1821b, 1821c, 1821d, 1821e, 1821f, 1821g)

Asterisks indicates a sum calculated by author

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annuities</th>
<th>$5,600</th>
<th>Permanent annuities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,475 of above sum sent to Piqua, Ohio Indian Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiefs' private annuities</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>Chiefs' private annuities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>Indian Agent [Richard Graham]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>Indian Sub-Agent [Pierre Menard]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>Indian Sub-Agent [John Campbell]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>Blacksmith [James Pool]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>Interpreter [James Wilson]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>General expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12,111.13</td>
<td>Expenses related to Emigrating Delawares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>Transportation of annuities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,727.80</td>
<td>Baggage, provisions, and supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,494.34</td>
<td>Transportation, ferry and provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>Keeping horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Goods</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$87.50</td>
<td>3,500 lbs. flour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$14.40</td>
<td>360 lbs. pork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12.50</td>
<td>25 bushels of hominy com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>25 lbs. tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>200 lbs. pork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>2 bushels of hominy com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$218.75</td>
<td>10 kegs [gun] powder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$105.63</td>
<td>5 kegs [gun] powder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$43.38</td>
<td>10.5 kegs lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$30.75</td>
<td>1 keg tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$30.04</td>
<td>1 keg tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$19.68</td>
<td>5 kegs lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>600 rifle flints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>500 rifle flints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$110.00</td>
<td>220 bushels corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>95 bushels corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$78.00</td>
<td>3,900 lbs. flour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$78.00</td>
<td>25 shoed horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$71.75</td>
<td>2,050 lbs. flour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$68.00</td>
<td>3,400 lbs. flour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$58.50</td>
<td>234 bushels corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td>220 bushels corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>550 lbs. salt pork and bacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12.50</td>
<td>250 lbs. biscuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>8 horse bells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$16.00*</td>
<td>4 bags of oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$32.05</td>
<td>8 bags of oil to 6 individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10.42</td>
<td>24 lbs. bacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5.53</td>
<td>1 bag of oil to [William] Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5.25</td>
<td>21 lbs. tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>1 2/3 yards Stroud [cloth]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>6.5 yards Calico [cloth]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>3.5 yards Factory [cloth] to [William] Gillis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>3 yards Factory [cloth]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1.13</td>
<td>3 ribbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>6 salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$34.75*</td>
<td>80 lbs.</td>
<td>bacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$185.00</td>
<td>185 bushels</td>
<td>corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$185.00</td>
<td>185 bushels</td>
<td>corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$185.00</td>
<td>185 bushels</td>
<td>corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$185.00</td>
<td>185 bushels</td>
<td>corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70.70</td>
<td>2,020 lbs.</td>
<td>flour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$67.27</td>
<td>1,223 lbs.</td>
<td>lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$66.05</td>
<td>1,877 lbs.</td>
<td>flour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$65.70</td>
<td>1,877 lbs.</td>
<td>flour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$64.89</td>
<td>1,854 lbs.</td>
<td>flour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$46.00</td>
<td>460 lbs.</td>
<td>iron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>600 gun</td>
<td>flints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>3 barrels</td>
<td>tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>35 lbs.</td>
<td>beef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>12.5 lbs.</td>
<td>salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>50 barrels</td>
<td>flour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>4,000 lbs.</td>
<td>flour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$105.00</td>
<td>3,000 lbs.</td>
<td>flour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>80 bushels</td>
<td>corn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, the $100 salt annuity was not included in the Graham's reports. It is also important to note that a portion of the annual annuity was diverted to the Piqua Indian Agency to assist Delawares still emigrating out of Indiana (Graham 1823a).

Secretary of War John C. Calhoun sent a letter to Sub-Agent Pierre Menard on 8 August 1821 urging the further westward removal of Delawares in an attempt to mitigate the heavy costs of the Delaware occupation in the Current River valley (Appendix B-2; Calhoun 1821b). The Delawares already settled on the Current River had significantly increased the amount of support required due to the very poor state of the land and the lack of game. The rugged and stony topography is ill suited for agriculture, and remains a very sparsely populated area in the state. Richard Graham described the settlement at Current River:

I was much pleased with the Delaware[s], they appear to be industrious & are very anxious to become farmers & they have
about 100 acres corn & praries [sic]. They have fixed themselves for the present on the West Fork of the Currents [sic], a branch of Black River, which empties into White River. The bottom on which they have settled is stoney [sic] though rich. The country around is mountainous & one mass of stone & destitute of game. They have to go 30 or 60 miles to kill deer & complain much, that their Horses become so lame in one day's journey that it is difficult to get them back. Indeed it astonished me to see that unshod horses could get over the country. (Graham [1822])

Although the Delawares attempted to plant cultivars in the floodplain upon arrival, the administration was anxious for further removal to not-as-of-yet designated lands further west. In an undated letter from Indian Agent Richard Graham, he described the lands along the Current River as “certainly the worst country & the most difficult of havemly [sic] I ever saw” and encouraged Delaware leadership to move immediately and abandon their crops for future Delaware immigrants (Appendix B-3; Graham [1821]).

During the worst part of the winter of 1821-1822, the groups that camped on the Current River in present-day Shannon and Carter Counties suffered from starvation due to crop failure (Ferguson 1972; Henson 1964; Weslager 1978a). To allay the crisis, Indian Agent Richard Graham made numerous purchase orders for food to be transported to the Delawares. On top of the already mounting removal expenses, the unexpected expense caused by the famine forced Graham to respond to Department of War letters demanding an explanation. On 12 November 1821, Richard Graham made an attempt to justify the continued massive expenses for the Delaware removal effort (Appendix B-4; Graham 1821b)
In late 1822, when many Delawares had finally settled at Delaware Town on the James Fork of White River in southwestern Missouri, there were still claims in the sum of $2,234.84 and $2,765 in additional provisions and transportation of these goods into southern and Southwest Missouri (Graham 1822c). Calhoun complained repeatedly about the expense of provisioning Delawares (Calhoun 1823). Table 5 displays the expenses related to the Delawares' occupation of Missouri in 1822. Again, part of the annuity was diverted to the Piqua Agency (Graham 1823a). This time, the expense is "to pay for horses furnished to the last emigrants" by John Johnston (Graham 1822f). There is also a receipt for a government-supplied blacksmith known only as G. Beauvais during the first quarter of 1822 (Graham 1822e). It is possible that James Pool, who served as blacksmith for the entire tenure of Delaware residency in Missouri, may have not been hired until the second quarter of 1822. There were also conspicuous expenses made to purchase tools and equipment from trading firms in Ste. Genevieve to furnish the government blacksmith.

**TABLE 5**

**ESTIMATED EXPENSES RELATED TO DELAWARE REMOVAL TO MISSOURI, 1822**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annuities</th>
<th>$5,600</th>
<th>Permanent annuities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200 of above sum sent to Piqua Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>Guizard claim (from Guizard 1828)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>Indian Agent [Richard Graham]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>Indian Sub-Agent [Pierre Menard]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>Indian Sub-Agent [John Campbell]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$268.20</td>
<td>Blacksmith [James Pool]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$142.20</td>
<td>Blacksmith [G. Beauvais] (from Graham 1822e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpreters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$58</td>
<td></td>
<td>Packhorseman [Felix Fontaine]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cook [Emanuel]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$43</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guide/Hunter/Express [Cohon, a Delaware man]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laborer [Edward Brafford] (from Graham 1822d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,421.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,234.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provisions for Delawares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation of annuities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation of provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rations for Agency staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,440</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trade Goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$675</td>
<td></td>
<td>Three month's meat rations for 2,400 Delawares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,350 bushels of corn for Delawares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000 bushels of flour for Delawares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powder, lead, gun flints, tobacco and salt for Delawares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30</td>
<td></td>
<td>For Blacksmith [Beauvais and Pool]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12</td>
<td></td>
<td>300 lbs. iron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 screw plate for smaller rifles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 polished files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 screw plate for breeching rifle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 dozen gouges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 saw for cutting rifle barrels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 rat tail files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 wimble or brace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 round planes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 dozen 6 l chisels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 cross cut saw files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 flat saw files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 half round files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 hand saw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 smoothing plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Jack plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 pitt [sic] saw files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 drawing knife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 hand vise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 drill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indian Sub-Agent Colonel Pierre Menard (1766-1844) was in charge of the initial transportation costs involved in the relocation of Delawares (and other native groups) into Missouri. At the time, he was Lieutenant Governor of Illinois and lived at Kaskaskia, a major ferry point across the Mississippi River. In addition to his political ties, Menard was also heavily involved in the fur trade as a part of Manuel Lisa's Missouri Fur Company and locally at the firm Menard and
Vallé (Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library 1774-1825, 1804-1826, [1804-1904], 1825-1824). Although the majority of commerce with native groups had been heavily controlled through the factory system, Congress ended the factory system in May 1822, opening up substantial opportunities for private traders and firms to make significant sums of money from government annuities.

Pierre Menard's massive job of ferrying such a large group of Delawares, horses, and goods across the Mississippi River was a historic event at which many horse thefts occurred (Missouri History Museum Archives 1795-1896). According to the provisions of the Treaty of St. Marys, 120 horses valued at $40 (at most) per horse had been provided as part of the settlement. Tong estimated as many as 1,400 Delaware-owned horses crossed the Mississippi River (1959). Many horses never made it to Southwest Missouri due to a major problem of horse theft. Delawares sent claims for reimbursement to the Indian Agents, but the investigation of these claims took years to gather and submit. Sub-Agent John Campbell and Indian Agent Richard Graham amassed a list of more than 30 horses lost to theft and submitted the total to the Secretary of War amounting to $1,910 (Appendix B-6; Graham [1825]e). Secretary of War John C. Calhoun passed the claims on to William Clark for investigation and reimbursement, but stipulated that "agreeable to the 3d Article of the treaty with them of the 3d October 1818, you will not pay at a higher rate for any such than the price fixed by said treaty, which is $40" (Calhoun 1824). While many of the stolen horses fell within the maximum price permitted by the treaty, it is notable that the horses stolen from chiefs or their children typically exceeded $40 in the valuation.
Horses were also stolen from Delawares who were traveling for the purpose to sell furs and hunting. In some cases, local white settlers were responsible for the thefts (Campbell 1825a; Graham 1823b, 1826m; Rodney and Horden 1826). After settling lands in Southwest Missouri at Delaware Town, the problem of horse theft continued. Richard Graham filed an additional claim on 25 September 1825 (Graham 1825e). At least two instances of horse theft committed by both Pawnees and Osages against Delawares were reported (Campbell 1825e; Chouteau 1826). There is even one case where a claim was made against Delawares for a stolen horse; a crime to which they admitted. Over $52 dollars was paid to settle the matter (Campbell 1828a).

An additional complication involved political boundaries and predispositions. Once the Delawares crossed the Mississippi River and moved into the jurisdiction of Richard Graham, the Indian Agent for Missouri who reported to the territorial governor William Clark, the promises made by Piqua, Ohio Indian Agent John Johnston were not easily. Dissatisfaction about not receiving promised government support during removal was expressed in a letter from Richard Graham to John C. Calhoun dated 4 March 1822 (Appendix B-6; Graham 1822c). The food insecurity, the lack of wild game to hunt, and the arduous journey across the rugged terrain made the trek into southern and southwestern Missouri slow-going and dangerous. Additionally, despite being given three years to remove from Indiana, there was no clear direction of where they were headed.
Insomuch as Delawares were crossing the Mississippi River into the Missouri in 1820, there was no place designated for them to go. As a result, many were forced to stop along the west fork of the Current River for the winter. Curiously, the lands promised to the Delawares as part of the Treaty of St. Marys were not apportioned as late as 1822. On 12 December 1820, Secretary of War John C. Calhoun wrote to Superintendent of Indian Affairs William Clark emphasizing that the War Department intended to “act liberally” with the Delawares although the stipulations of the Delaware portion of the Treaty of St. Marys did not include specifics about the location or size of lands the new Delawares lands nor any provisions during and after removal (Appendix B-7; Calhoun 1820).

Despite Delaware settlements being established on the James Fork of White River in late 1822, it is apparent from the documentary records that the St. Marys Treaty that apportionment was still not official. In January 1822, there were two places being considered for settling Delawares. The first site was located in Southwest Missouri along the White River, south of the Kickapoo allotment. The second site was located north of the Kickapoo lands, north of the Osage River, which would have placed Delawares much closer to the Missouri River, the newly-abandoned trading factory Fort Osage, and existing settled lands in the Boone’s Lick region. In a letter dated 3 January 1822, Graham expressed concern that lands surrounding the White River were too mountainous and did not include enough prairie lands. Instead, he suggested granting lands to the Delawares between the Osage and Missouri rivers in Missouri, north of the
Kickapoo allotment (Appendix B-8; Graham 1822a). Secretary of War John C. Calhoun, however, insisted upon moving the Delawares as far west as possible, away from white settlements and close to Osage territory (Appendix B-9; Calhoun 1822a). Yet, Calhoun made it clear that any lead mines on Delaware lands “must be reserved for the use of the U.S.” (Calhoun 1822a). The lead mine in question likely refers to a spot mentioned by Henry Rowe Schoolcraft in his journal of the 1818-1819 expedition into the area (Park 1955; Schoolcraft 1821).

It is also important to note that Calhoun’s letter to Graham insisted on situating the Delawares’ territory adjacent to Osage territories. This act foreshadowed significant problems during the entirety of the Delaware occupation of Missouri. Richard Graham, however, was keenly aware of the potential danger in an undated draft:

"It would not be sound policy to move the Delawars [sic] on the lands assigned for them, as their proximity to the Osage would inevitably produce a war, which now threatens very strongly to break out & which I most anxiously wish to put down, for that purpose I shall as I pass by the Delawar [sic] this Spring endeavour to take a few of their chiefs with me to the Osage Nation & use my best exertions to effect a friendly understanding between them. If I fail in this I fear the whole frontier of this state will be involved in an Indian War. I fear a General Indian War will take place on the frontier of this state [strikeout in original]. (Graham [1822]k)

Graham was aware of the heightened tensions already existing between Cherokees and Osages in Arkansas Territory and that fear of Osage aggressions was a driving factor in hesitation among groups of emigrating natives, including Delawares, Kickapoos, and Shawnees (Graham 1821a). The threat of warfare did not alter the assignment of lands in the White River valley.
The process of relocating the immigrant Delawares in Missouri reflects the chaos of the newly formed Western Superintendency of the Department of Indian Affairs. Considerable costs and problems associated with ferrying such large groups of people, supplies, and horses led to security problems and horse thefts. Also, the lack of planning in where to move Delawares reflects major issues with the nascent efforts as large scale Indian Removal policies, which would become national policy in the 1830s. Not only did the U.S. government have three years after the signing of the Treaty of St. Marys to determine where to relocate affected groups, the final decision was made more than a year after Delawares were already settling in remote areas southern Missouri. The cost of removal escalated with significant sums spent for provisioning Delawares due to the poor quality of land for agricultural use and the lack of game for hunting and trapping for meat and furs. The desire of the government to use eastern immigrant native groups as buffers between white settlements and Osages is clear. The consequences of moving Delawares and others onto recently surrendered Osage lands, however, would prove to be a much larger problem than the Indian Agency was prepared to handle.

**Neighbors in Southwest Missouri**

By October 1822, the boundaries designated for the Delawares were finalized, including the lead mine reservation. Unfortunately, William Clark reported that numerous squatters from the Boone’s Lick region with a dubious claim of having Spanish land grants were descending upon White River to work the lead mines and would have to be removed (Appendix B-10; Graham 1822g).
The Spanish land grant was never confirmed and Clark ordered all squatters to leave. After the final dispensation was made, the Delawares’ allotment in Southwest Missouri consisted of 3,000 square miles, although less than 100 square miles was occupied by Delaware families during their occupation (Foreman 1946:35-45; Morrow [1980]; Rees et al. 2000).

Upon arrival at their promised lands in Southwest Missouri, the Delawares confronted a few white squatters who were unhappy to find out from the government that the land legally belonged to the natives (Fairbanks and Tuck 1915; Ferguson 1972; Holcombe 1969[1883]; Houck 1908a, 1908b; Howard 1970-71; Tong [1958], 1959). Squatters were forced to move by William Clark. In general, conflicts were few, but the documentary record includes adjustments for horse thefts by the whites and pig thefts by the Delawares to feed their starving people (Campbell 1825b, 1825d; Graham 1821b, 1822g, 1822i; Weslager 1978a:213).

Some white settlers, however, stayed on Delaware lands or moved back and were ordered to pay rent to the Delawares (Graham 1824a; Menard 1824). It is probable that the rent was paid through providing a number of bushels of food per acre farmed, but some of those white settlers tried to supplement their incomes by distilling and selling alcohol (Campbell 1825d). Sub-Agent John Campbell requested assistance from his supervisor Richard Graham on 1 October 1825 to help remove several “outlaw characters” that were manufacturing and distributing liquors to the Delawares in Southwest Missouri. Campbell, in particular, mentioned Solomon Yoachum (1773-1850) who had
established a peach brandy distillery just inside the border of the Delaware allotment (Appendix B-11; Campbell 1825f). It is clear that John Campbell was extremely concerned about the presence of white squatters and alcohol sellers near the border with Arkansas Territory. A similar letter Campbell sent to Richard Graham dated 19 May 1825 expressed the severity of his alarm about the “whisky sellers” and “horse stealers” squatting on or near Delaware lands (Appendix B-12; Campbell 1825a). Several months after this letter, John Campbell reported to Richard Graham, “There has not been less than three hundred dollars of whisky brought in the nation by the Indians since you left” (Campbell 1825b).

Delaware Town represented one of the largest communities in Missouri during the 1820s and it is important to remember that it was a multi-cultural community. In addition to the majority of Delaware residents, there were members of other native groups such as Nanticokes, Shawnees, and Kickapoos, white settlers and traders of both French and American nationalities, and enslaved persons of African descent of which very little is known in the documentary record. While these neighbors brought useful economic trade and produced agricultural goods, there were also some negative consequences like alcohol and thievery due to their presence. It is apparent that Delaware leaders and Indian Sub-Agents welcomed some of these neighbors while condemning others, such as Solomon Yoachum and unproductive squatters.

Delaware Town
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The consolidation of many Delaware groups on the James Fork of the White River in southwestern Missouri continued the settlement arrangements experienced in Indiana of being located on the west fork of waterways (Yann 2009). Yann’s predictive model for Delaware villages in Indiana is based on Richard Adams’ description of villages as housing clusters of wealthier families in the center with poorer families on the periphery (Adams 1905:18; Yann 2009:114). This clustered settlement style represents a more traditional Delaware pattern where multiple clusters of households dot up and down the river, probably based on kinship and status (Escott 1878; Melton 1977; Rees et al. 2000, 2003; Yann 2009). The principal settlement in Southwest Missouri was called Anderson’s Village, also known as Delaware Village and Delaware Town. It was one of the most important settlements in the region because it served as a trade hub and was the location where the Indian Agency personnel and other eastern immigrant native group leaders visited the Delawares. Figure 6 shows the ultimate boundaries of Delaware lands in Southwest Missouri, bounded by Kickapoo lands to the north and Shawnee lands to the east.

The settlement pattern was not nucleated in design and consisted in several small enclaves scattered up and down the banks of the river for several miles. This pattern, resembling a string of pearls along the river, is comparable to traditional Algonquian settlement patterns (Eaton 2004; Gina S. Powell, 2005 pers. comm.; Yann 2009). Besides Anderson’s Village, there are notations for other Delaware villages nearby situated around the households of Captain Ketchum (Twehullahlah), Nonondoquomon, and Roasting Ear (also spelled...
Rostingear) in the historical record. Historically, Delaware settlements along the Muskingum River settled in a dispersed manner with small villages and satellite communities surrounding diplomatic centers where the chief residences would be located (McConnell 1992:229). The housing types were probably a combination of traditional bark-covered, post-in-ground wigwams (Figure 7), and log cabins, similar to styles used in Indiana (Missouri History Museum Archives 1795-1896; McCord 2002; McCoy 1840:53; Yann 2009).

Another trait important to Delaware villages was the long house that would have served as the location for the Council House and the Big House Ceremony or Gamwing. The Big House Church is also called Xingwikáon. In Indiana, Moravian missionaries reported that long houses were "about forty feet in length and twenty feet wide... built of split logs set together between dug-in posts and were provided with a roof..." (Gipson 1938:612-613). There are no written documents that describe a long house, Xingwikáon, or council house at Delaware Town, despite several notations about 'councils being held, nor has one been located through archaeological excavation.

In 1825, the Sub-Agent responsible for overseeing the Delawares, Major John Campbell, wrote to his supervisor Richard Graham about building a cabin to house the Delaware Agency at Delaware Town. He described his intent to build a log cabin in the style of James Wilson’s buildings near William Anderson’s (Kikthawenund) dwelling (Appendix B-12; Campbell 1825a). The type of housing found in Delaware Town and surrounding villages, therefore, included log cabins and out buildings for the traders and Indian Agency personnel, both
log cabins and traditional bark wigwam-style houses for the residents, and temporary housing such as tents used when visitors arrived (Graham 1826e).

It is important to note that the Piankeshaws, Weas, and Peorias also lived on Delaware lands in Southwest Missouri, but were generally found in their own communities. According to the Gillis probate records, Piankeshaws lived east of Delaware Town along Cowskin Creek in present-day Douglas County near Ava, Missouri (or on Cowskin River, a tributary of the Neosho River, west of Delaware Town) (Missouri State Archives 1873). The residences of Peorias and Weas are less well-known in the documentary record, but were likely south of Delaware Town near Swan Creek where William Gillis had another trading house. The Piankeshaws, Peorias, and Weas often visited Delaware Town, accepted their annuities there, and received speeches from Graham and Clark (Graham 1826f, 1826g, 1826h, 1826i).

During the summer of 1823, the endeavor of growing corn in the bottomlands of the James Fork of White River had been again thwarted by heavy rains that caused floods to damage fields and houses. While picking up a wagonload of goods near Delaware Town, Hippolyte Menard (born in 1770) wrote about the conditions to fellow trader Peter A. Lorimier:

\[\text{[O]ur field has been injured by the hy [sic] water White river [h]as been uncommonly hy [sic] the water run three feet hy [sic] in the houses[,] wales house [sic] and field [h]as been destroy [sic] for the lose [sic] of the corn I do not do it tell [sic] it get dry. (Menard [1823])}\]

It is probably that “wales house” could mean “warehouse.” While the alluvial floodplains in southwestern Missouri are fertile, they are prone to intense flooding
in the springs due to snow melt runoff and precipitation. Frequent flooding continued to thwart attempts to cultivate the floodplain of the James River. William Anderson (Kikthawenund) reported the tremendous loss of crops caused by three days of rain (Appendix B-13; Anderson et al. 1824).

Despite the better land quality in the James Fork of White River Valley compared to the Current River floodplain, lands in southwestern Missouri are nevertheless iron-rich and very stony, making it very difficult to farm. "Anderson complained to Clark and Graham that his people had been induced to vacate choice lands in Indiana for worthless lands in Missouri. He insisted that a better home be found for the Delawares" (Weslager 1978a:215). In a speech to Superintendent of Indian Affairs William Clark, translated by interpreter James Wilson, Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund), Lapanihilie, Captain Ketchum (Tweshullahlah), Captain Natcomin, Captain Beaver (Punchhuck), and Pooshies sent the a speech presenting numerous complaints and requests for further assistance:

Father, We know you have fulfilld [sic] your promise to us of furnishing provisions untill [sic] we got to our land. We have got in a Country where we do not find as was stated to us when we was asked to swap lands with you and we and we [sic] do not get as much as was promised to us at the Treaty of St. Marys neither. Father, We did not think that big man would tell us things that was not True. We have found a poor hilly stony country and the worst of all no Game to be found on it to live on.

Father, If we go a Great Ways off hunt we may find some Deer but if we do that we cannot make any Corn and we must still suffer. Father, We are obliged to call on you onst [sic] more for assistance in the Home of God you know that one God made us all and us know it (Appendix B-13; Anderson et al. 1824)
It is notable that two members from all three Lenape phratries are represented in this speech. Representing the Turkey phratry were William Anderson (Kikthawenund) and Captain Beaver (Punchhuck). The Turtle phratry was represented by Lapanihilie, also known as Big Bear, and Captain Ketchum (Twehullahlah). Traditionally, the principal leadership of Delaware groups prior to the middle-18th century came from the Turtle phratry. Captain Natcomin and Pooshies (also known as The Cat and a son of William Anderson) were the representatives of the Wolf Phratry. The phratry affiliation of the speech-makers suggests that the Delaware Great Council continued to thrive in Missouri.

That speech also alludes to the efforts of William Clark and William Anderson to gather as many Delawares and affiliated groups into Southwest Missouri as possible. After ascending to Principal Chief of the Delawares in Indiana around 1806, Kikthawenund’s guidance in Indiana focused on preserving remaining traditions like the Big House Ceremony or Gamwing, and extending invitations to the scattered bands of Delawares, Mahicans, Munsees, and others across the country (Ferguson 1972; Morrow 1981). Over the next two decades, including the span of occupation in southwestern Missouri, many Delawares joined William Anderson’s group, including members of the Brotherton reservation in New Jersey, Stockbridge-Munsee groups in Massachusetts, Long Island and Esopus Indians from New York, and many of the last remaining Ohio (Sandusky) Delawares (Grumet 1989:79).
In general, William Anderson's (Kikthawenund) efforts to bring disparate groups of Delawares remaining in Illinois and Ohio to join him in Missouri were successful, but not absolute. Roger Ferguson suspects this success was due to the government's eagerness to transport remnant native bands in the midst of white settlements westward (1972:125). In fact, during the negotiations for the Treaty of St. Marys, many Brotherton Indians received land grants in Indiana as part of the Delaware settlement (Kappler 1904). Yet, the Stockbridge-Munsee group received no land grants, presumably in order for them to accompany William Anderson's group west. Dated 5 February 1822, the leader of the Stockbridge-Munsees Solomon U. Hendricks or Ulhaunowausont sent ten strings of wampum along with a request to persuade Delaware leadership to divide part of their annual annuity to the Stockbridge-Munsees (Appendix B-14; Hendricks 1822). Richard Graham passed on Hendricks' speech and the strings of wampum on 6 November 1822 through interpreter James Wilson (Graham 1822h; Clark 1822):

I am satisfied that if ever a promise was made by your nation to receive the Muk-he-con-nuk [Stockbridge-Munsee] Indians as joint proprietors [sic] with yourselves in the lands alluded to in their talk that you will now in good faith, fulfill [sic] every stipulation that have [sic] been made by your Fathers at the council of Waupe-kom-me-kuk [Wappecommehroke]. (Appendix B-15; Graham 1822i)

Any reply made by the Delawares is not extant in the documentary record. There is no indication that any annuity money was directed to the Stockbridge-Munsee group. Yet, during 1821 and 1822, a percentage of annuity money was diverted to Indian Agent John Johnston at the Piqua, Ohio Agency (Tables 3 and 4;
Calhoun 1822b). If any of that money was used for the support or removal of Hendricks’ group, it is not indicated in the documentary record.

Once settled in Southwest Missouri, the documentary record of Delaware Town demonstrates the presence the Great Council and full participation by all three phratries as well as Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund). The decisions made by this group at the signing of the Treaty of St. Marys, however, alienated closely-related groups like the Brotherton and Stockbridge-Munsees who were cut out of some of the land exchange and annuity assignments. Certainly, the Brotherton group received some considerations including land for half-breeds in the St. Marys Treaty, but the requests made by the Stockbridge groups expressed frustration and alienation. Through the exchange of wampum and carefully crafted diplomatic language utilizing the symbolic status as “grandfathers”, numerous requests for financial assistance from “grandchildren” possibly went unmet. This would potentially exacerbate the relationship further. However, it is apparent that the Department of Indian Affairs was diverting partial sums away from the main group in Missouri to assist with the removal of other Delaware groups still in Indiana and further east, possibly including the Stockbridge-Munsee group.

Licensed Traders and the Fur Trade in the 1820s

The large amount of money pouring into Southwest Missouri in the form of more than $6,500 in annuities proved a fertile ground for white traders to establish trading posts in the area (Johns 1998; Kingman 1960). In addition to providing trade goods, these posts continued fur exchange relations extending
back to Indiana and beyond. The relationships persisted because a few traders
followed the Delawares west of the Mississippi River (Morrow 1981). Notably,
William Conner, the important trader in Indiana who was married to Mekingees,
remained in Indiana after receiving a land grant and a considerable sum of
money as part of the Treaty of St. Marys settlement. Mekingees and her children
moved into Missouri. However, three less-influential traders who lived alongside
the Delawares in Indiana situated themselves in Southwest Missouri to trade with
emigrating peoples. It is important to recall that the government trading factory
system was dismantled in 1822 and that there was considerable competition with
these local traders from established traders like the Chouteaus on the Missouri,
Arkansas, and Verdigris rivers. These three traders who followed the Delawares
from Indiana to Missouri were William Marshall (who died in 1833), James Wilson
(who died in 1834), and William Gillis (ca. 1797-1869).

In order to become a licensed trader, an application and a licensure bond,
plus invoice of goods, had to be filed with the Department of Indian Affairs
through the Indian Agent. In 1825, Adam Rittenhouse inquired with Indian Agent
Richard Graham, seeking a license. Graham responded and explained to
Rittenhouse that private licensure necessitated a complete invoice of goods, a
bond worth half the amount of all goods, and residency at Delaware Town if he
wished to trade with all of the native groups living in the White River region in
southern Missouri (Appendix B-16; Graham 1825a). William Anderson's village,
also known as Delaware Town, was the central hub of trade for all of the native
groups administered to by the Delaware Agency, headed by Richard Graham. It
was also the location of the Indian Agency building where John Campbell lived and where the distribution of the annuities took place for all of the groups listed above.

There are two existing invoices for Gillis' James Fork Trading Post (also known as Delaware Town) and Three Forks Trading Post dating both dating to 1827 (see Appendix C and Appendix D; contrast with Louis Vallé's invoice for the same year in Appendix E). In 1827, William Gillis obtained a joint trading license with Louis Vallé, and paid $1,000 for bonding (Appendix B-21; United States of America 1827). There are two very interesting clauses in this trading license. The first involves uniforms or other emblems of foreign power, which referenced the role of trade among the French and British spilling over into allegiances in past armed conflicts.

The other clause involves the ban on selling liquor, which was pursuant to the Indian Intercourse Acts. Based on the letter to Rittenhouse in 1825, the trading licensure process banned alcohol, but a letter from Richard Graham to the Secretary of War in 1821 indicated that this clause was a recent addition, or that the clause was extant, but completely unenforceable (Graham 1821b). Likewise, a small notation in one of Colonel Menard's notes about trader William Marshall indicates that he was permitted to sell alcohol with his license to the elderly at Anderson's village, in spite of the ban on alcohol clearly in place by 1825 (Appendix B-22; Menard 1826b).

Clearly, the enforcement of the ban on selling liquor had not been strictly followed in Missouri. This led Superintendent of Indian Affairs William Clark to
send out a strong admonishment to Indian Agent Richard Graham to curtail illegal liquor sales immediately for the sake of the peace and safety of the region (Appendix B-23; Clark 1827). This renewed effort by Clark, through his subordinate Graham, regarding the ban on traders selling alcohol helps to explain the wording on William Gillis' trading license from 1827.

William Marshall is one of the least well-known of these three traders mentioned above. He was affiliated with the Ste. Genevieve trading firm Menard & Vallé. Marshall was also married to a Delaware woman called Elizabeth, also known as Betsy, Eliza, Priscilla and Wilaquenaho (1797-1875). Together, they had at least one son called John Marshall, although they likely had other children whose names were not identified in the primary sources consulted for this research (Missouri State Archives 1873). According to Holcombe's History of Greene County, Missouri, Marshall established a mill near the confluence of the James and Finley rivers (1969[1883]:131-132). There is very small documentary trail for William Marshall. His probate record is on file in Greene County, and it contains a list that includes his personal effects, livestock, store goods, and also records his five slaves (Greene County Archives and Records Center [1999]). In all of the archival sources referenced for this project, there was only one letter authored by Marshall complaining to the Indian Sub-Agent of the Delawares Major John Campbell about rival trader William Gillis, who was trading in Southwest Missouri without a license (Appendix B-17; Marshall 1826). Indeed, William Gillis did not have a valid license to trade until 1827.
It is clear that William Gillis was approached by John Campbell about the licensing issue, but Gillis had powerful friends among the Delawares, even if he was not popular among the Indian Agents and Sub-Agents:

[William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] has called on me and expresses a wish that Mr. [William] Gillis may have license to trade on the three forks of white river, this you will be the best judge of yourself, I have permitted [sic] Mr. [William] Gillis to remain at the three forks of white river until [sic] I should hear from you as it was the particular wish of [William] Anderson, but he is not to trade any of the goods[.] You have no idea of the high ground this gentlemen [Gillis] takes here he is more than agent.... (Appendix B-18; Campbell 1826e)

The Gillis trading post at the Three Forks of White River was located outside of the lands designated for the Delawares, although its exact location is never precisely described and presently unknown (Graham 1824c). Likely, it was located near the mouth of the James River into the White River, which is presently underwater after Table Rock Lack was established. It is not the same as Gillis' other two trading posts in Southwest Missouri: Delaware Town and Swan Creek, located in Taney County near the present town of Forsythe (Missouri State Archives 1873; Morrow 1977). Elizabeth and William Marshall's children moved into Kansas with the Delawares after Marshall's death in 1833 (Holcombe 1969[1883]:131).

James Wilson also followed the Delawares from Indiana to Southwest Missouri. Wilson was known for having many native brides. Holcombe described Wilson as being "married to three squaws while here [in Greene County], and after living with each for a short time, would drive her off, and seek another
'affinity" (1969[1883]:131). James Wilson had at least one half-Delaware daughter, known only as the Wilson girl, old enough to marry trader William Gillis for a short time in 1828 or 1829 (Missouri State Archives 1873). After the Delawares removed to Kansas, Wilson remained in Southwest Missouri near the creek named after him until his death in 1834. At the time of his death, his widow was named Elizabeth, but it is likely that she is not of Delaware descent (Holcombe 1969[1883]:131). Elizabeth Wilson lived on and opened a tavern with neighbor William Dye (also spelled Dies), near the mouth of Wilson’s Creek (Garrison 1835b). James Wilson’s probate record is located at the Greene County Archives and Records Center (1999b).

Wilson was also affiliated with Ste. Genevieve-based trading firm Menard & Vallé, but this was likely after he was fired from his position as a Delaware interpreter for the Department of Indian Affairs in 1825. At some point in 1825, Sub-Agent John Campbell fired Wilson, sending a letter describing five charges against Wilson, including cheating the Delawares their iron entitlement (Appendix B-19; Campbell [1825]g). Immediately after firing Wilson, Campbell hired a man called Troit (also spelled Troyet) as official interpreter who was probably the same person as the Delaware man named Troit (who may have also been called James Wright). Local historian, Holcombe levied a more serious charge of thievery against James Wilson:

It is said of Wilson that he gained the confidence of the Indians, and got the handling of what money they had. He is reported to have buried this money with the intent to keep it from the Indians, but Judge Lynch’s code seems to have been known to the Delaware,
and they caught Wilson and hung him up by the neck until he revealed where the cash was hid" (Holcombe 1969[1883]:131).

This story is not confirmed in any primary source correspondence from the Delaware Town occupation and is probably not a true account. But, Wilson did assist the Delawares in other ways. While living among the Delawares, Wilson made bails and fencing and was paid $150 dollars for his services from the 1823 annuity (Wilson 1823).

William Gillis (Figure 8) is the most famous of the three men who pursued trade relations with the Delawares on the James Fork of White River. Later in his life, he was a very wealthy and influential city father of the Town of Kansas (today, Kansas City) (Morrow 1981). His surname is almost uniformly spelled "Gilliss" in the documentary record pertaining to Delaware Town, but the standard spelling of his name is used here. Gillis affiliated with the major trading company Menard and Vallé out of Ste. Genevieve and operated many trading posts in Southwest Missouri, including at Delaware Town, Three Forks of White River, and Swan Creek (Melton 1977; Morrow 1981). The Gillis trading post at Anderson's Village was also known as Delaware Town and he was William Anderson's preferred trader (Melton 1977:7, 11). Gillis may have been adopted as a member of the Delawares, but he was certainly related by marriage to Delaware women Black Squaw, Poquas, Charlotte, a half-Delaware daughter of James Wilson, and a daughter of Ketchum (Twehullahlah) (Missouri State Archives 1873). It is unclear whether or not some of these names may represent alternative names of the same women. William Gillis' marriages and his children
with them helped integrate him into the kinship networks of the people with whom he traded (Missouri State Archives 1873). His marriage to Poquas produced at least one daughter, Sophia Gillis (born in 1822).

Gillis was also married to native women who were not Delawares, but lived near Delaware Town. He was married to Little Girl, who was half-Nanticoke and half-French, with whom he had a daughter named Mary Gillis who was born in 1824 (Missouri State Archives 1873). According to his probate record, Gillis was married to Little Girl at the same time as he was married to Black Squaw (Missouri State Archives 1873). Gillis also married the daughter of Piankeshaw leader Laharsh named Kahketoqua. A daughter, Nancy Gillis, was born of this marriage in 1829 (Missouri State Archives 1873). We know so much about Gillis’ marital history due to a very public dispute over his extensive estate following his death. Although he was known as a committed bachelor in Kansas City who died with no children, some of his grandchildren from these early marriages appeared in court to sue for a share of his estate. The records of this court case, which went as far as the Missouri Supreme Court, ruled in favor of the descendants of Nancy Gillis (Missouri State Archives 1873; Morrow 1981). Curiously, there are no documents authored by Gillis pertaining to his trading activities at Delaware Town or elsewhere. But, the probate record depositions are very illustrative of Gillis’ operations as well as his personal life.

At his deposition for the Gillis probate case, one of Gillis’ former employees, Joseph Philabert, provided one of the only descriptions of the trading house operations from the 1820s:
It was one story hewed log house known as a double house with an open entry between. The south room was a kitchen—the north room was Gilliss' room. A door from each room opened into the open entry and one door on the west side of the kitchen opening to the outside. One window in the east side of Gilliss' room and a chimney at each end of the house. (Appendix B-20; Missouri State Archives 1873)

The Gillis house was a two-room dog-trot style log cabin with two hearths and chimneys and one east-facing window in the northern room. Two enslaved women, Mathilda and Olive, and their children also lived at the cabin with William Gillis (Missouri State Archives 1873). Like William Marshall, Gillis also owned slaves living at Delaware Town and there is very little known about their lives in the documentary record.

Other important traders included Gillis' partners Joseph Philabert (also spelled Filibert, 1804-1884), William Myers, and Basil Boyer (1808-1860) (Missouri State Archives 1873). Other licensed traders in the area included Peter A. Lorimier (1783-1871), Paul Baillo & Company, Joseph Archambeau, John B. Sarky, Amable Turpin (1766-1866), and François Lesieur (who died in 1826) (Clark 1824e, 1824f, 1825b). Of course, Delawares traveling outside of their territory would often trade with Jean Pierre Chouteau (1758-1849) in Arkansas Territory and Auguste Pierre Chouteau (1786-1838) on the Verdigris River in present-day Oklahoma.

In addition to selling merchandise, many of the traders purchased furs from Delawares and other groups. Trader Peter A. Lorimier reported the following
furs collected by Delawares (and possibly others) and delivered to Pierre Menard at Menard & Vallé on 11 July 1821:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>145# good beaver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>362.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 2nd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221 Racoons [sic] good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 2nd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 Foxes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 W. Cats</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Hisher [sic] [Fisher, related to Mink]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Otters good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 2[n]d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tygers [sic]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Rabbit skins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 muskrats [sic]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bear rotten wapped [sic] of ... [illeg.]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Total] 766.81 [incorrect amount]

The Dressed Deer skins are not yet counted nor examined but supposed to be as the others say correct. (Menard 1821b)

In 1830, William Marshall, on behalf of the Menard & Vallé firm out of Ste. Genevieve, received furs from William Myers near the confluence of the Kansas and Missouri rivers from Shawnees who had moved by 3 August 1830:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95lb of good Shaved Deer Skins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 -° d[itt]o Coon - d[itt]o</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Myers 1830)

It is possible to compare the two fur trade receipts by using the good quality raccoon skins as a common denominator. In 1821, Pierre Menard paid 33 cents a pound for raccoon skins while, in 1830, William Marshall paid $2.50 per pound. This difference might reflect nine years of inflation, pricing differences due to competition, or a decrease in supply from years of trapping in the area.
The fur trade may have supplemented annuities for many families and individuals or could have been bartered directly for store goods. The competition among traders for furs and annuity money was occasionally fierce. There are multiple occasions in the documentary record that illustrate active efforts to undermine the competition. For example, Indian Sub-Agent Pierre Menard, who was also a principal of the Menard & Vallé trading firm, send a speech to the leaders of the Peorias, Piankeshaws, and Weas at a meeting at Anderson's Village urging them to only do business with his colleague Peter A. Lorimier (1783-1871) (Appendix B-24; Menard 1825b). Pierre Menard's endorsement of Lorimier, while warning against association with any other trader, is significant in that he uses terms of familiarity “friend” and “brother” in his speech to mark all others as “unfriendly” and outsiders. Occasionally, traders levied lies against each other, although it is difficult to know exactly who was behind the lies. In this example, Pierre Menard warned Peter A. Lorimier of a rumor being spread by James Wilson to turn all of the other traders in the area against Lorimier (Appendix B-25; Menard 1825c). This kind of tactic was very powerful in directing the business toward or away from particular traders.

There are numerous ledger books related to fur trade, primarily related to the business of Pierre Menard located multiple document archives in Illinois. However, it is very difficult to identify specific cases of trade with Delawares due to many of the fur trade records being counted as bulk numbers. There are some cases where personal names and accounts are extant in Menard's records
because they are usually associated with outstanding debts (Menard 1821b; Menard and Vallé 1822a, 1823a, 1823b).

Traders also exploited the financial windfalls of the Delawares and other native groups who received government annuities. Isaac McCoy regarded the situation at Delaware Town a few years later in his 1830 journal:

Traders credit the Indians, charging three or four [times the] prices for their goods, expecting that all will not be collected, and charging so high as to make themselves safe if but a small amount should be collected....When a treaty occurs, they come in with these claims. A trifling present or profession of friendship, &c. will induce an Indian to say the claim is just, and must be paid, if he sells his land. (McCoy 1936[1830]:24)

Just as William Connor received land and a significant amount of money from the government as part of the Treaty of St. Marys to cede lands in Indiana, all of the traders who followed the Delawares into Missouri were hoping for the same deal.

Additionally, all of the traders living at Delaware Town took up extensive amounts of land to plant corn and raise livestock, rent-free, while charging Delawares for the bounty (Weslager 1974:370). Indian Sub-Agent Major John Campbell, who lived at Delaware Town, wrote a strongly worded letter about the "grand imposition" of the traders exploiting the lands belonging to the Delawares for their own financial gain (Appendix B-18; Campbell 1826e). In 1825, Delaware leaders William Anderson (Kikthawenund), Lapanihilie, Ketchum (Twehullahlah), and Captain Pipe (Tahungeecoppi) sent a letter to Peter Lorimier asking him to pay rent to the amount of five bushels per acre cultivated, which was half the amount recommended to them by the Indian Agent Richard
Graham (Appendix B-26; Anderson et al. 1825). These documents suggest that the rent was supposed to be paid annually to the Delawares, at least by the traders if not by other white families living nearby, was paid in bushels of corn. Considering that the average yield was probably between 20-30 bushels per acre, the 10 bushel rent payment would have been between a third and a half of all agricultural productivity performed by outsiders. The Delawares may have given traders a "discount" due to reciprocal relationships and/or due to their marriages to native women.

Traders also extended credit to Delawares over the year, expecting large portions of the annuities in order to pay off the accrued debts. One example of traders running up large debts on credit, to be paid at annuity time, was recorded by John Campbell. In a letter to Richard Graham dated 1 September 1825, he complained of the abuse of debt by the traders:

Killbuck[’]s band are [sic] much dissatisfied as the poor ones get not one cent [of the annuity]. Killbuck directed Col. [Pierre] Menard to pay it all over to the traders. I have directed the traders not to credit him on the faith of the annuity again or they would not be paid if I could avoid it. (Campbell 1825b)

In this case, Captain Killbuck and others of the Wolf phratry ran up over $600 in debt to trader William Marshall alone that had to be paid out of the 1825 annuity (Killbuck et al. 1825). From another letter written later that month, it is clear that Killbuck's group also charged up debts with William Gillis to the amount of $1,700 (Campbell 1825b, 1825d). In 1826, Killbuck's group charged $92 for buying cloth from Menard & Vallé to be paid from the 1827 annuity (Killbuck and Toklacaussy [Toletahsey] 1826). Campbell admonished the behavior of both Killbuck's band
and the traders, informing them all that credit based on annuity payments could only be given under William Anderson's authorization or for the burial of the dead or on behalf of the sick (Campbell 1825d).

This issue of one phratry charging up debts with the traders and getting a portion of the annuity thought to be disproportionate raises the question over class differences (or at least wealth and status differences) among the Delawares that extended to families or even whole phratries. While at Delaware Town, the most vocal complains about "poor Indians" and "rich Indians" came from the Wolf phratry:

The poor Indians complain to me constantly and state they get little or nothing that the big fish eat all the little ones up in the duration.... By this means the poor of his band are to get nothing. This is unjust and ought not to be suffered.... [William] Anderson the chief Joins me. He is much disatisfied [sic] at the conduct of Killbuck and his party. (Appendix B-27; Campbell 1825b)

The "rich" few of the Wolf phratry would run up debts for themselves throughout the year that would be paid during the annuity distribution, consuming most of the amount, leaving no annuity for the rest of the phratry.

The self-interested behavior of many of the traders continued as the Delawares and others were preparing to remove again out of Missouri. Sub-Agent John Campbell complained that Shawnee removal to Kansas was significantly delayed because William Gillis loaded his own gear into the wagons, which necessitated the Shawnees to carry their own heavy items (Campbell 1828b; Graham 1829). Also, based on a report by Major Richard W. Cummins, William Gillis attempted to replace long-time government Blacksmith James Pool
with a black man belonging to him for $150 less pay than James Pool received (Graham 1826a) by coercing Captain Ketchum (Tawhelalen) to complain about Pool. In his letter, Cummins reports that even William Anderson (Kikthawanund) asked for William Gillis to be removed as a trader, indicating that his patience with Gillis was ending (Appendix B-28; Cummins 1830c).

The presence of licensed traders in Southwest Missouri continued the impact of private traders on the Delawares evident in Indiana. In Indiana, William Connor married Mekingees, the daughter of Principal Chief William Anderson's wife. In Southwest Missouri, all three of the major traders also married Delaware women to establish closer kinship ties with the groups with whom they traded. These traders sought the wealth of the Delawares (and others) through their guaranteed annuity payments as well as additional money obtained through the trade of skins, furs, and bear oil. Yet, some of the negative consequences of this trading relationship stemmed from the illegal supply of alcohol, traders not paying rent to the Delawares for farming Delaware lands while selling the produce at exorbitant rates, and encouraging individuals and phratry leaders to run up large debts by purchasing goods on credit to be paid through future annuities or fur trading. In fact, it is clear that many of these traders intended Delawares to acquire such a large, un-payable debts as to force the U.S. government to pay the debt in one lump sum before securing Delaware removal from Missouri. This was a strategy successfully used by the Connor traders in Indiana and was likely the goal of William Marshall and William Gillis.

Conflict with the Osages
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Southwest Missouri was part of the traditional hunting territory of Osages. Despite relinquishment of the lands in an 1808 treaty, the Osages did not appreciate immigrant groups appearing a few years later (Missouri History Museum Archives 1821). Osage bands also represented groups with whom Delaware social networks never extended before. Unlike the Iroquois, Shawnee, Cherokee, and other eastern native groups, these Siouan speakers did not fit neatly into established kinship networks and did not recognize the Delawares' position as "grandfather." Problems between Delawares and Osages began while the Delawares were still residing on the Current River, resulting from the deaths of some Cherokees and Delawares in Arkansas (Ferguson 1972). It is important to note that a large contingent of Cherokees lived in Arkansas Territory and were already in conflict with Osages. On 20 December 1820, Governor James Miller of Arkansas Territory (1776-1851) wrote to U.S. President James Monroe about recent raiding and skirmishes that had recently left two Cherokees dead and a third Cherokee wounded that antagonized existing difficulties between Cherokees and Osages north of the Arkansas River (Appendix B-29; Miller 1820). The perceived threat of Osage hostilities had a mild effect on emigrating groups moving from Ohio and Indiana into Missouri (Adams 1905; Graham 1821a).

The growing hostilities between the eastern native groups, who quickly began re-establishing confederations of old allegiances against the Osages with the mindset staged for war deeply concerned the administration. Even while the Delawares were still living on the Current River, Indian Agent Graham set into
motion efforts to establish treaties of peace and friendship before hostilities broke out. While Graham attempted to stop the Delawares going to war against the Osages, the Delaware leadership received an urgent call from their Cherokee allies in Arkansas request for assistance. Graham reported his failure to Secretary of War John C. Calhoun in a letter dated 12 November 1821 (Appendix B-4; Graham 1821b; also [1822]).

By 1822, open warfare within the State of Missouri, had not broken out. Yet, Graham was extremely concerned about the threat of Delawares, Cherokees, and Kickapoos aligning against Osages. He made very strong warnings to the Delawares about the consequences of going to war, including a threat to withhold their annuity, extract all licensed traders, and remove any military protection (Appendix B-30; Graham 1822b). Graham further calculated that the Delawares and their allies could field at least 2,100 warriors whereas the Osages could produce 1,000 (and an additional 250 warriors could be added from Kansas allies) (Graham 1822b).

Finally, in September 1822, there was a pre-emptive peace treaty signed at the Delaware encampment on the Current River to alleviate tensions between the Delawares, Shawnees, Kickapoos, and Osages (Howard [1822]). The treaty, signed on 21 September 1822, remained in force for more than two years. Signatories of this treaty included many prominent Delawares: William Anderson (Kikthawenund), James Nanticoke (Lemottenuckques), Lapanihilie (Big Bear), Pooshies (the Cat), Petchenanalas, Nonondoquomon, Journeycake (John Quick), Petamonosse, Captain Natcomin, Captain Beaver (Punchhuck),
Captain Ketchum (Twehullahlah), Captain Killbuck, and Captain Whiteman (Suwaunock). In the case of this treaty, not every signer’s phratry affiliation is known, but it is clear that all three Delaware phratries are represented. Chiefs and important leaders from the Osages, Weas, Peorias, Kickapoos, and Piankeshaws also signed. Part of the treaty regarded a Delaware claim against the Osages to the amount of $1,000 of which the Osages would only agree to pay half (Kansas Historical Society 1822).

Yet, the most fascinating provision of the treaty was in Article 3:

Article 3rd It is mutually agreed that if any difficulty should occur [sic] between the Osages and any of the Delawares’ [’] Grand Children in the adjustment of it is to be left to the Delaware nation who are to decide without any deficimcy [sic] or partiality. But any difference between the Osages an[d] the Delawar[e]s themselves, is to be left to the desision [sic] of the Superintendent of Indian Affairs residing in the Country. (Appendix B-31; Kansas Historical Society 1822)

This 1822 Treaty of Peace and Friendship strongly reasserted the special status of “grandfather” to Weas, Peorias, Kickapoos, and Piankeshaws and the Delawares’ position to act as mediator and judge in the case of any disputes between the “grandchildren” and the Osages. Only in the case of conflict between the Delawares and the Osages would authority be granted to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs to make judgments or reparations. In the case of the possible cession of Osage lands to the Delawares, it does not appear in the documentary record that the deal was ever approved by William Clark. However, it fueled Richard Graham’s suspicions that one of the motivations for Delaware hostilities with the Osages was to procure more land from them (Graham 1822b).
It is important to clarify that, just as there has never been a singular Delaware Nation, there were many subdivisions among the Osages during the 19th century. Richard Graham detailed the schism amongst the bands of Osages in a letter addressed to Secretary of War John C. Calhoun on 12 November 1821. In this letter, Graham described that the Osages split into three groups in 1809 after the death of White Hair (Pahuska), consisting of the Claremore (Gramon) band (also called the Lower Osages) on the Verdigris River in present-day Oklahoma, and the Great (Upper) Osages who resided in Missouri (Appendix B-4; Graham 1821b). It is also important to note that the Greater or Upper Osages that signed the Treaty of Peace and Friendship in 1822 did not include Claremore’s band.

It is clear that even with a peace treaty signed, a growing amount of anxiety about native confederations and alliances being formed against the citizens of the United States flourished in Missouri and Arkansas Territory. On 5 December 1823, Colonel Matthew Arbuckle (1778-1851) at Fort Smith reported to Colonel Alexander McNair (1775-1826) about an incident involving Osages and white settlers at the Blue River in Oklahoma where five Americans and a sixth man were killed by an Osage raiding party (Appendix B-32; Arbuckle 1823). Yet, William Clark assured that the peace treaty was still in place because the violence was committed by Claremore’s (Gramon) group and not the Greater or Upper Osages who were treaty signatories (Clark 1824c).

Alexander McNair was the Indian Agent of the groups, primarily Cherokees, living at White River south of the Missouri border in the Arkansas
Territory. It is known that there were small numbers of Delawares living with Cherokees in Arkansas instead of in Missouri at Delaware Town (Graham 1824a). Arbuckle was extremely concerned about the hostilities committed by Claremore’s (Gramon) group against citizens of the United States and the close proximity of so many other native peoples of unknown affiliation (Arbuckle 1823). Superintendent of Indian Affairs William Clark allayed Arbuckle’s fears by clarifying that there was no chance for the immigrant native groups living on White River and its tributaries to unite with the Osages in the Arkansas Territory against the United States (Clark 1824b, 1824c).

On 6 January 1825, William Clark held a Great Council at St. Louis where many nations and bands convened. One of the goals of this meeting was to reaffirm close relationships between the many nations. Yet, a close reading of one document reveals that a large native alliance was being formed against Claremore’s (Gramon) band of Osages. Although this document only relays the numerous wampum strands and bunches presented to the leaders of the Arkansas Cherokees by the leaders of affiliated native groups, it illustrates the close symbolic relationships and alliances held between these groups (Appendix B-33; [Cherokee Nation] 1825). This display of wampum is important because not only are eastern immigrant native communities represented, but several who had not removed are showing their affiliation. Considering that an outbreak of conflict between Lower Osages and Cherokees had been going on for almost a decade and was about to reignite again, this symbolic display was a strong statement of alliance and an agreement of mutual aid. Also, the inclusion of blue
(or purple) wampum beads may have indicated an agreement to go to war against a common enemy in the immediate future.

Immediately after William Clark's Great Council in St. Louis, the first sign of trouble between the Osages and Delawares emerged in a letter from Delaware Captain Patterson (Meshaquowha) to Clark dated 27 January 1825. In this letter, Patterson reported that a camp of Osages, including members of the Upper Osages, fired upon and wounded a Delaware man and stole more than $140 in equipment and thousands of animal pelts (Appendix B-34; Patterson 1825). This altercation between Patterson's (Meshaquowha) party and Osages in Arkansas Territory (probably part of Claremore's band) led to injury and the theft of a significant amount of furs intended to be traded at Auguste Pierre Chouteau's post at the Verdigris River near present-day Fort Gibson, Oklahoma. Captain Patterson (Meshaquowha) both referenced and followed the treaty stipulations of the peace agreement signed in 1822 by presenting the matter to William Clark for reparations.

Quickly, William Clark initiated new peace talks between the Osages and the Delawares. This time, he ensured that all of the Osage groups, including Claremore's (Gramon) participated. Based on the text of this new peace treaty between the Delawares and the Great (White Hair or Pahuska) and Little (Claremore or Gramon) Osages signed 7 June 1825, reparations were made in the sum of $1,150 to the Delawares (Appendix B-35; Clark 1825a). This peace treaty was signed at St. Louis with William Anderson (Kikthawenund), Lapanihille, Tatamanis, Captain Patterson (Meshaquowha), Captain
Natcomin, Captain Suwaunock, Captain Killbuck, Captain Tunis, Panther or Pooshies, and Jonsey Quick (Journeycake) with twelve Osage signers, including White Hair (Pahuska) and Claremore (Gramon). As with previous treaties, although not every Delaware signer's phratry affiliation is known, all three phratries were represented.

A few days prior to the signing of this treaty, a much more significant land cession treaty signed between the Osages and the United States of America ceding all Osage lands in both Missouri and the Arkansas Territory. Paying reparations to the Delawares was an explicit part of Article 8 of that Treaty dated 2 June 1825:

[Appearing that the Delaware nation have [sic] various claims against the Osages, which the latter have not had it in their power to adjust, and the United States being desirous to settle, finally and satisfactorily, all demands and differences between the Delawares and Osages, do hereby agree to pay to the Delawares, in full satisfaction of all their claims and demands against the Osages, the sum of one thousand dollars. (Kappler 1904:219)]

The discrepancy in the amount to be paid in reparations to the Delawares between $1,000 in the land treaty and $1,150 in the peace treaty is easy to notice. It is possible that the $150 difference was to be paid out of Osage annuities while the United States paid $1,000 directly to the Osages. There were no Delaware signers on this Osage land cession treaty.

Two months after the new Osage-Delaware peace treaty was signed, talk of warfare was rising just west of the Missouri border. By September 1825, the Cherokees in Arkansas Territory were in preparations for war again, this time
against the Pawnees, Caddoan-speaking peoples living in present-day Nebraska and northern Kansas. Because the Cherokees had such extensive alliances with other eastern immigrant groups, as evinced by their display of wampum at the Council of St. Louis less than nine months previous, many of those allied groups were petitioned to take up the call of war as well. Sub-Agent John Campbell reported that the Delaware leadership was sending white (peace) wampum to the Cherokees in response to their request for assistance against the Pawnees (Appendix B-36; Campbell 1825d). Campbell was doing all that he could to prevent another outbreak of hostilities. Unfortunately, terrible news arrived a week later that shattered peace at Delaware Town.

On 27 September 1825, Sub-Agent John Campbell relayed a speech given by William Anderson about the death of his youngest son at the hands of Osages near the Verdigris River. The speech itself is no longer present in this historical record, but Campbell summarized it in his report to Richard Graham (Appendix B-37; Campbell 1825e). The name of this murdered son of William Anderson (Kikthawenund) is present in only one of the primary documents (Anderson 1825). Sesocum traveled from Indiana in 1824 and had his horse stolen near Ste. Genevieve. The next year, he traveled out to Red River to hunt and was killed. Sesocum’s death during the fall of 1825, immediately after the renewed peace treaty with the Osages in St. Louis that summer, led a new outbreak of violence.
As a comparison point to what was occurring at Delaware Town, Piqua, Ohio Indian Agent John Johnston provided a description of traditional Delaware war customs in his letter to Caleb Atwater:

War is always determined on by the head warriour of the town, which feels itself to have been injured. He lifts the war hatchet or club; but as soon as it is taken up, the head chief and counselors may interpose, and by their prudent counsel stop it. If the head warriour persists and goes out, he is followed by all who are for war....

Peace is determined on and concluded by the head chief and his counsellors [sic], and “peace talks” are always addressed to them. In some cases, when the resentment of the warriours runs high, the chief and his counsellors [sic] have been much embarrassed. (Johnston 1820[1819])

Shortly after the death of Sesocum, a prominent Delaware leader Lapanihilie died. By 1826, after the death of Lapanihilie, the war effort against the Osages was in full production. Sub-Agent John Campbell lived at Delaware Town full-time and grew concerned about the violence. The Delaware leadership, both the “peace” chiefs and the war leaders, were calling in all of their allies, including the Cherokees, Kickapoos, and Shawnees to assist them with the war effort. In a letter Campbell addressed to his supervisor Richard Graham, dated 16 March 1826, he described the first bloodshed during the newest Delaware-Osage hostilities including five Delawares and five Osages killed (Appendix B-38; Campbell 1826a).

Unfortunately, the Indian Agent overseeing the Osages, Alexander McNair, died on 18 March 1826. This greatly impacted the Superintendent of Indian Affairs’ efforts to stem the violence. Richard Graham sent a long letter to
Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund), dated late March 1826, admonishing the vigilante justice taken by the Delawares and further attempting to quell the Delaware warriors he could travel to Delaware Town in person from St. Louis:

My Brother, If what I have stated is true your nation has done wrong in killing the 5 Osages. You ought to have waited until [sic] there was some certainty of your son's [Sesocum] being killed by the Osages before you retaliated. Besides the solemn obligation [sic] of a treaty held Sacred by all nation in all quarters of the world & that too made under the sanction. I guarantee of your great Father, should have restrained you until [sic] you had his consent to go to war. But I fear now the steps you have taken will bring you into difficulties as well as the displeasure of your great Father. (Appendix B-39; Graham 1826b)

In his letter, Indian Agent Richard Graham carefully used kinship terms of "brother" and "Great Father" (as well as "grandchildren") to emphasize symbolic relationships between the United States and the Delawares. At the same time, Graham's letter emphasized that there was considerable doubt as to the identities of the murderers of five Delawares at the Roubidoux Creek and well as the death of Sesocum.

On 18 March 1826, Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) delivered a speech to his "Brothers" William Clark, Richard Graham, Pierre Menard, and John Campbell (Appendix B-40; Anderson 1826a). In this speech, William Anderson reveals the confederation between "four nations," the Delawares, Cherokees, Kickapoos, and Shawnees. His speech also requested assistance from the government in terms of providing gunpowder to Delawares and restricting gunpowder access (as well as goods from French traders, likely
the Chouteau family) from Osages (Anderson 1826a). In a separate letter, Matthew Arbuckle also recommended removing gunpowder and lead from the traders in order to keep it out of the hands of the Delawares and their allies (Arbuckle 1826c).

Just over a week later, another Delaware, Joe Elliott, was killed with at least eight other Delawares missing. On 29 March 1826, William Anderson (Kikthawenund) reported this new violence to Richard Graham (Appendix B-41; Anderson 1826b). Later in the speech, William Anderson decried the violence committed against the Delawares and their grandchildren. Anderson again requested more support of the government in doing justice against the Osages.

Not only had the Express dispatch routes been cut off during the outbreak of fighting, the Kickapoos on the Osage River relocated to Delaware Town in preparation for war (Campbell 1826b).

On 31 March 1826, government Blacksmith James Pool and his wife Phoebe fled Delaware Town and traveled to Colonel Pierre Menard at Kaskaskia. Colonel Pierre Menard reported Pool’s story to Indian Agent Major Richard Graham on 17 April 1826 although Menard thought the story was over-exaggerated (Appendix B-42; Menard 1826a). In the letter, Pool described a war party of fifty to sixty Osages within 70 miles of Delaware Town and a large party of Delawares and Kickapoos riding out to stop them. Pool’s wife was so alarmed at the impending danger that she insisted to be removed all the way to Kaskaskia, more than 270 miles away (Menard 1826a). Pierre Menard, of course, was skeptical about the heightened level of violence in Southwest
Missouri, partly due to Pool's over-reactions to the sounds of gunfire and the heightened aggravation of his wife, Phoebe. Also, Menard was confident that if the claims of Osage raiding parties was true, that his son Peter Menard would have already send word via the Express (Menard 1826a).

Indian Agent Richard Graham, after being apprised of the outbreak of violence since the renewal of the Delaware-Osage peace treaty grew uncomfortable about his power to end the conflict. The primary sources indicate a number of deaths as part of this outbreak of violence. Appendix F contains the full accounting of all deaths mentioned in the letters and reports between August 1825 and June 1826 researched for this study. In all, between 13 and 17 Delaware adults (including Sesocum, Joe Elliot, George Whiteeyes or Allmee, and his father George Bullet or Pondoxy), 8 Delaware children, 1 Shawnee adult, 11 Cherokee adults, 11 Osage adults of Claremore's (Gramon) band, 2 Osage adults of White Hair's (Pahuska) band, 3 American citizens, an unknown number of Kickapoos, and an unknown number of Comanches were killed in the violence stemming from the death of Sesocum in August or September 1825 through June 1826. The killings took place in Missouri, Arkansas, and present-day Oklahoma. In one summary letter written by William Clark to Secretary of War James Barbour (1775-1842), Clark reported that 8 Osages, 11 Delawares, and an uncounted number of Kickapoos had been killed in the violence between August 1825 and June 1826 (1826a). From the discrepancy in the numbers, I conclude that Clark is not counting the Delaware women or children who were killed. The number of Osages reported dead also does not correspond with the
count outlined in Appendix F, but probably only counts Osage deaths confessed to by and attributed to Delawares alone. Even in that case, the numbers do not match up.

Richard Graham, at a loss at how to resolve the conflicts, wrote to his supervisor William Clark on 29 April 1826 (Appendix B-43; Graham 1826c). In this letter, Graham expresses his doubts that the U.S. government would be able to enforce peace among the rival native groups in the West through diplomacy along and without considerable resources expended to create a line of military forts (Graham 1826c). Richard Graham’s letter also points out two very fascinating conclusions. First, he suggests that allowing the Delawares and Osages (and “grandchildren” of the Delawares) to conduct warfare would be preferable in terms of quelling future conflicts and would save the taxpayers the expense of funding a line of military outposts necessary to quash violence. Graham simply did not believe it was possible for an outside party to instigate a peace settlement, a sentiment he reported to his brother George Graham in a private letter (Graham 1826d). Second, Graham’s preferences and sympathies toward the Osages seem to realign to the Delawares by this point. Not only does he mention the constant (and expensive) Osage raiding on the Santa Fe Trail (pioneered in 1821), but that the Delawares can amass a force large enough to completely crush the Osages and rightfully take and occupy their lands, which would be one way to get Delawares and their allies to emigrate out of Missouri altogether. No response by William Clark to this proposal exists.
Of course, Richard Graham was not the only person attempting to settle hostilities. Colonel Matthew Arbuckle, the commander of the 7th Infantry Regiment, had just founded Cantonment Gibson at the Verdigris River (in present-day Fort Gibson, Oklahoma). At Cantonment Gibson, Matthew Arbuckle was attempting to broker peace between the Arkansas Cherokees and Osages of Claremore's (Gramon) band. On 14 May 1826, Arbuckle sent two nearly identical letters regarding his efforts to Sub-Agent John Campbell and Superintendent of Indian Affairs William Clark (Arbuckle 1826a, 1826b). Arbuckle was aware of the numerous depredations committed by the Osages of Claremore's (Gramon) group to the Cherokees, Delawares, and Kickapoos and wished to host a large Council at Cantonment Gibson to settle the matter holistically instead of group-by-group (Arbuckle 1826a, 1826b).

Meanwhile, William Anderson (Kikthawenund) was calling all of the Delawares' grandchildren in Southwest Missouri and northern Arkansas Territory to Delaware Town for a Great Council with the intent to go to war against the Osages. In response letter to Matthew Arbuckle dated 24 May 1826, John Campbell and Delaware leaders were pleased to learn of the proposed Cantonment Gibson Cherokee-Osage council, but that William Anderson (Kikthawenund) had given the matter of war over the recent killing of five Delawares on the Gasconade River by Osages to the warriors (Appendix B-44; Campbell 1826c). The Delaware leadership continued to resist the demands and requests to remain settled and passive. More than two months had passed since most of the letters between Indian Agency and military personnel regarding the
murders and the efforts toward war had been passed back and forth. It had also been more than eight months since the death of William Anderson's (Kikthawenund) son Sesocum. At the end of May 1826, the Delawares held a Great Council to seek justice.

To further complicate the matter, the issue of Delawares receiving justice from the government was not working out as the Delaware leadership intended. For example, after the murders of five Delawares at the Roubidoux fork of the Gasconade River occurred near the Sample sawmills, William Anderson reported that the sawmills were also "killed" in the attack (Anderson and Killbuck 1826). The Delawares denied involvement in the mill's destruction. In one speech, Delaware leadership blamed Osages for the destruction of the mill (Anderson and Killbuck 1826). In another document, Richard Graham claimed that the Delawares blamed drunken Shawnees; nevertheless, it was the Delawares who paid (Graham 18261). When the annuities were distributed in 1826, the Delawares were forced to pay $300 for the destruction of John Sample's sawmill on the orders of the Secretary of War (Delaware Agency 1826).

On 25 May 1826, Indian Agent Richard Graham was able to attend to the Great Council at Delaware Town. While there, he attempted halt the majority of the war effort. On 29 May 1826, Delaware leadership presented two speeches to Richard Graham in person, which were translated and written down. The first speech was given by Principal Chief of the Delawares William Anderson (Kikthawenund). The second speech was delivered by the primary War Captain Killbuck, who was also the head of the Wolf phratry:
My Brother, this is what the war chief says. He sees his chief [William Anderson] who has tried to stop us & his counsellers [sic] around him & you too. My brother you have done all you could to stop us but our warriors won't be stopped, they will break loose & you must not think hard of it. (Appendix B-45; Anderson and Killbuck 1826)

It is evident in these speeches that William Anderson (Kikthawenund) had grown very impatient with Richard Graham. There is a significant amount of bitterness about Graham's doubts of trustworthiness in regards to the identity of Secocum's murderers and numerous attempts to pacify the Delawares despite months of reporting atrocities committed by Osages. Captain Killbuck defiantly challenged Graham's (and even William Anderson's) power and authority to stop the warriors and their "grandchildren". The inability of the civil chiefs to interfere in times of war was already well-known, as reflected in John Johnston's letter to Caleb Atwater (1820[1819]).

In a fragment of an undated draft letter from 1826, Richard Graham illustrates a first-hand account of the ritual of war he witnessed when he was able to visit Delaware Town as the war effort was accelerating during May 1826:

[T]he war Drum had sounded, the Village chiefs had put out their fire, the Captains had assumed the lead in council.

I was asked to see Them do The war dance made & the red post smude[d] [sic] by all their warriors.

[T]he daw[n] followed & the red post was struck. (Appendix B-50; Graham [1826]n)

This letter provides evidence that traditional elements related to warfare existed at Delaware Town. First, there was the political separation of war captains and
civil chiefs (sachems), like William Anderson (Kikthawenund). The extinguishment of the civil chief's fire was a symbolic representation of the changing of authority over to the war captains. Second, other symbolic elements appear in Graham's letter including a war dance where a post was smudged red and later struck.

Faced with the defiance of the Delaware War Captain Killbuck and by the Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund), Indian Agent Richard Graham reported to his supervisor William Clark on 29 May 1826 about his diplomatic visit to Delaware Town. In this letter, Graham described his attempt to persuade the Anderson to halt the war captains and then to convince Suwaunock to speak on the government's behalf to the other war captains (Graham 1826e). Instead of speaking on behalf of Graham, Suwaunock chose to become intoxicated. Graham also attempted a form of financial encouragement by offering Tawhelalen the private annuity of his now-deceased brother Lapanihilie (Graham [1826]n). Graham lamented the futility of his persuasion techniques and remarked that outside interference likely exacerbated the matter between the Delawares and the Osages:

Killbuck spoke, his language breathed nothing but war, regretted the Interference of his G[reat] Father, that if they had been let alone, they would have had peace with the Osages before this. That now it was too late, their Tomahawks were Sharpened & they could not, nor would not turn back, that if they even thought of it their young men would not listen [to] it. (Appendix B-46; Graham 1826e)

Richard Graham's letter paints a picture of the large number of people amassing at Delaware Town for the Great Council and answering the Delawares' call for
war. Richard Graham's multiple efforts to influence the decision to go to war ended with a passive resistance of inebriation and a near-extortion attempt by Tawhelalen to claim a private annuity that was not heritable. Lapanihille died prior to March 1826. His death was not related to the Delaware-Osage violence. The extortion attempt seemed to work because the money was paid and Graham's intended effect of stopping hostilities occurred. Most of the violence had ceased by the end of March 1826. Of course, Graham had to carefully justify the transference of the private annuity to his superiors (Graham [1826]n).

A second eye-witness account to the Great Council at Delaware Town penned by Lieutenant Th[omas] Johnston of the 7th Infantry out of Cantonment Gibson. In his report to his superior officer Matthew Arbuckle, Johnston observed that the actions of the Delaware war leaders were not simply out of disobedience:

The idea of throwing United States' hooks between them and the Osages was... not in my opinion from any contempt they had at the power of Government, but they had taken a Stand - had made choice of two evils, reckless of consequences.... Their determination for War appeared rather to be the result of a deep rooted hatred for the Osages and a desire to have satisfaction in an Indian way - blood for blood. (Appendix B-47; Johnston 1826)

Comparing these two individual's observations of the same series of events reveals that both Richard Graham and Thomas Johnston perceived that the Delawares and their "grandchildren"'s predisposition to war was not something that can be easily stopped through mediation or reparations facilitated by the government. Richard Graham seemed to perceive the obstinacy of the Delaware warriors as a slight against the authority of the government and perhaps even as
personal slight against his own position. Johnson, however, saw the war effort not as a manic bloodthirstiness, but as a traditional, deliberative, redress for crimes. Moreover, Johnson probably sympathized with the Delawares' position that handling the conflict in their own way would have settled the matter long ago and that the interference of the government merely prolonged the matter and expended political capital wastefully.

Of course, just as the Delawares were painting the Osages in a villainous light, the Osages in present-day Oklahoma also had advocates defending them to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs. The Sub-Agent for the Osages, Paul Liguest Chouteau (1792-1851) wrote in defense of the Osages to William Clark in a letter dated 10 June 1826 and asked for a new Great Council in St. Louis to exact a third peace treaty between the Osages and the Delawares (and their "grandchildren"):

I can assure you... that for the last 12 months, which I spent with the Osages, no Delaware or Kickapoo Scalps have been danced, heard of, or even seen in that nation. And they hope that their Great Father the President will as he promised in the 11th Art. of the Treaty, extend his protecting arms over them, since they have so well complied with the Last Treaty. They wish also to hold in your presence at St. Louis a council with the Delawares and Kickapoos and Cherokees, to prevent this War of extermination which is likely to be carried on amongst them. (Appendix B-48; Chouteau 1826)

Paul Liguest Chouteau's letter to William Clark was very protective of the Osages. Chouteau claimed that the Delaware deaths were either imagined or pretended and that some of them could be blamed on the Pawnees from Texas (or other groups). He outlined the murders committed against the Osages,
although the identity of the murderers (in some cases) was uncertain. Chouteau also referenced the peace treaty between the Delawares, their grandchildren, and the Osages multiple times, requesting adjudication, protection, and the willingness to pay reparations for crimes for which Osages were found guilty. There was, however, one instance of a known Osage murderer who the Osages refused to give up to the Cherokees, at least until a new Indian Agent was selected after the death of Alexander McNair, the former Governor of Missouri, in March 1826.

Finally, the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, William Clark, wrote to Secretary of War James Barbour about the conflicts between the Osages and the Delawares. In a letter dated 11 June 1826, Clark clearly took the side of the Osages in his correspondence and used the opportunity to institute policy to effect removal of all native groups out of Missouri and consolidating them in Kansas under the watchful eyes of the a proposed new Cantonment Leavenworth:

For the purpose of preventing this evil in a great measure, as well as to commence the great work of civilization, I must beg leave to suggest that authority be given by the Government to exchange the lands which have been assigned to the Shawneese [sic] and to the Delawares, Kickapoos, Piankeshaws, & Peorias within this state, for lands to be apportioned and laid off to them outside of the State Boundary, on and near the Kansas river... (Appendix B-49; Clark 1826a)

William Clark was clearly taking a different position than Richard Graham in moving to quash hostilities between native groups and attempting to rely solely on the pact made in peace treaties to handle all difficulties. Of course, it is clear
that the use of peace treaties to enforce peace had their own series of problems when evidence of guilt was difficult to ascertain and the time to resolve disputes between the commission of a crime and the settlement was so long that retaliatory killings could take place. Therefore, Clark was determined to utilize government force in the form of cantonments and forts (and the military) to enforce the peace when the peace treaties failed. In addition, he overtly stated his intention to gather to disparate segments of all tribes to be amassed and distilled on smaller lands in Kansas (near the proposed Cantonment Leavenworth, built the next year in 1827) for increased policing. Ultimately, Clark wished for the full adoption of farming and livestock for the livelihood of the native and the complete abandonment of hunting (Clark 1826a).

After the Great Council at Delaware Town at the end of May 1826, Graham felt confident that his efforts to pause the war efforts were successful, mostly due to the transfer of the private annuity to Tawhelalen. Yet, the Delawares send the tomahawk to the Cherokees in Arkansas in spite of Graham’s efforts, calling their allies to war. Richard Graham scrambled to attempt a peace talk at Cantonment Gibson. At this point, Richard Graham had been detained at Delaware Town for almost a full month trying to maintain the peace. Richard Graham waited for correspondence from William Clark and, after receiving it, composed a speech for the Delaware leadership and warriors. The draft of his speech, dated 20 June 1826, issued several strong warnings to the Delawares if they went to war against the advice of the government:
[H]e has always protected you the Delaware[s] have been his favorite children, he allways [sic] gave you what you asked for & loved to talk about the Delaware[s] but now what will he say when he hears the Delawares will no longer listen to his word, that they stop their ears & shut their eyes & turned their backs upon him that they will not hear or see him but wackssum [sic] him. If you persist in shutting your ears against his words, can you expect he will be as kind to you as he had been[?] (Appendix B-51; Graham 1826j)

Richard Graham’s speech makes several calculating moves. First, it attempts to compare the behavior of the Delawares and the behavior of the Osages in the eyes of the government and pose the Osages’ behavior as favorable and more sympathetic. Moreover, the actions of the Delawares are characterized as alienating the government and angering the Great Spirit in addition to being dishonorable for not following their own promises in the 1822 and 1825 peace treaties. Second, Graham’s position of attempting to stop the Delawares’ preparation for war is abandoned in this letter. He explicitly encourages the continuation of their efforts, but to hold off on open war until meeting at a Council in St. Louis, mediated by William Clark.

The Delawares acquiesced to a Council with Superintendent William Clark in St. Louis, but only on their own terms (Appendix B-52; Anderson 1826f). Richard Graham’s gambit worked. He successfully convinced the Delawares to meet with the Osages in September and delay an all-out war for the ensuing few months. Superintendent of Indian Affairs William Clark immediately began preparations for the Council and wrote to Secretary of War James Barbour requesting finances for holding the Council, providing presents, and asking what the official position was that the government wanted to take (Clark 1826b).
William Clark warned Barbour that if "the Indians in question [are] allowed to settle in their own way, their disputes, the Osages being the weaker party, the Consequences in all probability would terminate very seriously for them" (Clark 1826b).

In September 1826 William Clark brought leaders of both groups to St. Louis again (Ferguson 1972; Foreman 1953; Missouri History Museum Archives 1795-1896; Weslager 1972). After another treaty was signed, the authorities were confident that, if the chiefs could keep control of the young men and rogue bandits, the peace would be maintained (Missouri History Museum Archives 1795-1896). Yet, within four months, more violence ensued. In a speech delivered to William Clark on 27 February 1827, William Anderson (Kikthawenund) expressed skepticism about the possibility of continued peace:

My Father Clark you no [sic] well that this is three times that we have made peace and you see they have begun again, you no [sic] my brother very well how these Osages behave you have seen them a long time and no [sic] there [sic] bad conduct towards all your red children, you see now my Brother they have killed fore [sic] Kickapoos[,] one Cherroka [sic] and [a] Kickapoo woman taken prisoner and some Delawares [sic] killed number not yet known…. (Appendix B-53; Anderson 1827a)

In this speech, William Anderson also mentions some violence that occurred between the Choctaws and some of the Delawares' "grandchildren in Arkansas Territory. Very little is written about these particular acts of violence in the documentary record, but the speech indicated that the conflict was mitigated quickly and amiably (Appendix B-53; Anderson 1827a).
Also, in this particular speech, William Anderson (Kikthawenund) alternated between referring to William Clark as “brother” and “father.” From the content of the paragraphs, the kinship term “father” was used when William Anderson was reporting information to Clark on behalf of the “grandchildren” of the Delawares as well as when making a critical statement against the utility of the peace treaties with the Osages. The kinship term “brother” was used for more personal topics where the two men are less separate in terms of social status.

Politically, William Anderson (Kikthawenund) was making a strong point to William Clark about how Delawares react to violence. In the case of the Choctaw killings, the matter was blamed on a reckless or foolish young man. In other words, it was an anomaly condemned by and quickly remedied by the Choctaw leadership. William Anderson was intentionally contrasting the Choctaw example to the Osage violence where the altercations were not confined to foolish men, but rather applied to many of the Osages. Thus, the different reactions of the Delawares were being rationalized by Anderson as responses to foolishness on one hand and a belligerent population on the other hand.

Also, despite the differences held between Delawares and Osages, Delawares adopted some of the cultural traits of Plains hunting culture, including long-distance hunts in the winter and summer. Some adoption of subsistence patterns occurred and bison hunting technology became part of Delaware custom (Weslager 1972). It was at this point that the efforts of the government turned from peacemaking to wholesale removal of all native groups from Missouri at all costs.
A Push Toward Kansas

Of course, the political forces directing the Delawares and others to leave Missouri did not begin after September 1826. In fact, as soon as Delawares began the process of removal to Missouri from Indiana, political powers within the newly ratified State of Missouri were already directed to further remove all natives outside the boundaries of the state. On 2 December 1822, just as Delaware lands had been assigned in Southwest Missouri, Senator Duff Green (1791-1875) wrote Secretary of War John C. Calhoun about the political problem of relocating emigrating natives to the newly ratified State of Missouri (Appendix B-54; Green 1822). Duff Green's letter, of course, is just one politician to a government official, but Green was not the only member of the new Missouri legislature with the aim of Indian removal. Powerful Missouri Senators like Thomas Hart Benton were also fervently opposed to lands in Missouri being claimed by any native group (Faragher 1998; Houck 1908a, 1908b). The first mention of further removal out of Missouri directly to the Delawares occurs as early as 1825, just under three years after designating lands in Southwest Missouri. Sub-Agent John Campbell's letter dated 1 September 1825 stated, "I have written a letter to Gen[e]r[a]l Clark by request of Anderson and the Chiefs generally on the subject of there [sic] future location which you can see" (Campbell 1825c).

The subject of removal beyond the Missouri state limits came up again in early 1826. Indian Sub-Agent John Campbell reported his efforts to his supervisor Richard Graham:
The second chief died about one [illegible] since I laid before the chiefs the map sent by me they are well pleased with the country, and soe [sic] soon as the Shawnees [sic] chiefs and Kickapoos chiefs arrive they will then visit that country on the Kansan [Kansas] river, I will send an express as soon as the indians all arrive I should be glad to have a Kickapoo interpreter [sic] when they arrive. (Campbell 1826a; 1826d)

It is relatively clear that if the conflicts and warfare between the Osages and Delawares had not reignited after August 1825, the efforts to move Delawares and their grandchildren into Kansas would have experienced an accelerated timeline. Although the Delawares were focused on the conflict with the Osages, Delaware Town itself was being used as a hub by the Delaware Indian Agency for negotiating and removing other groups. In January 1827, Shawnee representatives met at Delaware Town intent upon inspecting new permanent lands in Kansas (Menard 1827). It was the intention of John Campbell and Richard Graham for the Delawares to also inspect Kansas lands, but they refuse to embark on such a trip until spring. Yet, when spring arrived, Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) continued to stall the excursion to Kansas on the grounds of wanting to choose escorts to the lands and also for waiting for the arrival of more emigrating “grandchildren” from east of the Mississippi River (Anderson 1827a; Menard 1826).

Yet, by the summer 1827, William Anderson’s son Sarcoxie traveled to see the lands in Kansas. After his return, the Delawares and their grandchildren planned to hold a Great Council to discuss the matter. In a letter dated 19 August 1827, John Campbell reported to Richard Graham of his continued difficulties in
getting the Delawares to act upon the proposal to remove. According to Campbell, "The great question is not yet decided relative to their removal but will be in the course of a few days, the lower Indians are unanimous in favor of the Kansaw [sic] river" (Campbell 1827). When John Campbell referred to the "lower Indians," he was writing about the differences of opinion between the Delaware phratries (Campbell 1827). Yet, he blamed the Delawares for their delaying tactics by insisting to wait for the arrival of Cherokees and Shawnees before any decisions could be made (Campbell 1827). Campbell also endeavored, through his friend Suwaunock, to prevent a new outbreak of warfare that would inevitably delay the removal process even longer.

In the spring of 1827, a contingent of Delawares traveled to the Kansas River to inspect the lands that William Clark, Richard Graham, and Pierre Menard had been advertising for months to entice the Delawares and their grandchildren out of Missouri. William Anderson (Kikthawenund) sent a speech to William Clark on 19 August 1827, illustrating his extreme disappointment in the proposed allotments in Kansas:

My Brother Clark you wrote to me last Spring to try to get all my people to gather from every quarter. I am trying to doe [sic] soe [sic] but I am afraid when they have soe [sic] small spot of land they will not come, the land you speak of on the Kansaw [sic] might of been large enough for my own people and the Shawnees and Kickapoos but what am I doe [sic] with all the balance of my grandchildren I doe [sic] not no [sic] what too [sic] think. (Appendix B-55; Anderson 1827c)

The concerns William Anderson (Kikthawenund) expressed in this speech were very valid reasons to delay signing any treaties to move. Not only was there the
issue of smaller and smaller apportionments of land as Delawares moved west, but crossing into Kansas posed major shift in environment to a relatively treeless plains. Transitioning from a woodlands-style hunting and horticultural existence to a life on the plains requires more intensive agricultural practices like irrigation in addition to lands in which to hunt bison of the plains. Anderson was also concerned with the prospect of feeding so many people with an annuity that would not be much larger than the $5,600 currently being received. Also in that speech, Anderson requested to move to the Cantonment Gibson area on the Verdigris River which was a very practical choice because that area is on the western edge of the Ouachita Mountains, a similar ecology to lands in central and southern Missouri (Anderson 1827c). Kansas likely seemed too different to be acceptable.

Sub-Agent John Campbell addressed the content of William Anderson’s speech in his letter to Richard Graham, also dated 19 August 1827:

[The Delawares] are much divided amongst themselves, the lower party belonging to Ketcham[']s [Tawhelalen] band and part of the Wolf party are in favor of the Kansaw [sic], but the great men of [William] Anderson[']s Village have borne them down, as they doe [sic] in all other affairs of the nation, Sacoxia [Sarcoxia] & Patterson [Meshaquowha] think that you did not give a fair view of the country.... (Appendix B-56; Campbell 1827)

Upon hearing this news, Richard Graham reported to William Clark the difficulties in securing the Delawares’ willingness to leave Missouri, although Graham had little doubt that the Delawares would remove despite the Cherokees’ attempts to draw them southward (Graham 1827b). Graham also proposed dismissing or
transferring John Campbell out of being the Delaware Sub-Agent, due to his bad temper and not effecting the settlement terms (Graham 1827a, 1827b).

In the meantime, more families of Delawares, Munsees, and Kickapoos were removing from the State of Illinois into Missouri. In a letter dated 8 November 1827, Richard Graham reported on the number and movement of some of the bands emigrating from Illinois including Kickapoos, Delawares, and Munsees (Graham 1827c). It was Graham’s hope to send these migrating groups straight up the Missouri River to Kansas. Richard Graham encouraged Indian Agents and others, like Pierre Menard’s son Peter Menard (1797-1871), to do anything to entice any remaining native groups in Illinois to remove to Missouri or Kansas Territory as soon as possible (Graham 1827d). By 16 June 1828, 109 Delawares and Munsees waited in St. Louis to hear word about the Missouri-Kansas land swap (Clark 1828a). On 3 August 1829, a treaty was ratified, ceding a three-square-mile tract of land held by a branch of Delawares on the Sandusky River, bringing even more Delawares into Missouri on the eve of more land cessions (Kappler 1904; Menard 1830).

In preparation for removing all American Indian groups from Missouri, Superintendent of Indian Affairs William Clark drew up an estimate of the expenses to effect removal. In the case of the Delawares, Clark estimated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the price of 40 horses</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of 6 ox waggons [sic]</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farming utensils required</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provisions for 14 months</td>
<td>9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a saw &amp; grist mill</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the hire of a man to purchase &amp; issue</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Annuity to be Expended in breaking up fencing, & preparing the Land for Cultivation & for Stock 1000
Annuities for 4 Chiefs 100 ea[ch] 400

$17,000

(Clarke [1828]b)

Based on the approximately $30,000 dollars in expenses to relocate Delawares into Southwest Missouri through 1820-1822, William Clark's estimate seems to be a gross underestimate (Tables 3, 4, and 5). Of course, the ultimate cost to ferry Delawares across the Mississippi River is not known, but removal necessitated crossing the Kansas River north to the lands near Cantonment Leavenworth or a route that would require two ferry passages across the Missouri River to cross north of the river in Missouri and then again to cross the state border into Kansas. In the letter, there is a priority for the establishment of permanent buildings and equipment related to agricultural pursuits as well as a provision for more private annuities to entice the Delaware leadership to remove on terms favorable to the government.

The growing concern with American Indian peoples culminated in Jacksonian policy aimed at assimilation and westward removal. Considerable literature relates to this new American policy toward Indian removal, including Billington (1967) and Foreman (1933, 1946, 1953). As a result, in 1828, the Delawares felt pressure to leave Missouri and began the process that would lead to the signing of the Supplemental Treaty of St. Marys (also known as the Treaty of Council Camp) in the winter of 1829 that exchanged the Delawares lands in Southwest Missouri for lands in Kansas territory, another $1,000 in annuities, and
additional assistance (Cooley et al. 1975; Farley 1955; Foreman 1946, 1953; Grimes 2002; Kappler 1904; Tong 1959; Weslager 1978a). Again, William Anderson (Kikthawenund) proved to be shrewd in land deals, learning from past deal and past mistakes.

In a speech dated 22 February 1828, William Anderson finally acquiesced to William Clark that the Delawares would move to Kansas lands recently acquired by the United States from the indigenous Kanza peoples. Yet, William Anderson established very generous terms (generous to the Delawares) that the government hesitated to deal with for many months (Appendix B-57; Anderson 1828a). In this speech, William Anderson (Kikthawenund) drove a shrewd bargain. He requested lands or other considerations to be set aside for certain “half-breed” Delawares, their government-supplied Blacksmith James Pool, and three unnamed white people living with them. More importantly, William Anderson requested a large increase in the annuity, an increase in the annual iron and steel ration, and considerable assistance in moving and establishing buildings and agricultural fields in Missouri. The largest expense to the government, however, would be the tens of thousands of dollars of debts racked up by almost every single Delaware individual to the numerous private traders in Missouri (Anderson 1828a).

In a separate letter to William Clark, sent the same day, William Anderson addressed the matter of private annuities for his children and Captain Patterson or Meshaquowha, his future successor to the role of Principal Chief:
M[y]. B[rother]. I have five Sons [Suwaunock, Pooshies, Secondine, Sarcoxie, and adopted son Kockkatowha] and One daughter [Quatatas or adopted daughter Mekingees]. I want you to assist me Speaking to my great Father the President, to give to each of my Six Children One hundred dollars a Year, as long as they live as they all have large families of Children to Support.

M.B. I wish you also to assist my great friend Capt. Patterson [Meshaquowha] who is also getting old, he is now the head of the Wolf party and has much to do and is not able to hunt anymore for his living. I wish you to try to get the same Sum of money a year that I have asked for my Sons and you will please my heart and his also. (Appendix B-58; Anderson 1828b)

Although William Anderson requested $600 in private annuities to his sons and daughter, plus an additional $100 for Captain Patterson [Meshaquowha], William Clark's earlier estimate only included money for four private annuities.

The next week, William Anderson (Kikthawenund) sent a speech to William Clark again to amend his conditions for removal. In this case, he requested lands on the east side of the Missouri River in addition to lands in Kansas (Appendix B-59; Anderson 1828c). The small piece of land in Missouri that William Anderson requested is the southern portion of present-day Platte and Clay Counties, Missouri. It is unclear as to why this land was attractive to Anderson, although the land is fertile bottom-land and well positioned for riverboat trade as well as being located near the hub of the Santa Fe Trail. The Town of Westport and the Town of Kansas had not yet been platted nor populated.

By 13 January 1829, Superintendent William Clark wrote to Secretary of War Peter Buelle Porter (1773-1844) about the planned expenses for treaty
negotiation and removal of many of the native groups in Southwest Missouri. In this estimate, Clark determined that it would cost the U.S. government approximately $40,000 to relocate the Delawares, Munsees, Kickapoos, Piankishaws, Weas, Peorias, and Shawnees, including gifts, provisions, and 20 year annuities for many of the groups (Appendix B-60; Clark 1829a). If Clark's earlier ([1828]b) estimate seemed to understate the expenses for removal, this estimate is significantly leaner. For the Delawares, the expenses calculated total less than $10,000 whereas in the previous year, it was estimated to be more than $30,000 in terms of expenses for Delaware removal. If the extra funds designated as "presents" counted for private annuities and potentially paying off all debts with private traders, the estimated sum in 1829 was greatly reduced and not practical. Lastly, it is important to note that this is the first mention of limited annuities for the exchange of land. Formerly, annuities were perpetual, but this policy was being replaced by limited duration annuities to prevent continual support by the government and predatory lending by the privately-licensed fur traders.

At some point in 1829, Indian Agent Richard Graham was summarily dismissed and replaced by Captain George Vashon (1785-1835) whose agency was now located near Kansas, not at Delaware Town. George Vashon continued the efforts pushing for American Indian removal beyond the bounds of Missouri. Sub-Agent John Campbell's residence also moved from Delaware Town to the Fort Leavenworth area around this time (McCoy 1936[1830]:11). During the spring of 1829, the government moved to survey and mark out the bounds of the
lands intended for the Delawares (Figure 9). On 15 August 1829, George Vashon reported that the Delaware leadership’s hesitation to move would soon be ameliorated due to a recent treaty negotiated with the Kickapoos in which they received a sizable perpetual (not limited) annuity (Vashon 1829a). George Vashon hoped that the Kickapoo negotiations would entice all other reluctant tribes to sign for similar terms and elicit rapid removal to Kansas (Vashon 1829a).

Finally, on 24 September 1829, the Delawares entered into a treaty negotiation to amend and supplement the 1818 Treaty of St. Marys that would relocate the Delawares from Southwest Missouri to lands in Kansas. This treaty is sometimes referred to as the Supplemental Treaty. In this treaty, the Delawares agreed to surrender all lands in Southwest Missouri and move to Kansas, near Fort Leavenworth, including a ten-mile-wide “outlet” onto the prairies for hunting purposes (Kappler 1904:304-305). In addition, the government promised to supply horses, wagons and ox teams, farming and building utensils, provisions for one year, a grist and saw mill, a trust fund established for the support of a school, and a perpetual annuity of $1,000 (Kappler 1904:304-305). The annuity of $1,000 was less than requested by William Anderson, but it was a perpetual annuity instead of a limited duration appropriation. Also, the land sold for the support of the school garnered $46,080, which the government invested at 5% interest (Weslager 1972:369). The signers of the Supplemental Treaty of St. Marys included Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund), Captain Patterson (Meshaquowha),
Pooshies, Captain Whiteman (Suwaunock), Jonny Quick (Journeycake), John Gray (Onloohotahnah), George Girty, Captain Beaver (Punchhuck), Nanotauxien (Nonondoquomon), Little Jack, Captain Pipe (Tahunqueecoppi), and Big Island. Captain Pipe was part of the Sandusky band that ceded lands in Ohio a month earlier. The phratry affiliation for many of these individuals is unknown. There is certainly representation from the Turkey and Wolf phratries, but the identity is not clear for the representative for the Turtle phratry, if any.

On 19 October 1829, the six Delawares signed off on the treaty as being assigned to inspect the land were Nauchecaupauc, Nungailautone, James Gray, Sam Street, Aupaneek, and Outhteekawshaweat (also spelled Quenaghtoothmaul) (Kappler 1904:305). None of those signing the inspection were the same as Delawares signing the supplemental treaty. Refusing to complete the treaty until Delawares inspected and approved the lands solved the issue that occurred upon removal to Missouri when the lands were not chosen and delineated nor considered adequate until after arrival in Southwest Missouri. This treaty stipulation guaranteed properly surveyed and bounded lands approved by the Delaware leadership (Weslager 1978a:216).

While waiting for the Treaty to be ratified, it became clear that not all parties were pleased with the supplemental treaty. The largest cause for concern was that none of the debt accrued by the traders was scheduled to be paid by the government at the conclusion of the treaty. Indian Agent George Vashon wrote in a confidential letter dated 27 October 1829 to the Secretary of War John H. Eaton (1790-1856) explaining the intentional omission:
It is said the Indians owe $30000 [to traders] & they pledged never to remove unless the Govt will pay their debts.

In my Council with the Delawares they first required $30000 as compensation for improvements, in addition to the paymt [sic] of debts, and an additional perm[sic] annuity of $3000 with Houses built, farms made, mills erected, stock of every kind furnished, & provisions on their way & for a year after with waggons [sic] etc[.] etc. (Appendix B-61; Vashon 1829b)

George Vashon's efforts to circumvent the influence held by the traders due to the extensive debts owed were successful, temporarily, in saving the government $30,000 or more dollars. Unfortunately, for Vashon, the Treaty was only provisional and was contingent on further approval by the Delaware leadership in addition to ratification by Congress.

In 1828, a contingent of 228 Peorias, Piankeshaws, and Weas moved into Kansas (Campbell 1828b, 1828c, 1829). As early as the November 1829, a few Delaware families joined them. Because the supplemental treaty had not been ratified or appropriated for, many of these families suffered from a lack of food and other resources. On 18 November 1829, George Vashon justified his expenditure to William Clark of more than $2,100 for unexpected supplies and provisions due to the starving condition of many of the migrating Delawares (Vashon 1829c). Unfortunately, many Delawares began moving within two months of the signing of the treaty, before the survey and the official ratification by Congress. In this case, no money was appropriated to assist with moving or provisions as stated in the treaty. By the time the money was appropriated, most
Delawares were already in Kansas. Money was still spent by the Indian Agency, but it was done on an ad hoc and emergency basis and later reimbursed.

One of the detractors of the supplementary treaty was William Clark himself. In a letter to Secretary of War John H. Eaton dated 2 December 1829, Clark explained that the most unacceptable terms of the treaty entailed the permanent, not limited nature of the annuities:

Limited annuities I am inclined to believe would have a better effect than if they were perpetual, as the Indians at the present generation would see the necessity of early exertion to ensure subsistence [sic]. (Appendix B-62; Clark 1829b)

William Clark's effort to eliminate perpetual annuities was intended to reduce the continued expense on the taxpayers as well as reduce dependence upon the government by the all of those persons who benefitted from the annuity. Not only did Clark advance the position to have limited duration annuities to ensure that the removed peoples achieve self-sufficiency quickly, but directed annuities to spend funds on agricultural activities and buildings also acted to quash the private traders' (and whisky sellers') dependence and exploitation of the annuities. By the end of 1829, Indian Agent George Vashon was replaced by Major Richard W. Cummins (Delaware Agency 1830).

By 18 January 1830, the leadership of the Delawares sent out a speech to William Clark and Pierre Menard to protest the impending ratification of the supplemental treaty. A significant argument involved the six signers of the treaty who acted as observers of the Kansas lands. William Anderson (Kikthawenund) argued that these men acknowledged that they looked at the land, but that their
signing of the treaty did not indicate approval. Further, Anderson reiterated many of the original terms that the Delawares requested more than two years prior:

We made a paper before his [George Vashon] departure from this place, saying if they should find the Land good, to sign the paper. We done it to satisfy the Agent, to show that the Land was good we sign the paper. If the Agent has wrote [sic] to you or to Congress more than I have stated, it is nothing. (Appendix B-63; Anderson et al. 1830)

This letter reiterated many of the terms posed in William Anderson's speech from 1828 and modified or abandoned several points. The signers of this speech included William Anderson (Kikthawenund), Captain Patterson (Meshaquowha), Captain Beaver (Punchhuck), Captain Suwaunock, Captain Pipe (Tahunqueecoppi), and Captain Pooshies. Kikthawenund and Punchhuck, represented the Turkey phratry. Meshaquowha, Suwaunock, Tahunqueecoppi, and Pooshies represented the Wolf phratry. No representative from the Turtle phratry participated in this speech.

Before the treaty was ratified by both the U.S. Congress as well as the Delaware leadership, there was still a lot of room for adjusting the supplemental treaty. As William Clark was attempting to change the nature of annuities, Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) also advocated for additional terms in the form of private annuities for his family in this private letter to William Clark and Pierre Menard dated 18 January 1830 (Appendix B-64; Anderson 1830a). In this speech, William Anderson changed the number of recipients from six children to four children. He omitted his daughter from consideration and one son referred to before is no longer counted. Also, Anderson revealed three
deceased sons, which leaves a question as to the identity of a third deceased son. The adopted son Kockkatowha was still alive in 1830. It is unclear as to the troubles mentioned between the government and James Connor, who had been acting as an official interpreter. William Clark indicated to Secretary of War John H. Eaton that the terms were favorable versus two years ago, although he did not approve of the permanent annuity (Clark 1830a).

By August 1830, the supplemental treaty had been finally ratified by Congress, but it had not been ratified by the Delawares. Even after the government’s ratification of the treaty, the Delawares were still attempting to secure favorable terms to ensure shelter from the weather and storage capabilities for adequate food during the winter when many would remove to Kansas. William Anderson still had a bargaining piece: the position of sending an agent to approve (or reject) the designated lands. In a letter to Sub-Agent John Campbell, dated 13 August 1830, William Anderson announced that he was sending John Quick (Journeycake) as the agent who would inspect the Kansas lands on behalf of the Delawares:

When he is satisfied, he will be ready to go with the surveyors, not without. Whilst they are surveying you will be purchasing horses for us: you will employ men to assist them in driving those horses here. [W]e wish to move in two months from this date. Nothing more at present [emphasis in original]. (Anderson 1830b)

The tone William Anderson utilized in this letter was very assertive and commanding. He was directing John Campbell’s activities during the preparations to move. Two days later, William Anderson sent a different letter to William Clark that also used this shortened, assertive tone, which may be due to
a new official Delaware Interpreter, James Conner (Ahlahachick) (Anderson 1830c). Delaware requests for provisions and assistance with transportation continued throughout the fall (Appendix B-65; Campbell 1830).

The four-month survey of the lands designated for the Delawares in Kansas has been preserved in the journal of Isaac McCoy, who was also a Baptist minister and missionary (McCoy 1936[1830]). The expedition started near Fort Leavenworth, which was situated on the lands assigned to the Delawares which were immediately reserved by the United States upon this discovery (McCoy 1936[1830]:377). Journeycake (John Quick) and James Connor (Ahlahachick) arrived at McCoy’s camp on 24 August 1830:

[Johnny Quick or Journeycake] cheerfully agreed to proceed. But stated that neither the nation nor he wished for him to go farther than to see the bounds of their tract generally marked that they cared not to see their out-let marked. They would be content without it. It would save the agent, who is old, from much fatigue, and would allow him to return in time to aid in removal to their new country. (McCoy 1936[1830]:13)

Less than one month into the excursion, on 20 September 1830, Captain Journeycake (John Quick) left the party and returned to Delaware Town (McCoy 1936[1830]:31). While most of the surveying party had been subsisting off of hunting turkeys and deer up to that point, after Captain Journeycake left for Missouri, the game grew increasingly scarce to the point that Isaac McCoy was considerably worried about the lack of food and water on the outlet lands.

Before leaving, Journeycake requested that the government issue the Delawares a patent on the new lands in Kansas (McCoy 1936[1830]:33). Prior to
leaving Indiana lands to move into Missouri, William Anderson (Kikthawenund) also made a request for a deed to the lands. Although it seemed to McCoy that this was one of the first requests of its kind, he reported on William Anderson’s earlier request in 1820 (McCoy 1840).

During the fall of 1830, many Delawares were organizing to move, but the Department of Indian Affairs had no money to pay annuities, provisions, or assistance of any kind. William Clark complained to Secretary of War John H. Eaton about having to borrow money to the sum of $27,000 to pay the annuity obligations (Clark 1830b). Despite the final ratification of the supplemental treaty (due to the survey still being incomplete), there were no funds appropriated to assist with removal. On 14 September 1830, Clark advised:

I would therefore most earnestly recommend that the means be afforded those Indians to move, whilst they are in the disposition to do so. It is well understood that Chief [William] Anderson himself is willing to move whilst his Son Shauanock [Suwaunock] and other Chiefs, are strongly opposed to the measure. (Clark 1830c)

Several Delaware families, including William Anderson left the James Fork of White River in September 1830 and moved to their new lands north of the Kansas River. Newly-assigned Indian Agent Richard W. Cummins reported Anderson’s arrival to William Clark in his letter dated 4 November 1830 (Appendix B-66; Cummins 1830a). By the time Isaac McCoy’s survey party returned to the Fort Leavenworth area on 21 November 1830, Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) had already moved to Kansas and was settled (McCoy 1936[1830]:45). At the conclusion of Isaac McCoy’s survey, he reported to the government that the Delaware allotment in Kansas amounted to 197
924,160 acres with a 10-mile-wide outlet into the plains totaling 1,318,000 acres for a total of 2,242,160 acres (McCoy 1936[1830]; Weslager 1972:370).

Within one month, most of the residents of Delaware Town have removed to lands in Kansas. Richard W. Cummins' letter dated 2 December 1830 reported that more than 400 Delawares passed the agency house to settle in Kansas, which was the bulk of the group (Appendix B-67; Cummins 1830b). Upon their arrival, there were immediate demands for provisions:

The Chiefs demand of me their provisions as provided for in their Treaty, and say it was to be delivered to them on their land…. I have told them that their Treaty was not yet ratified and that no appropriation was made to carry it into effect. (Cummins 1830b)

Later that month, Richard Cummins wrote to Clark with much more desperation due to the poor condition of the Delawares trying to camp in the harsh winter conditions (Cummins 1830c). Many of the hunters were gone for the winter hunt, leaving most people at the camp without any provisions except those supplied by Richard Cummins' own person credit account (Cummins 1830c).

Traveling to Kansas at the beginning of the particularly harsh winter of 1830-1831 proved to be disastrous for the Delawares. Not only were most of the Delawares' horses killed, but their starving state was barely mitigated by the Indian Agency. Now that spring and planting season was about to arrive in Kansas, there were no horses fit to run the plows (Appendix B-68; Cummins 1831).

On 6 June 1831, William Clark submitted a bill to the federal government amounting to the whole of the costs utilized for Delaware removal to Kansas:
My Bill of Exchange of this date... on order for Thirty three Thousand Seven hundred and twenty Dollars, is for that amount received of him, and which when paid will be charged to me under the appropriation of the 2nd of March 1831 for carrying into effect the Supplementary Article (of the 24th September 1829) to the Delaware Treaty.

Viz.
For furnish forty horses $1600.00
For the expenses of Six waggons [sic] and ox teams to assist the Delawar[e]s in Removing $1620.00
For the Farming utensils and tools for building houses for the Delawar[e]s $4000.00
For provisions for the Delawar[e]s on their journey and after their Removal to there [sic]
New Country $22,500
For building a Grist & Saw Mill for them $3000
For the payment of the permonant [sic] annuities to the Delawar[e]s for 1831 $1000

33,720

[emphasis in original]. (Clark 1831a)

Compared to the earlier two estimates made by Clark, it is clear that the amount for provisions was considerably more than anticipated. By themselves, the provisions cost $22,500.

Of course, there were still Delawares from Delaware Town who went to hunt in the swamps of Southeast Missouri that had not removed by 1831. Pierre Menard sent trader William Myers into the swamp to persuade them to remove to Kansas. Myer's letter dated 7 August 1831 reported that there were 49 Delawares and others residing in the swamp that would need government assistance to remove to Kansas (Myers 1831). Of course one of the issues with the lands in Southeast Missouri involved the Spanish land grants that were
legally granted to Delawares and Shawnees in January 1793 by the Baron Carondelet. On 26 October 1832, at the Treaty of Castor Hill, Delawares in Kansas signed on behalf of the Delawares who had lived in the southeastern Missouri lands, known as the Apple Creek Delawares to cede that land to the United States (Kappler 1904:330-337) This was also the treaty where the massive debts to the traders William Marshall and William Gillis were paid in the sum of $12,000. The signers of that treaty were Principal Chief Patterson (Meshaquowha), Captain Natcomin, Captain Ketchum (Tawhelalen), and Nonondoquomon. Lifetime private annuities of $100 for Patterson, Natcomin, and Ketchum were also stipulated in that treaty.

Missionaries

It is important to note that, with the exception of the traders and a few permitted white residents, the 1820s is the only decade in the history of William Anderson's group of Delawares where there are no missionaries living nearby, regardless of denomination. Prior to leaving Indiana, Quakers, Moravians, and Baptists kept records of their missionary experiences living with or traveling among the Delawares. In Southwest Missouri, there is a notable paucity of records. As John Johnston mentioned in his letter to Caleb Atwater prior to Delaware removal to Missouri, this group was adamantly opposed to missionary activities for many reasons outlined earlier while the Delawares were in Ohio and Indiana. There is only one record of a Baptist missionary, Nathaniel B. Dodge (1781-1848), traveling to Delaware Town in January 1824 when he estimated the population to be 900 with 40 additional families arriving in the spring (Clark
1824a; Graves 1949:137-138). During Dodge's brief stay, he met with Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) at Delaware Town to convince the community to send their children to the Harmony Mission School on the Neosho River, in Osage territory, to learn to read and write (Graves 1949:137-138). William Anderson feared for the safety of the children and would not make any commitments to Dodge, especially while so many were away on the Winter Hunt (Graves 1949:137-138).

There are three annual reports from the Harmony Indian School filed by Reverend Dodge for the years 1825 through 1827 that are found with the Western Historical Manuscripts Collection at Columbia, Missouri. In 1825, the school boasted 40 students and highlighted a 14-year-old Delaware student named Esther Petchouku who could read from the Bible and was assisting with teaching the third class of students (Dodge 1825). In 1826, the student population dropped to 25 due to the difficulties taking place between the Osages and Delawares (Dodge 1826). By 1827, the number of students attending the school increased to 35 (Dodge 1827). No further reports for the Harmony Mission School were filed. The difficulties with the attendance numbers of the Harmony Mission School due to conflicts between Delawares and Osages are merely a window into the larger difficulties that emerged in the documentary record pertaining to Delaware Town.

After Delaware removal to Kansas, there were many more attempts to establish missionary efforts on Delaware lands. During the February 1831, Mormon missionary Parley Parker Pratt (1807-1857) recorded a brief visit with
William Anderson at his camp in Kansas. In his journal, Pratt described William Anderson’s two-room log cabin with a central fire and mentions that Anderson had multiple wives with their calico and hide clothes adorned in silver (Pratt 1874). During his visit, Pratt presented William Anderson and blacksmith James Pool with a copy of the *Book of Mormon*.

In addition to Baptist and Mormon missionaries, Methodists also moved into the lands in Kansas and attempted to set up churches and schools. Considerable literature exists detailing the competition between denominations and the establishment of missions among the Shawnees and Delawares in 1837 (Farley 1955; Grimes 2002; Joy 1992; Miner and Unrau 1978; Unrau 1979). The site of the Delaware Mission, founded by Reverend John G. Pratt (1814-1900), is in present-day Wyandot County, Kansas, near Edwardsville.

**Grandfathers in Kansas**

The new Fort Leavenworth Agency encountered trouble paying the 1831 annuities due to an incorrect amount of money being appropriated. In particular, none of the private annuities for four Delawares “chiefs” were funded by Congress (Clark 1831b). It is not clear about the identities of all four chiefs who were receiving the private annuities, but they were probably William Anderson’s sons Suwaunock, Pooshies, Secondine, and Sarcoxie. Although William Anderson advocated on behalf of Captain Patterson (*Meshaquowha*), it is unclear whether or not he received a private annuity. Anderson would have still received his $360 annuity from the original Treaty of St. Marys, although it is not
clear if Lapanihilie’s private annuity of $140 was extended to Toletahsey beyond the year 1826.

William Anderson, himself, sent a speech to Secretary of War Lewis Cass (1782-1866) on 22 September 1831 about the regarding payment of the four annuities and the condition of the Delawares in Kansas (Appendix B-70; Anderson 1831). In this letter, Anderson also requests a $200 annuity for Patterson (Meshaquowha) and complained about the lack of game in Kansas. Again, William Anderson requested a title to the lands and complained about the broken promises of George Vashon in regards to the payment of debts to traders. The large debts were drawing most of the men away to hunt, leaving only a few to work the land agriculturally. Although the four private annuities for Anderson’s sons were being held up by appropriation, it does not appear that Captain Patterson (Meshaquowha) ever received the annuity requested until a separate treaty signed in 1833 ceded lands held by Apple Creek Shawnees and Delawares to the United States (Ellsworth 1833; Kappler 1904).

That same day, Captains Suwaunock and Natcomin also sent a speech to Lewis Cass regarding depredations by the Osages and requesting reparations from the Osages’ annual annuity (Appendix B-71; Shoanack [Suwaunock] and Natcoming [Natcomin] 1831). Requesting $1,770 out of the Osage annuity, which was a significant amount, was an attempt by Delaware leaders to call in the power of their status as preferred clients. It is possible that this sum was intended to pay off debts to traders, but it was also an illustration to Lewis Cass about the financial windfall the fur trade was to Delawares (and other groups) in
paying off extensive debts in lieu of the policy of subsistence farming advocated by William Clark.

*Suwaunock* and *Natcomin* were also calling in old depravations in hopes of being paid. On 28 September 1831, they called for the sworn testimony of Peter Lafleur, a trader on Red River, for skins stolen in 1824 (*Appendix B-72; LaFleur 1831*). This claim of $1,702 was also likely intended to pay off debts to traders and serves to illustrate the supplemental income that fur trading was bringing to both the Delawares as well as the fur traders. The trade of animal skins, in many cases, was the more lucrative business than sundry clothing, kitchen items, and equipment.

After much of the Delaware leadership removed to Kansas, William Anderson (*Kikthawenund*) continued his efforts to extend the symbolic kinship relationship as "Grandfathers" to native groups that had never dealt with Delawares before. Major John Dougherty (1791-1860), Indian Agent for the Pawnees in Kansas, reported a meeting with William Anderson in his letter dated 22 July 1831:

> In April last, [William] Anderson one of the principal chiefs of the Delaware nation visited this agency... for the purpose of expressing through me to the several tribes of Indians within my Agency and particularly to the Pawnees his great desire to cultivate and maintain with them the most strict and friendly intercourse and as a visible manifestation of his desire presented me with the wampum in conforming to the custom of his tribe, accompanied by a request that I would in his name and that of his tribe (whose feelings and wishes he represented) deliver the same to those several Indian tribes. (*Appendix B-73; Dougherty 1831a*)
This informative letter revealed that, while William Anderson made efforts to extend a hand of friendship toward the Pawnees through their Indian Agent, two or three Delawares had already been murdered. It was possible that Anderson was unaware of the deaths since they occurred before the Supplementary Treaty of St. Marys was signed and Suwaunock may have heard about the deaths at Red River from Cherokees. This letter also raised concern over the 10-mile wide Delaware outlet into central Kansas. This area was still considered territory of the Pawnees until the 1833 Treaty with the Pawnees ceded all lands south of the Platte River in present-day Nebraska to the United States (Kappler 1904).

It was not until October 1831 that Agent John Dougherty was able to present William Anderson's speech and wampum to the Pawnees. The Indian Agent for the Pawnees reported that:

> They desired me... to inform the Delawares that they would hold fast the wampum Anderson had sent them, until [sic] he or some of his people should call as his village and see it again with their own Eyes. After which they hoped they would look upon each other as Brothers and that the road between their towns would be kept clean. (Appendix B-74; Dougherty 1831b)

Despite this attempt at peace, in 1833, a brief war erupted between the Delawares, their grandchildren, and the Pawnees, resulting in the death of Anderson's son Pooshies. In retaliation, Suwaunock led a party that successfully sacked a major Pawnee village. On 12 November 1833, a peace treaty between the Pawnees and Delawares and many other tribes, including "Shawnesse [sic], Kansas [sic], Ioways, Otoes, Omahaws [sic], Kickapoos, Weas, Peorias, Piankashaws [sic], Kaskaskas [sic], Ottowas, Pottawatomies
The Pawnees recognized the Delawares as "grandfathers" after this treaty. The Delaware signers of this treaty were Chief Patterson (Meshaquowha), Natcomin, Captain Ketchum (Tawhelalen), Nonondoquomon, The White Man (Suwaunock), Long House (Secondine), John Gray (Onloohotahnah), Moses (Nahkapash), Toletahsey, and Big Man (Kockkatowha). Meshaquowha, Natcomin, Nonondoquomon, Suwaunock, and Secondine represented the Wolf phratry, Kockkatowha represented the Turtle phratry, and it is unclear whether the Turkey phratry was represented due to not knowing the affiliation of all signers.

One of the consequences of moving to Kansas is that it placed the Delawares directly into the oncoming path of western migration and settlement of thousands of people. The Delawares' proximity to the Missouri and Kansas rivers, the Military Road between Fort Leavenworth and Fort Gibson, and the Sante Fe Trail brought many problems including increased liquor trafficking and diseases like influenza and smallpox. Soon after the Delawares settled in Kansas, there was a smallpox outbreak in the area that probably contributed to the deaths of numerous Delawares. John Dougherty, the Indian Agent for the Pawnees, reported the death of William Anderson (Kikthawenund) in his letter to William Clark on 9 November 1831 (Dougherty 1831b). Anderson possibly died in the smallpox outbreak.

Yet, this increased exposure to the outside world brought a heightened level of awareness about the predatory nature of many of the traders who lived amongst the Delawares. Indian Agent John Dougherty was extremely concerned
about the level of influence the traders had over Delawares in urging the Delawares to continue in the fur trade over agricultural pursuits (Dougherty 1831b). The issue of massive debts to the traders and the need to purchase goods necessitated many of the able-bodied men to travel long distances away from the lands in eastern Kansas into the Plains to trap for furs and skins. Also, upon moving into Kansas, traders who acted in relative isolation and without much oversight, like William Gillis, were suddenly under a lot more scrutiny and open to several attacks upon their characters. François Gesseau Chouteau complained about Gillis for bringing seven gallons of whiskey to the Delawares on Christmas Day 1831 (1832b).

Trader François Gesseau Chouteau (1797-1838) wrote his uncle Pierre Menard about the different attitudes of the fur traders in regards to the immigrant native groups. One notorious culprit in driving up debts and trading without a license was William Gillis. Chouteau’s wrote numerous letters illustrating Gillis’ self-serving behavior (Chouteau 1831a, 1831b).

By 1832, the last of the Delaware quit their claims to the land and Greene County was officially established the following year (Escott 1878; Fairbanks and Tuck 1915; Greene County Archives and Records Center 1999a; Holcombe 1969[1883]; Rees et al. 2000). William Anderson (Kikthawenund) died in Kansas in October 1831 (probably as a result of a smallpox outbreak), ending his long-time leadership of the Delawares. During the Delaware occupation of Kansas, missionary efforts began once again and residential schools opened for the education of Delaware children (Gowing 1912; Joy 1992; McCoy 1840; Miner 207
and Unrau 1978; Unrau 1979). Also, the location of Delawares on easily accessible roads and trails led to an increase in the amount of alcohol being provided and consumed. François Gesseau Chouteau reported on 7 September 1832:

I believe we will make approximately five thousand dollars with the Loups [Delawares] and probably three thousand with the Indians that remain to be paid. We have made 40 packs of deerskins since my trip to St. Louis. The Loup [Delaware] tribe drinks a lot at the present and often many die. Not a day passes that at least 30 gallons of whiskey is not brought into the village. In five years from now, I presume that they will be almost all destroyed if they keep on at that pace. (Chouteau 1832b)

The Delawares' geographical position in Kansas placed them on the edge of the Great Plains, where bison hunting was more accessible (and already familiar), but they quickly ran into trouble with Pawnees, mirroring their earlier troubles with Osage peoples (Weslager 1972:376). Intertribal tensions and the flood of outsiders through the area due to gold rushes and the Santa Fe Trail made the Delawares' lands in Kansas rather incompatible in terms of their desired isolation. Some Delawares left the main body to live with the Chippewas in 1859. In 1867, nearly a thousand Delawares anxious to leave Kansas for lands in eastern Oklahoma could not obtain any land (possessed solely by the Five Civilized Tribes), unless they gave up their tribal affiliation and joined the Cherokees, buying land from the Cherokees afterward (Michael 2010; Obermeyer 2003, 2009a, 2009b; Weslager 1972). Many Delawares did not feel that they were giving up their status as Delawares with this arrangement (Obermeyer 2003). This agreement was supposed to invest the Delawares and
their descendants with the same rights, immunities, and claim to annuities, distributed money, and politics as any Cherokee person. Several court battles ensued to protect Delaware/Cherokee rights to the Cherokee dividends as full-members of the tribe even as recently as the year 2009 after losing federal recognition twice (Obermeyer 2003, 2009a, 2009b; Weslager 1972).

In the 1860s, the Cherokee Nation was divided into nine districts and the traditionalist Delawares primarily lived in the Cooweescoowee district, where Delaware customs, including the Gamwing or Big House Ceremony, were preserved until the mid-20th century (Weslager 1972:442). On the other hand, modernist Delawares separated themselves from the rest of the Delawares and pursued a less traditional and more acculturated lifestyle. Many of the descendants of the Southwest Missouri residents became the Federally-recognized group known as the Delaware Tribe of Indians in Bartlesville (Obermeyer 2003). A second federally recognized Delaware group is the Western Tribe of Delawares, based in Anadarko, who are the descendants of the Absentee (or Western) Delawares that moved from southeastern Missouri into Texas and aligned themselves with the Caddo (Weslager 1972). It is important to remember, however, that there was considerable membership permeability between these groups during the 1820s and 1830s. This membership exchange will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

By the time Greene County, Missouri was being surveyed and platted by the General Land Office in 1835, the surveyor’s notes indicated that Delaware Town was a shadow of its former self:
The site of the "Old Indian Delaware village [sic]" is situated immediately on the west bank of James Fork of White River about 30 or 40 chains west. This antique & celebrated villiage [sic] is now forsaken & in Ruins a few dilapidated cabins only mark the spot of this once populus [sic] villiage [sic] so well known in the legendary history of the Delaware tribe of Indians, by whom it was formerly inhabited. (Garrison 1835a)

Figure 10 is a map created from the survey notes. It is likely that much of the wood from the cabins had been stripped by nearby homesteaders for their own homes, outbuildings, and fences. At least one home was being used by a homesteader:

The Old Indian Village Delaware lies about 30 chains South; on the west bank of James Fork of White River. It is inhabited by one family only of whites and is in Ruins. A few diplapidated [sic] cabins only remains on the site. There is [sic] 3 other settlements & Cabins in this Section on the River. (Garrison 1835b)

It is also possible that some of the buildings were razed by the earliest white settlers due to the location of villages in the fertile floodplain of the James River or that the decaying organic material in the remaining sub-floor pits in the houses was deemed a nuisance. One recollection by early settler S. C. Turnbo reads:

A village of the Delawares stood in the forks of Findley [Finley River] and James [River in Stone County] where it is said that the Indians constructed huts out of bark which with their bark floors and bark bunks with other vegetable accumulations was a menace to the few white settlers in that locality who rose up in anger and kicked against the nuisance and demanded a stop put to it. The white people claimed that the decomposing vegetable matter produced chills, malarial fevers and other kinds of sickness. (Keefe and Morrow 1994; Turnbo 1844-1925)
While some accounts state that white families moved into these farms immediately after the ratification of the Supplementary Treaty of St. Marys, it is more likely that the timbers from the houses were taken for new construction activities. Another traveler to the region, William F. Switzler commented on the state of Delaware Town in 1836:

Twelve o clock when we started for a stand 12 miles distant known by the name of the: Delaware towns: This place was once an Indian village of considerable Strenght [sic], but it is now in a State [of] dilapidation therefore bears but few marks of former greatness. There is a Large creek (Wilson) running along the Side of this old Town. It is said, that the Idian [sic] Graves are seen for four or five miles on the Bank of this creek. We traveled on & passed the Line dividing Missouri from Arkansas Territory [by] next day after we left the Indian Village. (Switzler 1836)

Today, the Delaware Town communities exist in a rapidly-urbanizing area in Christian County, Missouri approximately one mile south of the Wilson’s Creek National Battlefield in Southwest Missouri.

**Patron-Client Relationships**

After presenting a thorough discussion of the historical context leading to the Delawares’ occupation of Southwest Missouri, including many of the primary sources available from that time period, it is important to present some additional comments about Delaware Town. Numerous types of relationships, patronages, and fictive kinship ties can be studied using the primary sources. By studying the language used and the motivations that can be gleaned from the documents, an understanding of the political and social nature of these relationships can be achieved. A discussion of the kinship terms used is located in Chapter 5.
One important set of relationships discussed earlier involved the Delawares and the fur traders. When examining the private fur traders at Delaware Town and elsewhere, it is important to note the differences between traders who married native women in common-law relationships and who achieved a kinship status with the people they were trading with and those traders who did not have such a relationship. William Gillis and William Marshall are two traders who married Delaware women. James Connor was also married to at least one Delaware woman, but he did not appear to continue being a trader once hired as an official U.S. interpreter or after his firing from that post. In particular, William Gillis appeared to benefit tremendously from his relationship with the Delawares to the point where William Anderson vouched for him and requested Gillis to receive an official license to trade.

Of course, as William Gillis helped Shawnees move into Kansas, and once he settled into Kansas himself, his relationship took on an even more predatory tone. He appeared to be using government equipment to move his own goods instead of Shawnees and also plotting to drive up debts instead of working to alleviate the debts, as François Gessoeu Chouteau and Pierre Menard attempted to do. Gillis intended to continue trade in Kansas, but without government oversight and without license (Campbell 1828b). Additionally, Gillis used his relationship and power with Killbuck to try to replace blacksmith James Pool in order to make money by replacing him with one of his enslaved men (Cummins 1830c).
The remote location of Delaware Town made it undesirable for many of the famous traders of the American Fur Company, like the Chouteau family, to do business with the Delawares. Instead, Chouteau trading houses were located much closer to major, navigable waterways such as the Missouri River at Fort Osage and later in Kansas and the Red River in present-day Oklahoma. The Chouteau trading houses, as a result, had a very lucrative trade primarily with the various Osage bands and tended to favor working with them. Certainly, many of the eastern immigrant groups (including Delawares) traveled to Red River to trade, finding the abundance of fur-bearing game greater than in Southwest Missouri. This preference of doing fur trading business with Osage partners may explain some of the concern over Osage conflicts with the much larger Cherokee and Delaware (plus their grandchildren) contingent as an interruption or threat to business. Most of the politicians during this time, even William Clark, had significant investments in the fur trade business.

The Delawares faced an important change in patronage relationships after moving to Missouri. While living east of the Mississippi River, Delawares held a special status in the east due to recognition as the first ethnic group that made a treaty with William Penn and also held status as "grandfathers" to many of the other eastern native groups (Merritt 1998). Yet, upon crossing the Mississippi River, many of the personnel running the Indian Agencies were unfamiliar with this special relationship. William Clark, Pierre Menard, and the Chouteaus had a considerably longer financial relationship with the Osages and tended to treat
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Osages as preferred clients, even with their relative lack of acculturation compared to most of the eastern immigrants.

The threat of withholding Delaware annuities if they and their grandchildren went to war with the Osages did not elicit the response the government desired. Instead, Delaware leadership countered with notions of justice with which the government agents had a difficult time arguing. Within two years of residence at Delaware Town, the personnel of the Indian Agency (in addition to the Secretary of War) reaffirmed the special relationship with the Delawares and recognized their position as "grandfathers" to many of the eastern immigrant groups. The 1822 peace treaty signed on the Current River is the best illustration of the turning of the tide in favor of Delawares as preferred clients. By 1824, the constant conflicts between the Osages and whites traveling West on the new Santa Fe Trail led to many former champions of the Osages to give up on them in favor of Delawares. One telling example was expressed in a letter dated 24 January:

Gen. Atkinson [General Henry Atkinson (1782-1842)] sent an express a few days ago to Col. [Matthew] Arbuckle ordering him to come a[nd] demand to be made of the murders of the five Americans. Those Osages are so much in the habit of committing [sic] outrages against the American traders, & citizens passing through their country it will become necessary to punish them as the will is increasing (Clark 1824b).

Political patronage also included material goods and gifts. Of course, the Delaware leaders were not the only ones to receive gifts, but there are numerous records of the gifts bestowed upon tribal leaders by the U.S. government to
cement their status as patrons and clients. One example is this list of gifts reported by Superintendent of Indian Affairs William Clark to Secretary of War John C. Calhoun on 25 July 1824:

- 8 large Medals
- 10 2d size medals
- 20 ps Arm bands
- 40 ps Wrist bands
- 40 half moon gorgets [all] Silver
- 2 gross [288] Ear rings
- 21 Hal peales [sic]
- 10 crosses
- 21 Hal Trimmings
- 10,000 grains of Wampum
- 12 Flags
- 6 Flags smaller size
- 5 fowling pieces [shotguns] – in place of Rifles
- 21 powder Horns – Red, Green, & Blue
- 40 Plumes
- 26 small Trunks (Clark 1824d)

Another example of a gift appeared in Richard Graham’s expenses when attempting to persuade Delaware and Shawnee removal to Kansas:

Abstract of Delivery of Presents by R. Graham U.S. Ind. Agt in the quarter ending 31 Augt 1828

To whom Delivered Description [sic] of articles delvd [sic] Tobacco
Shawnee Indians 1400 224.00
Delawar[e] near & 196 49.00 (Menard and Vallé 1828)

The increased amount of tobacco for the Shawnees was likely on account of that group having already agreed to cede lands in Missouri whereas the Delawares had not. While gifts and presents were a perquisite for friendship and amicable feelings toward the government, Indian Agent
Richard Graham wrote, "I will ask of you to deduct there from the annuity $1000 [Osage] & $500 [Cherokee] of the am[oun]t for presents" (1821a). His request was denied.

**Delaware “Grandfathers” and Miami “Grandchildren”**

In addition to the discussion of the history and significance of the Delawares’ status as “grandfathers” of the eastern native groups, there is one additional grandparent-grandchild relationship that is important to note that took place during the Delawares’ residency in Southwest Missouri. While the Delawares extended their status to many other groups that immigrated across the Mississippi River into Missouri, significant intertribal politics also extended back east with the Miamis who owned the land the Delawares occupied while in Indiana.

Immediately prior to Delaware removal from Indiana, the daughter of secondary chief Lapanihilie was believed to be murdered by a group of Miamis and an additional six Delawares had been killed by Miamis (Ferguson 1972). The documentary record provides a list of the deceased:

- **Washum.** 16 or 17 years on White River near [William] Anderson’s, killed by a Miami.
- **Sanaquis,** on his route from Detroit to Piqua, when called by [John] Johns[on] during war he was killed by a Miami in his sleep 5 miles above Ft. Wayne.
- Two Indians – **Packquire** [spelled Pachaquim on 1 September 1825], comeing [sic] from Detroit with goods & stopped at the Miami village Tathe leaving encamped & was killed. 1813 or 1814.
- Last winter **Pachena** [spelled Pachina on 1 September 1825] a woman married to a Miami. Killed at a Miami town [last winter].
- Lapinihie [Lapanihilie] Daughter. $500 ea[ch] is demanded by War Cheifs [sic].
June 1825. Three at [sic] the above were killed in [illegible] [emphasis added]. (Graham 1825b, 1825d)

In 1825, Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) demanded payment of $3,000 for the deaths and the return of personal effects from the Miamis upon threat of war, a threat taken very seriously by the Indian Agency (Ferguson 1972). The counteroffer was only $500 (Richardville et al. 1825).

A quick comparison of the amount agreed upon by at the Miami council and the amount demanded by the Delawares reveals that the amount was only one-sixth of the full claim. This discrepancy was immediately noted by Indian Agency officials, who immediately requested that John Tipton rectify the amount with the Miamis (Campbell 1825d; Graham 1825d). Delaware leadership also took a stand. Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund), Lapanihilie, and Twehullahlah sent a speech to the Miamis still in Indiana asking them to open their "hearts wider" than the $500 offered to repair the rupture between the two groups by issuing reparations for the dead Delawares (Anderson et al. 1825).

By March 1825, Sub-Agent Pierre Menard sent correspondence to Indiana Senator General John Shields Tipton (1786-1839) explaining that $500 was insufficient to settle the matter and that the belongings of the deceased daughter of Lapanihilie would need to be returned or replaced (Menard 1825a).

Part of understanding this dispute between the Delawares and the Miamis requires an understanding of the timing and cultural values. First, the Delaware claim against the Miamis was made immediately after renewing the peace treaty with the Osages in June 1825. The Delawares received $1,150 in reparations
from that settlement. Second, because the original claim against the Miamis in
1824 is not extant, this is the first time in the documentary record where we can
see a full list of the charges made and the amount in reparations demanded. It is
impossible to know whether $3,000 is more or less than requested in the original
letter sent in 1824, but the purpose of the money is clear (Ferguson 1972;
Weslager 1972, 1978a). It was blood money intended for revenge.

Demanding blood money, incidentally, characterized the revival of an
ancient practice among many Algonquian groups. When John Johnston wrote to
Caleb Atwater about the customs of the Delawares before their removal to
Missouri, the practice of demanding blood revenge or blood money was detailed
in that letter. According to Johnston, the family of a murdered Delaware could
issues different claims in order to be satisfied, including payments or seeking out
the death of the murderer(s) (Johnston 1820[1819]:299). When evaluating the
case of these four deaths, it is not clear who the kin of the deceased are except
in the case of Lapanhilie’s daughter, although it is presumable that the Miamis
knew the family of the other deceased Delawares based on the names. The
deviation away from Johnston’s recollection of the remedy for murder is that
there is no attempt to kill or kidnap the murderers or kin of the murderers. In fact,
it is possible that the identity of the murderers is unknown except for being
Miamis. Also, the claims of murder are old claims extending back to a decade in
some cases. Whereas it was tradition to involve the tribal leadership in old claims
in the past, the tradition appears to have been continued in the Delaware claims
against the Miamis.
What makes the Delaware-Miami matter so interesting is that it dragged on for years, which stoked the growing animosity between the groups that it could not be resolved more quickly. One of the causes of the delay involved the impending outbreak of warfare. Just after the death of Sesocum, William Anderson (Kikthawenund) and Captain Killbuck send another speech to the Miamis, reiterating the $500 in blood money per death (Graham 1825f). Yet, two months later, John Tipton reported that the Miamis were growing impatient and would only pay $500 (Tipton 1825).

Tipton's also accused the Delawares of antagonizing the Miamis to get money for their debts instead of out of a sense of revenge (Tipton 1825). That accusation was likely an accurate one. Also, Tipton raised a threat that any physical retaliation by the Delaware's kin, even for the single admitted murder, might be stopped by the United States government. There is also very pointed text about the bad feelings remaining about the Delawares ceding and receiving annuities from selling lands in Indiana. In essence, Tipton's letter is a "take it or leave it" type of proposition.

It was more than eight months until the Delawares turn their attention to the claim against the Miamis. Between August 1825 and June 1826, the hostilities between the Osages and the Delawares are at their most intense. By the beginning of July 1826, the Delawares are in a three-month wait for the council with William Clark in St. Louis and have time to revisit the Miami matter again. In a letter dated 8 July 1826, Richard Graham informed John Tipton's that the Delawares refused the ultimatum and would seek redress in person once the
conflicts with the Osages were resolved (Graham 1826k). Also, Graham was successful in reducing the claim from $3,000 to $2,000, at this point, and requested a response from Tipton by September.

On 28 February 1827, William Anderson (Kikthawenund) sent the Miamis a third speech on the subject. This speech was a stronger ultimatum:

You Miamies [sic] we will now give you fore [sic] months more and see what you will doe [sic]. [If you pay us in that time you will then make our hearts glad[.].] We will then hold you faster by the hand than ever[.] If you doe [sic] not settle in that time[,] I shall then let my people goe [sic] and they must doe [sic] as they please.
(Anderson 1827b)

Interestingly, the matter seemed to be settled when Joseph Richardville, the son of Jean Baptiste Richardville (Peshewa), the principle Miami chief, addressed the matter on behalf of his father. His reply invoked the traditional address of the Delawares as “grandfathers” and the Miami as their “children” and conscientiously reminded William Anderson and the Delawares of the Miamis’ generosity of staying on their lands, and receiving money the sale of land, in Indiana (Weslager 1972:368). Joseph Richardville or Wahpemunway (born in 1789) spoke at Council on 6 August 1827 and repeatedly utilizes the symbolic kinship term of “grandfather” (Richardville 1827). When comparing Peshewa’s 1825 letter and Wahpemunway’s letter in 1827, the outcomes are the nearly identical. The sum of $500 is the same. The denial of paying more money remains. Yet, the tone in the 1827 letter is less antagonistic and more reverential, denoting the kinship terms and the conciliatory language.
To help ensure the Delawares' acceptance of the $500, John Tipton enlisted some subterfuge tactics to press the compromise. In his letter to Pierre Menard dated 18 August 1827, Tipton admits to meddling in the matter for years (Tipton 1827a). To John Tipton, this little deceit committed by Indian Agents for the purpose of avoiding more bloodshed is worth suffering the moral and ethical dilemmas. Surely, the meddling in the Delaware-Miami dispute extended back to the very first letter from Tipton in 1825. Also, in this letter, John Tipton shifted his correspondence from dealing with Richard Graham to dealing with Pierre Menard. On 20 October 1827, $500 was transferred from John Tipton to Pierre Menard, who was much more flexible with Tipton, to settle the matter (Tipton 1827b).

On 29 April 1828, Pierre Menard reported to Tipton that he used Graham as a scapegoat by accusing him of mistranslating when he explained to the Delaware leadership why the Miamis only offered $500 (Menard 1828). The effort for John Tipton and Pierre Menard to pass off the $500 offer as a mistake of the Indian Agent Richard Graham instead of as a slight by the Miamis appeared to be quite effective and nearly settled the matter completely. The additional recent deaths of Delawares at the hands of Miamis, in addition to the whereabouts of Lapanihilie's daughter's belongings, were still outstanding issues requiring resolution.

By 1829, it appeared as though the difficulty between the Delawares and Miamis had been resolved. Yet, in a letter dated 26 November 1829, John Tipton wrote to Pierre Menard to hold off payment of the $500 because the Miamis
received word that there were no longer any living relations of the deceased Delawares (Tipton 1829). No further correspondence regarding this issue can be found in the Tipton Papers, any of the Menard Papers, nor with the Delaware Agency or Fort Leavenworth Agency papers. It is possible that the $500 was never transferred and the matter never resolved. This prolonged and fruitless exchange soured the once-close relationship between the Delawares and their “grandchildren,” the Miamis.

Conclusion

In addition to the documentary resources, archaeological resources are important in supplementing and constituting a more complete history and anthropological study of the Delaware occupation. Archaeology is especially informative to historic Delaware settlements because no other sites have been located in Missouri or Indiana (McCord 2002; Wilkie 1984; Yann 2009). In 2003, the Center for Archaeological Research made an initial discovery of historic Delaware material culture that consisted of several metal detector finds and a partially-excavated pit feature rich in artifacts. The more intensive 2004 field season led to the discovery of a Delaware log cabin basin and sub-floor pit that likely belonged to William Anderson (Kikthawenund) or to one of the secondary chiefs. Subsequent field seasons unsuccessfully attempted to identify additional Delaware features, but found prehistoric artifacts post-dating the Kansas City Hopewell phase (2005), explored Civil War era materials related to Colonel Franz Sigel’s charge in the Battle of Wilson’s Creek (2007), and further investigations of the poorly understood prehistoric occupation at 23CN1 (2011).
In this chapter, I first presented a summary of Delaware history from pre-Contact until the Treaty of Greeneville (1795). This time span represents the most well-known periods in Delaware history. After moving into present-day Indiana, the historical “presence” of Delaware peoples begins to fade. Fortunately, there is still adequate literature produced by Moravian missionaries and the United States government surrounding the War of 1812 and Tecumseh’s War. After the signing of the Treaty of St. Marys in 1818, however, there are very few records written about the lives of Delaware peoples until the middle-to-late 1830s. Part of this paucity of documentation is due to the near-absence of missionaries in Southwest Missouri, with the exception of a brief visit by Nathaniel Dodge. Also, with the exception of some correspondence of fur traders, Indian Agency personnel, and the occasional speech from Delaware leaders, translated and recorded for posterity, the Delaware occupation of Missouri is one of the least well-known periods in their history. Using existing knowledge of Delaware history, I established four themes that could be followed and examined once the Delawares crossed the Mississippi River.

The first theme involved the forging of a recognizable “Delaware” ethnicity by the 1750s after establishing independence from the Six Nations. Part of this identity involved a special status as “grandfathers” of other eastern Algonquian groups. This role of “grandfathers” implied a certain expectations of reverence, obedience, tribute, and consultation from “grandchildren” who wished to go to war or request intervention to make peace. The position of status additionally led to invitations from Wyandots, Piankeshaws, and Miamis to come to their lands as
they moved westward. A second aspect of this identity involved a more formalized political structure of the three phratries where each phratry had a civil chief (sachem) and a war captain with distinctive roles that acted together at the Great Council, guided by a paramount civil chief after 1772.

The second theme involved religious and spiritual movements. It can be observed that upon losing political maneuverability at the end of wars, when there were no longer two (or more) sides to play against each other, religious revitalization movements among the Delawares (and others) emerged. After the end of the Seven Years' War, four revitalization or nativist movements manifested through political unification strategies of Netawatwees and through spiritual leaders Papounhan, Neolin, and Wangomend. Later, Custaloga advocated for conversion to Christianity to counter the ill effects of witchcraft. By 1806, the effects of nativist movements led by Beata and the Shawnee Prophet (Tenskwatawa) led to further social changes, including the consolidation of many traditional seasonal rituals into a novel form called the Big House Ceremony or Gamwing.

The third theme surrounded the roles of Delawares in war and peace. Notably, part of the Delaware identity included the right to initiate and engage in warfare, which was hard-won from the Six Nations who attempted to pacify the Delawares as “women.” When Delawares fought in wars, it is important to remember that Delaware leaders did not always pick the same sides to fight for, which occasionally divided them. Yet, by choosing to go to war, Delaware leaders' motivations included attempting to hold onto land, to fight against trade
restrictions, and to keep out invaders or settlers. Unfortunately, in many of the
wars Delawares participated in involving European powers, the side that the
Delawares chose ended up being the losing side. Thus, after each war, the
Delawares would be forced to give up land or suffer other penalties. When
Delaware leadership opted to remain neutral, they suffered from their neutrality
not being recognized, a lack of protection from war deprivations due to not
having any allies, and receiving no special dispensation from the victors of the
war because of their neutrality.

Lastly, the fourth theme embodies the social and political savvy of
Delawares in using their position, resources, and relationship to leverage the
maximum amount of benefits for themselves. In short, their identity was a form of
social capital (Bourdieu 1986). Of course, these manipulations did not always
work as intended, such as with the “Walking Purchase” or the massacre at
Gnadenhütten. Even after breaking with the Six Nations, the Delawares
continued to maintain relationships with them and the government of
Pennsylvania to maximize their economic and political outcomes, while
maintaining enough remoteness to avoid influxes of settlers and too much
political interference. Likewise, Ohio Delawares switched allegiances away from
the British during the Seven Years’ War to better take advantage of the generous
and lucrative French traders. Much of this maneuverability was lost, however,
once the Delawares were unable to play sides between the British, French, and
American governments. As Delawares found their position untenable or no
longer desirable, leaders tended to alter course to swap lands for more remote
locales, switch allegiances to obtain favorable outcomes, or establish (or eschew) relationships that they might benefit from more (or have stopped benefitting from).

Through a careful chronological and thematic exploration of the documentary resources transcribed from multiple archives as part of this research, I was able to illustrate many facets to the social and political dealings with other immigrant “grandchildren” tribal groups, “grandchildren” remaining East of the Mississippi River, with local people, with fur traders, with the Indian Agency, and with the Osages and (later) Pawnees. Likewise, through a careful examination of the documentary resources, it is possible to make sense of the continuation of the four historical themes during the 1820s at Delaware Town.

Ultimately, when their position as “grandfather” or as preferred clients of the government did not seem to be recognized by the territorial authorities in Missouri and the western Superintendent of Indian Affairs, Delaware leaders made sure to establish this status and ensured it was recognized before they even settled on the James Fork of White River. Leaders, like William Anderson, achieve this recognition by utilizing their power to form confederations with Cherokees and other emigrating native groups to form war parties that exceed the strength of Osage warriors. The strongest symbolic indicator of the re-establishment of “grandfather” status was through the 1822 peace treaty between the Osages and the Delawares (and their “grandchildren”) where the United States government cedes the right to settle issues among the “grandchildren” to the Delawares. After getting this social station recognized,
however, the Delawares must act to maintain it through clientage, wampum exchange, warfare, and political negotiations. While the practice of Principal Chief continued with William Anderson, many of the letters and treaties had representations from all three of the phratries. Moreover, all of the phratries are politically active at Delaware Town, especially the Wolf phratry, which appeared to act independently in terms of both economics and politics.

The theme of religion and ritual at Delaware Town is much more difficult to see in the documentary sources. There is no mention of the Big House Ceremony or Gamwing although it is a practice that existed before and continued after the Missouri occupation. Therefore, it likely continued at Delaware Town. Also, the overt forms of nativist movements in Ohio and Indiana do not appear to continue in Missouri, with the possible exception of the efforts of William Anderson to consolidate all of the scattered Delawares in one place. Of course, I argue in Chapter 5, that this is really a goal of the government and not to the benefit of the Delawares. Yet, William Anderson's insistence to keep missionaries away from Delaware Town continued the skepticism and distrust of the intentions of Christian missionaries after the massacre at Gnadenhütten in 1782. Unfortunately, much of what historians know about Delawares in the period before 1818 comes from the records kept by missionaries, especially Moravians, a record that is absent during the Delaware residency of Southwest Missouri.

The Delawares also continued to exercise their "masculinity" and ability to go to war while residing in Missouri. Immediately upon crossing the Mississippi River, Delawares were called to war by Cherokee allies and fought to exert
regional dominance, build or reinforce allegiances, and to serve as justice for murders and thefts. The efforts of the Indian Agents to quell or pacify Delawares ultimately did not work, partly because pacification policies during the mid-to-late 1700s ended up having extremely negative consequences for Delawares. Delaware leaders, however, had to walk a thin line between exerting their masculine identity as warriors, their "grandfather" role as leaders, and as preferred "children" of the United States government.

At Delaware Town, conflict patterns did not appear to conform to kwulakan taboos described by Speck and Obermeyer, which indicates that the taboo might be a more recent adaptation (Obermeyer 2003:89; Speck 1931:51). Kwulakan is considered a unique Delaware conflict management approach similar to other Woodland "harmony" practices where subjects under contention would be avoided in hopes that the problem would go away instead of escalating into a kwulakan taboo situation (Obermeyer 2003:89). Based on a careful reading of the literature regarding activities at Delaware Town, the kwulakan taboo does not appear to be a conscious concern because numerous conflicts arise and are actively pursued and escalated. Instead, it is possible that kwulakan is a more recent Delaware taboo that emerged while residing in Kansas as a result of decades of extremely negative consequences for being involved in warfare or aggressive conflict. Even in the case of non-aggressive conflict, such as the blood money example with the Miamis described below, pursuing the issue so tenaciously led to lasting bad feelings between once-close groups.
Lastly, the ability to exercise "Delaware identity" to maximize their social capital in the form of benefits, preferential status, financial windfalls, or to foster closer relationships is clearly evident at Delaware Town. With a close reading of the primary sources generated by Delaware authors and by non-Delaware authors to William Anderson and other leaders, it is clear that Delaware identity is being used to manipulate other immigrant native groups into removing to Kansas, to exact preferable terms in treaty negotiations, to procure reparation payments for murders and thefts, and to get the best deal possible from the numerous traders competing for their business in furs or their annuities.
FIGURE 2. Location of Delaware-Speaking Peoples at Time of European Contact. Unalimi and Unami are usually lumped together as Unami by most scholars. (Map from Kraft 1986.)
FIGURE 3. Line Drawing Portrait of Principal Chief William Anderson or *Kikthawenund*. From Chick Allen's *Captain William Allen, Civil War Veteran of Tennessee*. (Drawing from Cranor [1991].)
FIGURE 6. Map of Missouri Showing Delaware, Kickapoo, and Shawnee allotments in Southwest Missouri during the 1820s. Delaware lands are marked as 150, Kickapoo lands as 179 and Shawnee lands as 126. Also note the Apple Creek Shawnee Allotment, marked 125, in Southeastern Missouri. (Map from Royce 1899.)
FIGURE 7. Reconstructed Traditional-Style Bark-Covered Lenape (Delaware) Wigwam. (Photo courtesy of Center for Experimental Archaeology, http://www.phillyarchaeology.org/more/nativeamerican/background.htm.)
FIGURE 8. Line Drawing Portrait of William Gillis. (Drawing from Morrow 1981.)
FIGURE 9. Map of Allotments for Emigrant American Indians in Kansas Territory. The Delaware allotment is numbered 316 and covers the area surrounding Fort Leavenworth and the long outlet of land extending into western Kansas. (Map from Royce 1899.)
FIGURE 10. 1835 GLO Map of Delaware Town. Note the tavern at the
confluence of Wilson’s Creek and James Fork, the White River Trail indicated on
the map and that the villages are shown to be on the west side of the James Fork
of White River. Excavations at 23CN1 took place on the east side of the James
River. Based on 1835 GLO survey notes. (Map from Garrison 1835a, 1835b.)
CHAPTER 4: AN ARCHAEOLOGY OF IDENTITY AT DELAWARE TOWN

After a thorough examination of the documentary records associated with Delaware Town as identified, transcribed, and discussed in the previous chapter, this chapter presents a parallel line of archaeological evidence to utilize in the interpretation of Delaware identity in Chapter 5. First, I present a discussion about the environment of the study area, part of the Ozarks Mountains. Then, I present a brief overview of archaeological research conducted near the project area. Importantly, I make the case that all archaeological data investigating Delaware peoples prior to 1830 has been found at sites within the Lenapehoking homeland, and very little is known (archaeologically) about Delaware treks westward. Thus, to compare Delaware archaeological sites, I introduce historic-era Delaware sites excavated in the northeastern and Middle Atlantic regions of the United States and discuss attempts to find Delaware villages in Indiana, eastern Missouri, and Southwest Missouri prior to the start of the 1999 field season. Next, I detail the archaeological surveys, remote sensing, and intensive excavations conducted by Missouri State University’s Center for Archaeological Research in 1999, 2003, 2004, and 2005 to illustrate the methodologies utilized in finding and investigating Delaware occupation sites. The archaeological data presented below focuses primarily on the 2003-2005 archaeological field
seasons germane to early-19th century artifacts and features. The following
descriptions of the site’s major cultural features and the analysis of artifact
classes are presented in order to highlight the findings of this research as well as
the assemblage that I will discuss in the following chapter. To set the stage for a
discussion of practical politics, this study utilizes four artifact classes related to
agency: 1) Dietary Habits, 2) Bodily Attire, 3) Production, and 4) Exchange. In
some cases, information from primary documents will augment these four artifact
classes with items that did not survive in the archaeological record.

The Delaware Town archaeological site, 23CN1, was the first site
recorded within Christian County in the Missouri Archaeological Survey. This
area was already known, locally, as the location of Delaware Town, even if no
historic-era artifacts were recovered from the site until 1999. Upon its initial
recording, archaeologists found only prehistoric stone artifacts dating from the
Archaic (7800-800 B.C.) and Woodland (800 B.C.-A.D. 950) periods. The general
location of Delaware Town has been well known since the first GLO surveys of
Southwest Missouri (Garrison 1835a, 1835b). The persistence of local history
and memory formed the basis of this site’s pre-emptive identification as part of
the brief Delaware occupation of Southwest Missouri. For example, a paved,
rural avenue called Delaware Town Road follows the ridgeline north and east of
the site. Delaware Cemetery, also known as Howard Cemetery, is a private
family cemetery converted to public use in the early-20th century and is located
immediately north of the site on the high ridge. This burial ground is not
contemporary with the 1820s Delaware occupation. The earliest headstones date
from the Civil War era. To the immediate south of the site is a Missouri
Department of Conservation public fishing access, also bearing the name of
Delaware Town.

Although the namesakes of Delaware occupation of Southwest Missouri
existed, it was largely supplanted or regulated to the status of a footnote by the
mainstream history of pioneers, farmers, and entrepreneurs who moved in after
the Delawares (and other groups) immigrated to Kansas. Interest in Delaware
Town began to re-emerge in the late 1950s with the writings of Marvin Tong
([1958], 1959), Winslow Kingman (1960), and continued into the 1980s with the
work shifted focus away from Delawares toward whites who operated within the
social and economic networks of trading posts, illegal whiskey sales, and the re-
refashioning of annuity silver into local coinage. Prior to the Delaware Town
Archaeological Project in 1999, most attention was paid to information related to
the trader William Marshall and the famous Kansas City entrepreneur and trader
William Gillis and his operations of the White River Trading Company, including
his relationships with Delawares and other native groups. In fact, the
archaeological investigations that initially located the Delaware Town cabin site
(Features 2 and 3 at 23CN1) were primarily searching for Gillis’ trading post and
not the Delaware villages.

Certainly, one reason for this focus involves the production of historical
evidence. A majority of the archival data pertaining to the Delaware occupation of
Southwest Missouri was written by the fur traders, Indian agents, military
personnel, missionaries, and white settlers. Virtually none of these documents contained information about domestic life. The available primary sources predominantly feature official correspondence linked to the Department of War, which was in charge of the Department of Indian Affairs during this period. The economic activities involved with, and recordkeeping necessary for, the efficient management of an Indian Agency or trading post (or the settling of a trader’s probate) required literacy and official correspondence. The Delawares themselves left no written correspondence apart from a few speeches and letters translated and written by official government interpreters. While the existing documentary record provides many fascinating insights, archaeological research is necessary to expand knowledge into daily life and individuals “invisible” in Delaware Town history.

**Study Area and Environment**

The Delaware Town Archaeological Project encompasses 3.75 mi.² (9.71 km²) and 2,240 acres (906.5 hectares) in Christian County and 160 acres (64.75 hectares) in Stone County, Missouri. Project directors selected this space based on historical documents, oral histories, and maps pertaining to the occupation of Delaware peoples, private traders, and squatters during the 1820s. The Christian County portion of the study area extends three miles on the east and west banks of the James River at the confluence of Wilson’s Creek (Figure 11). This portion of the James River Valley was chosen from historic GLO maps and the work of local historians. The Stone County portion of the study area follows the base of the bluff line on the north bank of Finley River (Figure 12), a tributary of James
River. Documentary records from the Gillis probate indicated that the fur trader
William Marshall established a mill and trading post at the confluence of these
two waterways and that a small Delaware village was 300 yards away (Menard
1826a).

This region is part of the Ozarks Mountains (from the French "Aux Arcs," a
shortened "Aux Arkansas") and constitutes a rolling, upland dome stretching
across most of southern Missouri, northern Arkansas, portions of extreme
southeastern Kansas, and eastern Oklahoma. The location of northeast
boundary of the Ozarks is the most controversial because some scholars include
the Lincoln and Shawnee Hills in southwestern Illinois (Rafferty 1980:3). The
Ozarks Mountains region, along with Ouachita Mountains (separated from the
Ozarks by the Arkansas River), is the most elevated and mountainous found on
the continent between the Appalachian and Rocky Mountains. The most rugged
terrain in the Ozarks exists in the Boston Mountains of central Arkansas and the
St. Francois Mountains in central-eastern Missouri (Figure 13). The Ozarks
possessed several physiographic features that distinguish this large region from
the surrounding areas. Notably, this distinct highland features ancient rock
formations from the Ordovician and Mississippian geologic ages exposed due to
uplifting, swift streams within deeply entrenched river valleys (Bretz 1965:133).
The Ozarks is also rich in mineralogical resources, including galena, iron, and
chert. The uplifted limestone and dolomite bedrock formations underlie the
overabundance of chert and quartzite resources (Rafferty 1980:3-6). The
ubiquitous nature of chert in the Ozarks was a boon to prehistoric peoples, which
that has deeply impacted the archaeological record. Prehistoric campsites and lithic
scatters spanning more than 13,000 years of human occupation exist on nearly
every level surface surrounding rivers and larger streams in this region
(Chapman et al. 1951:12; Scholtz 1967:19-20; Ray 2007:18). The soluble
bedrock of limestone (calcium carbonate) and dolomite (magnesium carbonate)
dissolves into karst features, such as caves, sinkholes, springs, and "losing
streams" (Rafferty 1980). Although both chert and karst features are found
throughout the world, they are not generally found in abundance in the regions
immediately surrounding the Ozarks.

The Ozark Mountains are characterized as a dissected plateau formed
due to uplifting and subsequent erosion. Elevations range from 500 to 1,770 ft.
(152-540 m) above modern sea level (AMSL) in the St. Francois Mountain region
to 500 to 2,560 feet (152-780 meters) AMSL in the Boston Mountains. Between
the St. Francois and Boston mountain ranges, the Ozarks' geography is divided
into two physiographic regions known as the Salem Plateau in southern central
and eastern Missouri and the Springfield Plateau in Southwest Missouri,
northwestern Arkansas, extreme southeastern Kansas, and northeastern
Oklahoma. The Delaware Town project area lies inside the Springfield Plateau
within four miles of the rugged transition zone into the Salem Plateau to the
southeast. The highest elevations of the Salem Plateau peak at 1,500 feet (457
meters) AMSL while the Springfield Plateau's top elevation is 1,700 feet (518
meters) AMSL (Rafferty 1980:17). The Delaware Town Archaeological Project
area's elevation ranges from 1,100-1,300 ft. (335-396 m) AMSL. The bedrock of
the Salem Plateau consists of more dolomite while the Springfield Plateau is primarily limestone. Also, the Salem Plateau’s relief is sharper while the Springfield Plateau is a transition zone between the mountainous regions and the prairies and plains. Except for the rugged Eureka Springs Escarpment bordering the two plateau regions and steep borders to the stream valleys, both the Salem and Springfield Plateaus’ reliefs are gentle and rolling. The resulting upland prairies are easier to till, particularly in the river bottomlands, which facilitated early urban, industrial, and agricultural development.

Soils in the Delaware Town Project area belong to two major patterns described in the Christian County soil surveys. The majority of soils in the uplands are in the Goss-Clarksville gravelly silt loam association (Figure 14). These soils are produced from cherty limestone parent material, and more than 30-80% of the soils consist of cherty materials. The Clarksville soils dominate the slopes and drainages from the uplands into the bottomlands. While the Goss soils have slopes of 8-15%, the Clarksville soils slope between 15-50% with the more extreme topographic reliefs being associated with more chert concentration in the soil due to erosion. In the river bottoms, the Dapue (formerly Huntington) and Peridge soil series are predominantly alluvial and loess soils found in association with one another (Dodd 1985; Figure 15). Both Dapue and Peridge are nearly level (predominantly <8% slope) and are mostly free from cherty inclusions (<10%). This flat and relatively stone-free landform seems ideal for agricultural use; however, Dapue alluvial soils are prone to frequent or occasional flooding and Peridge loess soils rapidly erode after tilling and removal
of the ground covering (USDA 1997). After the Peridge soils erode, stone and chert fragments become more highly concentrated and the soil loses most of its agricultural productivity.

Using the USDA Web Soil Survey tool in 2010, the Delaware Town Project area was analyzed using the data from 2008 Nationwide Soils Report (Table 6). Within the Christian County area of interest, more than 85% of the project area fits the Dapue-Peridge and Horsecreek-Jamesfin landform patterns. More than half of the Christian County project area falls within the Dapue-Peridge association. 970 acres (or 41%) is Dapue silt loam and 194 acres (or 8.2%) is Peridge silt loam. Likewise, over 35% of the Christian County portion of the project area falls within the Goss-Clarksville association: 512 acres (or 21.5%) is Goss gravelly silt loam and 338 acres (or 14.2%) is Clarksville “very gravelly” silt loam. The Stone County area of interest expresses similar patterns. Because this part of the project area is closer to the escarpments dividing the Springfield and Salem Plateaus, the relief in Stone County is more dissected and hilly (Gregg 2004). Approximately 28% (45 acres) of the Stone County portion of the project area consists of very gravelly and sloped uplands and rock outcroppings. The remainder of the project area (117 acres) consists of alluvial river bottomlands.

### TABLE 6

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE DELAWARE TOWN PROJECT AREA SOILS USING THE 2008 WEB SOIL SURVEY (USDA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Christian County Area of Interest (AOI) for the Delaware Town Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals for area of interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Stone County Area of Interest (AOI) for the Delaware Town Project Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Code</th>
<th>Soil Description</th>
<th>Percent Slopes</th>
<th>% Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70031</td>
<td>Hailey-Reuter complex, 15 to 30 percent slopes, very rocky</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73000</td>
<td>Pomme silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73117</td>
<td>Clarksville-Scholten-Hailey complex, very gravelly silt loam, 3 to 15 percent slopes</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73120</td>
<td>Reuter-Gasconade-Rock outcrop complex, 15 to 60 percent slopes, very rocky</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Slope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74639</td>
<td>Waben extremely gravelly silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74640</td>
<td>Hootenville silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes, rarely flooded</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75401</td>
<td>Horsecreek-Jamesfin soils, silt loam, 0-2 percent slopes, occasionally flooded</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals for Area of Interest</td>
<td>162.9 acres</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The soils in Southwest Missouri are an important environmental indicator of why this region was initially selected for immigrant Delawares, Kickapoos, and Shawnees. This land was marginal agricultural land and difficult to traverse, making it undesirable for white settlement. Soils in the Ozarks are often extremely deflated due to erosion and differ considerably from the deeper alluvial soils surrounding the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, which had been highly desirable to French, British, and American settlers. Likewise, soils in Missouri north of the Missouri River are distinctively deep, less rocky, and more fertile than soils in southern Missouri, due to wind-blown loess and glacial till. Upland soils within and surrounding the Delaware Town Project area are typically cherty and shallow. Often, the ground surface is less than 6 ft. (1.8 m) to the cherty limestone or dolomite bedrock. Along riverbanks, floodplain soil is loamy and has a deeper profile, which is more favorable to plow agriculture. However, the floodplain context lends considerable risk to crops due to seasonal flooding and soil loss due to erosion. The poor prospects of using this land for long-term agricultural use will be explored further in the next chapter.
Early explorers in Missouri rarely ventured into southwestern Missouri. During the Spanish and French possession of this territory, European explorers such as Hernando de Soto (1539-41), Jolliet and Marquette (1673-74), Baron de Lahontan (1688), and Sieur de Bourgmont (1713-14), Charles Du Tisne (1718), and MacKay and Evans Expedition (1795-1797) preferred to follow the massive river systems of the Mississippi and Missouri (Houck 1908a, 1908b). This tradition continued once the United States took over the Louisiana Territory with the Louis and Clark Expedition (1804-06). River transportation via keelboats, steamboats, rafts, and canoes constituted the most rapid (albeit risky) method to travel with goods. The only contiguous river route leading into southwestern Missouri involves the White River, a major tributary of the Mississippi River. The distance from the mouth of the White River to the mouth of James River (historically, James Fork of White River) is more than 700 miles, a prohibitively long journey for most. After arriving at the mouth of the James River, it is an additional 100 miles upriver to the Delaware Town Project Area.

This portion of the Ozarks is poorly recorded prior to American explorer Henry Schoolcraft's hunting expedition in the winter of 1818-1819. Schoolcraft set out from the lead mining town of Potosi, which was the farthest extent of westward settlement in Missouri south of the Missouri River at the time. Leading a small hunting party by foot and with a packhorse, Schoolcraft was bound for the White River and its abundant hunting grounds. One impetus for this expedition was the recent (1808) cession of Missouri Territory lands by the Osages and their withdrawal from the area. During his expedition, Schoolcraft
was primarily interested in the relatively unknown natural resources of the area, but was drawn to the White River due to tales of excellent hunting prospects. Schoolcraft's description of the Western Ozarks was the first written account of the difficult terrain, the flora and fauna, and the mining possibilities in Southwest Missouri and northwestern Arkansas (Park 1955; Schoolcraft 1821). He gained most of his knowledge from local white settlers he encountered during his travels.

The environment significantly constricted possibilities for agricultural settlements. In the eastern Ozarks, historical geographer Walter A. Schroeder studied how French and American settlers organized their settlements based on the agricultural potential of the land (2002:32-33). Primarily, alluvial river bottoms were the choice for settlements, and the hilly backcountry of the Ozarks remained barren of settlement outside of the occasional fertile basin. The character of this Ozark Mountain-Ozark River Country dichotomy is elegantly explored in Henry Schoolcraft's expedition from Potosi to the White River in Arkansas that passed through much of the project area. His description of the uplands reveals the desolate nature of the stony, dissected hills:

The country... presented a character of unvaried sterility, consisting of a succession of lime-stone ridges, skirted with feeble growth of oaks, with no depth of soul, often bare rocks upon the surface, and covered with coarse wild grass, and sometimes we crossed patches of ground of considerable extent, without trees or brush of any kind, and resembling the Illinois prairies in appearance, but lacking their fertility and extent. (Schoolcraft 1821:53)

Schoolcraft's journal takes a sharp stylistic turn once he encounters the Finley and James Rivers. Clearly, this portion of the Ozarks still consisted of rugged
uplands and stony country, but his description of this bottomland is markedly different than his stark illustration of much of southern Missouri:

Near our present encampment are some bluffs, which serve to diversify the scene, and at the foot of which is situated a valuable lead mine... It is a mixture of forest and plain, of hills and long sloping valleys, where the tall oak forms a striking contrast with the rich foliage of the evergreen cane, or the wavering field prairie-grass. It is an assemblage of beautiful groves, and level prairies, of river alluvion [sic], and high-land precipice, diversified by the devious course of the river... The junction of Findley's [sic] Fork with James' River, a high point of land, is an eligible spot for a town....

A profitable fur-trade would be one of the immediate advantages attending such a settlement. (Schoolcraft 1821:58-59)

Schoolcraft's party was enamored by this area and chose to remain in the vicinity for several days while exploring caves, hunting, and mining lead ore. His lasting esteem for this land was evinced in later recollections of this journey. He described the river as "pure as crystal" and the river bottom lands as "the most fertile and beautiful lands which the whole valley of the Mississippi affords" (1853:236).

These bottomland soils were characterized by the first General Land Office (GLO) survey of the area as "1st quality fit for cultivation," but were subject to occasional flooding (Garrison 1835a, 1825b). Subsistence farming, even when coupled with hunting, comprised a dangerous gamble for the Delaware farmers. In the summer of 1823, due to floodwaters destroying crops, the villages along the James River suffered. In a letter to Peter A. Lorimier, Hypolite Menard reported a flood on White River where three feet of water destroyed a warehouse.
and an agricultural field (Menard [1823]). The summer of 1823 also devastated crops further up the James Fork of White River at the Delaware settlements. Several chiefs sent a speech to their “father” William Clark pleading for continued assistance with provisions due to continued problems almost a year after losing their crops to flooding (Anderson et al. 1824).

The natural flora and fauna of Southwest Missouri was abundant, but could not keep pace with the large populations of emigrating American Indian groups and the monumental drain of the fur trade on the local wildlife. Osage hunting parties utilized the western Ozarks as a hunting ground for generations. When Henry Schoolcraft trekked through the Swan Creek valley, he noted no less than three large deserted Osage hunting camps and described rectangular bent-pole wigwam structures (1821:54). Animals important to the fur trade (deer, elk, bear, beaver, and otter) were abundant in southern Missouri and noted in Schoolcraft’s journal; however, these animals had been trapped and hunted their furs and skins for almost 140 years prior to Delaware immigration to the area. Of course, other animals and plants found in Southwest Missouri are listed in Table 7, many of which appear in the archaeological assemblage from Delaware Town.

### TABLE 7

**LIST OF ANIMALS AND PLANTS IN SOUTHWEST MISSOURI DURING THE 1820S**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mammals (rats and mice excluded)</th>
<th>Opossum</th>
<th><em>Didelphis marsupialis</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-tailed shrew</td>
<td><em>Blarina brevicauda</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least shrew</td>
<td><em>Cryptotis parva</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Cooley et al. (1975); Garrison (1835a, 1825b); Schoolcraft (1821); Schwartz and Schwartz (1959); and Powell (2004, 2005).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern mole</td>
<td><em>Scalopus aquaticus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bats</td>
<td>several species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-tailed jack rabbit</td>
<td><em>Lepus californicus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern cottontail rabbit</td>
<td><em>Sylvilagus floridanus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swamp rabbit</td>
<td><em>Sylvilagus aquaticus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodchuck</td>
<td><em>Marmota monax</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern chipmunk</td>
<td><em>Tamias striatus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern gray squirrel</td>
<td><em>Sciurus carolinensis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern fox squirrel</td>
<td><em>Sciurus niger</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern flying squirrel</td>
<td><em>Glaucomys volans</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td><em>Castor canadensis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskrat</td>
<td><em>Ondatra zibethicus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote</td>
<td><em>Canis latrans</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray wolf</td>
<td><em>Canis lupis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red wolf</td>
<td><em>Canis niger</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fox</td>
<td><em>Vulpes fulva</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray fox</td>
<td><em>Urocyon cinereoargenteus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black bear</td>
<td><em>Euarctos americanus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raccoon</td>
<td><em>Procyon lator</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-tailed weasel</td>
<td><em>Mustela frenata</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotted skunk</td>
<td><em>Spilogale putorius</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped skunk</td>
<td><em>Mephitis mephitis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Otter</td>
<td><em>Lutra canadensis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puma</td>
<td><em>Felis concolor</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobcat</td>
<td><em>Lynx rufus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk</td>
<td><em>Cervus canadensis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-tailed deer</td>
<td><em>Odocoileus virginianus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bison</td>
<td><em>Bison bison</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild turkey</td>
<td><em>Meleagris gallopavo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie chicken</td>
<td><em>Tympanuchus cupido</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catfish</td>
<td><em>Ictalurus sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carp</td>
<td><em>Cyprinus carpio</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western painted turtle</td>
<td><em>Chrysemys picta belli</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common snapping turtle</td>
<td><em>Chelydra serpentina</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-toed box turtle</td>
<td><em>Terrapene carolina</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornate box turtle</td>
<td><em>Terrapene ornate</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak</td>
<td><em>Quercus sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Oak</td>
<td><em>Quercus velutina</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Type</td>
<td>Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Oak</td>
<td><em>Quercus alba</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackjack Oak</td>
<td><em>Quercus marilandica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Oak</td>
<td><em>Quercus stellata</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory family</td>
<td><em>Juglandaceae sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory</td>
<td><em>Carya sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Black Walnut</td>
<td><em>Juglans nigra</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Walnut or Butternut</td>
<td><em>Juglans cinerea</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm</td>
<td><em>Ulmus sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple</td>
<td><em>Acer sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persimmon</td>
<td><em>Diospyros virginiana</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td><em>Platanus occidentalis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td><em>Corylus americana</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td><em>Prunus sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry</td>
<td><em>Morus sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackberry</td>
<td><em>Celtis sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit-bearing shrub</td>
<td><em>Rubus sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit-bearing vine</td>
<td><em>Fragaria virginiana</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowering shrub</td>
<td><em>Vitis sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit-bearing vine</td>
<td><em>Rhus sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowering shrub</td>
<td><em>Acalypha sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbaceous annual</td>
<td><em>Oxalis sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood sorrel</td>
<td><em>Chenopodium berlandieri</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goosefoot</td>
<td><em>Euphorbia sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurge</td>
<td><em>Verbena sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbena</td>
<td><em>Polygonum sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckwheat family</td>
<td><em>Polygonum lappathifolium</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curlytop Knotweed</td>
<td><em>Phytolacca americana</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbaceous perennial</td>
<td><em>Ranunculus sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttercup family</td>
<td><em>Portulaca oleracea</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succulent annual</td>
<td><em>Vicia sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purslane</td>
<td><em>Lespedeza sp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-succulent herbaceous annual</td>
<td><em>Mollugo verticillata</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American pokeweed</td>
<td><em>Solanum sp.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Description</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nightshade</td>
<td>Solanum ptycanthum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black nightshade</td>
<td>Silene sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion and Catchfly</td>
<td>Silene sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragweed</td>
<td>Ambrosia artemisiifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursage/Ragweed</td>
<td>Ambrosia sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowering plant, vespertine</td>
<td>Jimson weed, Devil's trumpet, Angel's trumpet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain</td>
<td>Zea mays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereal, leaf vegetable</td>
<td>Amaranthus sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo</td>
<td>Arundinaria gigantica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gourd</td>
<td>Cucurbita sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass</td>
<td>Panicum sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass</td>
<td>Poaceae sp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timber was also a good resource of the western Ozarks. The French referred to the Ozarks as *bois* instead of *forêt* to characterize the well-spaced, mature trees where sunlight reached the ground, permitting grasses and cane to grow (Schroeder 2002:34). Important trees for agricultural and industrial purposes were reported in the first official survey of the region. The GLO field notes for this part of Christian County mention black and white oak, black jack oak, hazel, post oak, walnut and sycamore trees (Garrison 1835a, 1835b). Schoolcraft also wrote about a diverse landscape of hickory, maple, white and black walnut, elm, mulberry, and hackberry, all trees that were not noted in the official GLO survey (1821:56-58).

**Previous Archaeological Investigations**

For more than a century, archaeological research in Missouri focused on prehistoric peoples from the earliest Paleoindian hunters to the decline of the Mississippian mound-building societies. Historical archaeology in Missouri, in
many respects, is still stuck in the 1950s. During the first half of the 20th century, historical archaeology in the United States focused on European settlements, which still appear to be the predominant emphasis in Missouri. Regionally, the subjects of most historical archaeology in the last thirty years are the French settlements of Ste. Genevieve, early St. Louis and Kansas City, the 1906 World’s Fair, Civil War battlefields, forts, houses of famous men, farmsteads, cemeteries, and roads. When the profession of historical archaeology turned to “those without voice” in the 1960s, Missouri archaeology, largely, did not follow. A few notable exceptions include the work of Chip Clatto, who documented Underground Railroad sites and found evidence of African slavery at the Lemp Avenue Archaeological Site in the late 1990s and early 2000s (Clatto [2001]). Also, the Illiniwek Village archaeological site in extreme northeastern Missouri, which was visited by Joilet and Marquette in 1673 and excavated by the Missouri Parks Department, revealed evidence of culture contact and trade, although the site’s importance is heavily buttressed by the two famous French explorers (Larry Grantham 2005, pers. comm.).

Archaeology related to the Delawares has been continually investigated for more than a century and rests primarily in the northeastern United States. Amateur archaeologists were responsible for much of the early work (Abbot 1912, Butler 1947; Cotter et al. 1993, Grumet 1995). The bulk of professional archaeological work has been synthesized by archaeologist Robert Steven Grumet who outlined the major sites related to Delaware patrimony in Historic Contact: Indian People and Colonists in Today’s Northeastern United States in
the Sixteenth through Eighteenth Centuries (1995:238). The majority of archaeological work for the Delawares emphasizes sites associated with the Munsee dialect groups and was described by Herbert C. Kraft in his seminal works *The Lenape: Archaeology, History, and Ethnography* (1986) and *The Lenape or Delaware Heritage: 10,000 BC to AD 2000* (2001). Most of this work is related to archaeology performed in preparation for major reservoir projects, such as the Tocks Island Dam project (later decommissioned), the Delaware Water Gap Recreation area, and the Minisink Historic District National Historic Landmark (Custer 1996; Kraft 1975). These projects contributed a significant amount to the existing archaeological prehistoric Delaware and Munsee collections in New Jersey, although most of the Late Woodland and more recent historic archaeological contexts were completely destroyed by plowing (Puniello 1981). The only archaeological sites from this later time period came from contexts involving pits or burials cutting into the lower strata and escaping obliteration by the plow. Table 8 lists all historic-era sites (prior to A.D. 1840) associated with Unami Delawares and Munsee Delawares in the United States. Other sites may be known, but are either not publically available or are not published.

**TABLE 8**

**UNAMI DELAWARE AND MUNSEE DELAWARE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES WITH HISTORIC COMPONENTS FOUND IN THE UNITED STATES DATING TO A.D. 1840**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hendrickson</td>
<td>Ulster Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1400s-1600s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minisink Historic District</td>
<td>Pike Co., PA</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1500s-1750s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Historic Landmark</td>
<td>Sussex Co., NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell-Browning-Blair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minisink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratschler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overpeck</td>
<td>Bucks Co., PA</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1550-1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley Flats Complex:</td>
<td>Ulster Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1500s-1600s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyncoop Farm/Grapes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Lake Rock Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill 1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley Rock Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongore Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenia</td>
<td>Dutchess Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1600s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Farm</td>
<td>New Castle Co., DE</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1600s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croton Point</td>
<td>Westchester Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1600s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finch Rock Shelter</td>
<td>Westchester Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1600s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaeser</td>
<td>Bronx Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1600s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenhardt-Lahaway Hill</td>
<td>Burlington Co., NJ</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1600s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shagabak Rock Shelter</td>
<td>Dutchess Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1600s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward’s Point National</td>
<td>Richmond Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1600s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Landmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>Salem Co., NJ</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1600s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minguhanan</td>
<td>Chester Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1600s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motts Point</td>
<td>Nassau Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1600s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Creek</td>
<td>Sussex Co., PA</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1620-1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Massapeag National</td>
<td>Nassau Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1630-1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Landmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monksville Reservoir</td>
<td>Passaic Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1630-1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller Field</td>
<td>Warren Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1650-1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calno School Burial</td>
<td>Warren Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1650-1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Etten</td>
<td>Orange Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1650-1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman</td>
<td>Pike Co., PA</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1660-1690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>County, State</td>
<td>Tribe</td>
<td>Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiorati Rock Shelter</td>
<td>Orange Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1660-1760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry's Farm</td>
<td>Warren Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1660-1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester City</td>
<td>Camden Co., NJ</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>Late 1600s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater</td>
<td>Bucks Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>Late 1600s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemberton Family Cemetery</td>
<td>Bucks Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1680s-1705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman II</td>
<td>Sussex Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1680-1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apshawa Rock Shelter</td>
<td>Passaic Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1680s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring House Rock Shelter</td>
<td>Rockland Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1680s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queonemysing</td>
<td>Delaware Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1690s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playwicky Farm</td>
<td>Bucks Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1600s-1700s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury Farm</td>
<td>Gloucester Co., NJ</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1600s-1700s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36LE198</td>
<td>Lebanon Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1600s-1700s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaRoe-Van Horn House</td>
<td>Bergen Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Early 1700s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okehocking</td>
<td>Chester Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>Early 1700s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster County Park</td>
<td>Lancaster Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1700-1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>Chester Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1720-1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingefield/Maxatawny</td>
<td>Berks Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1725-1746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Brook</td>
<td>Chester Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1720s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo Lake</td>
<td>Passaic Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1730s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder Mons Kerk-Hoff</td>
<td>Bergen Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1730s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemeinhaus National Historic Landmark</td>
<td>Northampton Co., PA</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1733-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Island</td>
<td>Clinton Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1741-1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knouse or Wapwallopen</td>
<td>Luzerne Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1744-1755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr/Haines Mill</td>
<td>Burlington Co., NJ</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1745-1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pahaquarra</td>
<td>Warren Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Mid-1700s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36BK357</td>
<td>Berks Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>Mid-1700s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohulbuctetam</td>
<td>Armstrong Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1751-1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers or Kuskuski</td>
<td>Lawrence Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1763-1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pymatuning</td>
<td>Mercer Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1764-1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Eagle's Nest</td>
<td>Centre Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>1779-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potake Pond</td>
<td>Rockland Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1700s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36WY44</td>
<td>Wayne Co., PA</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>1700s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott Farm National Historic Landmark</td>
<td>Burlington Co., NJ</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>County, State</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield or Watchogue</td>
<td>Staten Island, NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluebead</td>
<td>Berks Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Island</td>
<td>Burlington Co., NJ</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington Rock House</td>
<td>Bergen Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington Rock Shelter</td>
<td>Bergen Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td>Sussex Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Demarest House</td>
<td>Bergen Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton Pond</td>
<td>Wayne Co., PA</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faucett</td>
<td>Pike Co., PA</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods Field</td>
<td>Montgomery Co., PA</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>Hudson Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Early Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariners' Harbor, Old Place</td>
<td>Staten Island, NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Early Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Brook Findspot</td>
<td>Warren Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskeeta Cove</td>
<td>Nassau Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Ferry Point</td>
<td>Bronx Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect Street</td>
<td>Bergen Co., NJ</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampo Rock Shelter</td>
<td>Rockland Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossville</td>
<td>Staten Island, NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Early Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryders Pond</td>
<td>Kings Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soundview</td>
<td>Nassau Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvan Lake Rock Shelter</td>
<td>Dutchess Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throgs Neck</td>
<td>Bronx Co., NY</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermuhlen</td>
<td>Bucks Co., PA</td>
<td>Munsee</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Creek</td>
<td>Ocean Co., NJ</td>
<td>Unami</td>
<td>Historic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


There are three notable archaeological collections with evidence of Contact or post-Contact Period materials: 1) the Miller Field site, 2) Minisink Historic District National Historic Landmark sites, and 3) Pahaquarra sites (Kraft 1972, 1975, 1986). It is important to note that these sites are all located at the northern periphery of the occupation zone of Munsee dialect speakers and are far removed from where the most direct trading and contact with Europeans
would have taken place (Kraft 1986:218). At these three sites, the majority of artifacts were recovered from burials, domestic storage pits, and trash pits, and included iron hoes, axes, adzes, metal knives, brass and iron arrowheads, glass beads and bottles, and ceramic pipes and thimbles. Brass was relatively rare at these sites. Brass kettles were often repurposed into cutout jewelry, fishhooks, needles, and other ornaments (Kraft 1986:208). All of this archaeological information was utilized in the 1980s when John Kraft helped create a life-sized Winakung Lenape village as part of the Waterloo Village living history museum in Sussex County, New Jersey, which is closed indefinitely for repairs (Kraft 1989).

There are additional problems with the archaeological work performed at the Delaware Water Gap and the sites reported by Herbert Kraft as part of the Tocks Island project. These sites exist at the northern periphery of the Delaware homeland Lenapehoking, according to Dean (1978) and Kraft (1972). Comparative archaeology of Delaware sites reveals that the archaeological remains from the Munsee areas in the western and northern periphery are characteristically differently from other Unami and Unalachtigo sites in Delaware and southern New Jersey. This marked difference is notable even in the 16th century when the ceramics produced by Unami Delawares are similar to Susquehannock neighbors while Munsee ceramics are more similar to Mohawk and Oneida peoples (Grumet 1995:231). Herbert Kraft argued that the archaeological imprints of prehistoric Munsee and Unami groups are differentiated as far back as 10,000 years ago (1984:7-8). The settlement pattern in the Unami region consists of dispersed settlements whereas the northern and
upriver sites are more nucleated (Grumet 1995:238). Another difference is that Munsee burials tend to orient southwards whereas Delaware burials tend to orient westward towards the setting sun (Cotter et al. 1993:24). Therefore, Munsee Delaware archaeology sites in the Northeast and Middle Atlantic region may not be directly comparable to Unami/Unalachtigo settlements as they move further westward.

One Unami Delaware archaeology site of note is the Montgomery site in Chester County, Pennsylvania. It is a cemetery site excavated by Weslager in the 1950s and Becker in the 1970s that has a terminus post quern of 1720-1740 based from data analysis of the glass trade bead assemblage (Cotter et al. 1993:25). In the 22 graves, 11 of which were children, most of the individuals were interred in coffins with brass, copper, pewter, ceramic, glass trade goods, and the first examples of trade silver ever documented in an archaeological context (Cotter et al. 1993:23-24). The amount of European trade goods found at this site, as well as the westward orientation of the burials themselves, marks Unami sites as characteristically different from Munsee sites that are conspicuously lacking in an abundance of European trade goods, even in later colonial periods.

Temple University conducted more recent Unami Delaware site excavations in the early 1990s linked to historic 17th century Delaware habitation at the Playwicki Farm site (36BU173) in Bucks County, Pennsylvania (Moore 2008; Stewart 1999). This site is also called Playwicky in other texts. Aside from Munsee-attributed archaeological sites, Playwicki Farm is one of the only
examples of settlement strategies amongst Unami Delaware archaeological sites. During three years of excavations at the site, two house patterns were identified. Structure 1 is thought to be more a traditional style wigwam and measured 18 ft. x 25 ft. Structure 2 is circular, 40 ft. in diameter, with wooden posts set within a wall trench. Radiocarbon dating from posthole debris in Structure 1 attributed the house's construction to 1780 ± 60 years. In addition to the two structures, other identified features included a hearth or pit and a possible third structure fitting the pattern of Structure 2 (Moore 2008; Stewart 1999). The house structures as Playwicki are more than 200 years older than the cabins found at Delaware Town and because there is no archaeological evidence of Delaware habitations sites between eastern Pennsylvania and Missouri, it is impossible to study the sequence of continuity and change in architectural patterns and settlement styles.

European trade goods were rare finds at this site, which makes Playwicki an interesting correlate to Munsee sites. It appeared as though the inhabitants of the Playwicki site were still producing much of their own chipped stone and ground stone tools as well as ceramics. It is also important to note that agricultural plowing nearly destroyed the whole site. Areas of the Playwicki Farm site adjacent to slopes benefitted from the deposition of soil eroded from those slopes. Portions of the sites further away from the base of the slope had no intact cultural features (Stewart 2002:191). This fascinating preservation context in deeply-plowed fields is very similar to what occurred at Delaware Town. In
Missouri, the dug-out house floor partially survived extensive chisel plowing due to deposition from eroded slopes on the north end of Feature 3.

Between the occupation period of the Playwicki site and the excavations of the Delaware Mission in Kansas from the mid-to-late 19th century (David Gann 2009, pers. comm.), there have been virtually no archaeological sites attributed to Delaware-speaking peoples except for mission-based villages in Ontario, Canada (Yann 2009). The Glenn A. Black Center at Ball State University conducted an extensive literature review of the historic Delaware occupation of Indiana (Wepler 1980a, 1980b; Yann 2009). Overall, there were 37 villages, 15 on the banks of the west fork of the White River. Wepler also noted that Indiana archaeologists had been avoiding the historic American Indian sites due to bias towards prehistoric sites or Euro-American historic sites and that many of the historic native villages were now lost under urban sprawl or destroyed due to the chisel plow (Wepler 1980a:3). In 2002, Ball State University conducted archaeological testing of 5 of the 15 sites (157 acres total) documented on the West Fork of White River in order to craft a management plan. No evidence of Delaware occupation was found, partly due to inaccurate reporting of locations and also utilizing a sampling methodology that may have been inadequate in locating the sites (McCord 2002:iii).

Duncan C. Wilkie of Southeast Missouri State University encountered this same problem of archaeological visibility. As part of a cultural resource management project, Wilkie surveyed 17.5% of the Apple Creek drainage in Missouri, specifically looking for historic Delaware and Shawnee village sites that
were well documented as part of a Spanish land grant in the late-18th century. Although he documented 41 archaeological sites, only 2 were from the historic era after 1830. He found nothing indistinguishable from Euro-Americans living on small frontier settlements in those two historic sites (Wilkie 1984:153-154). In the end, after years of searching, Wilkie found nothing indicative of historic-era American Indian occupation.

The inability to distinguish Apple Creek Delaware and Shawnee archaeological sites from non-Indian archaeological sites from the same area and time period may emphasize the conspicuous changes in behavior associated with this dissertation’s central premise that the Delawares were re-exerting their ethnic and political identity. I argue that many of the material changes that clearly identify Delaware Town as early-19th century and “Indian” are linked to the behaviors being utilized at Delaware Town to exercise Delaware ethnic identity. The material evidence behind this assertion is presented toward the end of this chapter and analyzed in Chapter 5.

“Invisible” Delawares

There are distinct cultural factors contributing to the relative archaeological “invisibility” of Delaware villages. First, there is the issue of settlement patterning. Unlike contemporary Wea archaeological sites at Ft. Ouiatenon and Kethippecanunk that are more nucleated and concentrated (Jones 1989), historic Unami Delaware village sites have more fluid and dispersed communities. This settlement pattern of smaller clusters of dwellings spread over large areas was noted much earlier at the Playwicki Farm site and other 18th century American
Indian villages in the Middle Atlantic region (Kent 1984; Rountree and Davidson 1997:37; Stewart 1999:41; McCord 2002:98).

Second, there is also an issue of dealing with multi-ethnic communities. At sites in Ohio and Indiana, primarily concerning archaeology associated with Forts (Fort Recovery and Fort St. Marys) and research at the Auglaize villages, it is difficult for archaeologists to identify ethnic identity in villages or forts where it is historically known that multiple ethnic groups visited or resided (Yann 2009:66). When multiple groups—often closely related linguistically and in cultural patterns—live together, utilize similar resources in congruent ways, share in and participate in analogous styles to colonialism, warfare, and religious revitalization movements, making ethnic group distinctions is more difficult, but not impossible. This is one area where historic archaeology and ethnohistory researchers need to develop more meaningful methodology in terms of ethnic identity and boundaries even in multi-cultural and multi-ethnic contexts.

Third, there exists the conundrum of distinguishing early Euro-American sites with immigrant Delawares. This was one of the primary troubles in the work of Duncan Wilkie in southeastern Missouri (1984). Archaeologists often fall into the trap of needing “ethnic markers,” such as trade beads or silver to make ethnic determinations or to assess the level of cultural assimilation. This assimilationist view was utilized by Kinietz’s work on Delaware culture chronology that identified 476 Delaware cultural traits and tracks whether they are present or “denied” at various points in time (1946:22-37). A more subtle analysis of settlement and
subsistence patterns would be informative when the traditional artifact assemblages are indistinguishable.

Archaeology near the Delaware Town Project area includes recent investigation at the Wilson's Creek National Battlefield conducted by the National Parks Service, the University of Arkansas, and Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research (CAR) in 2001-2004 and 2006-2007 (A. Holly Jones 2007, pers. comm.). Nearby, a significant prehistoric caim site (23CN13) reminds archaeologists of the formidable prehistoric presence in the vicinity (Marshall 1956). Within the Delaware Town project area, there were three cultural resource management projects conducted by CAR, mitigating sewer lines and assessing historical resources that mention Delaware Town, trading posts, and their probable locations, but found no archaeological data relating to the occupation (Cooley et al. 1975, 1979; Helm and Purrington 1982). Delaware attribution of archaeological sites in these surveys relied heavily on historical literature reviews rather than archaeological data with the exception of one site, 23CN3, immediately south of the Highway 14 bridge over James River that included historic-era artifacts (Cooley et al. 1975:25-35).

Archaeological Survey

In 1999, the official search for Delaware-era occupations in the James River Valley began. Staff archaeologists with Missouri State University's Center for Archaeological Research (CAR), led by Neal Lopinot, Mark A. Rees, and Gina S. Powell were guided by the recent works of historians Melton (1977), Morrow ([1980], 1981, 1985), and Tong ([1958], 1959), initiated an archaeological field
school specifically focused on identifying the William Gillis trading post (Rees et al. 2000:32). According to Eliza Bullett’s testimony delivered in the Gillis probate record, the trading post was “Che-wa-y-wek” or “up the hill,” from the Delaware settlements, on the west bank of the James River near Wilson’s Creek (Missouri State Archives 1873). The probate also illustrated the many buildings and outbuildings associated with the trading post that have good archaeological presence. The Jackson County probate courts asked Joseph Philabert about William Gillis’ house at Delaware Town. Philabert described Gillis’ cabin as being a one-story hewn log building, with a two rooms, in a dog-trot style, including a kitchen in the south room and Gillis’ quarters in the north room (Missouri State Archives 1873). In addition to Gillis’ two-room house, other buildings associated with the trading post included a cheese house, a cabin for hired men, a cabin for one of his Delaware wives, two storage buildings, produce cribs, and hen houses (Morrow [1980]:154). Once the Gillis trading post could be identified archaeologically, it would be a good anchor point in locating the Delaware villages in the river valley, if any survived plowing and erosion.

A three square-mile area of interest was set up in Christian County, Missouri to search the lands around the confluence of Wilson’s Creek and James River and extending for two miles downstream. Although several properties of high interest could not be surveyed in 1999 and 2000 due to landowners’ dissent, CAR utilized pedestrian survey and shovel test pits in both terrace and floodplain contexts to locate archaeological features (Rees et al. 2000:32). In 1999, field investigations investigated twelve previously-recorded archaeological sites and
located one new archaeological site. A brief summary of the sites visited during the 1999 and 2000 field seasons are described in Table 9. Low-density lithic scatters were ubiquitous to all of the properties investigated. Although it is possible that these lithic scatters could be a mixture of prehistoric and historic, very few sites have any diagnostic artifacts. Four of these lithic scatter sites contained diagnostic lithic materials ranging from the Paleoindian Period to the Mississippian Period, including a few sherds of undecorated ceramics from the latter era. Locating artifacts diagnostic to the early-19th century was a challenge. Five archaeological sites yielded artifacts from the late-19th century to the 20th century due to extant historic homesteads on the premises. Two sites yielded less than a handful of non-diagnostic iron artifacts. The absence of early-19th century finds left archaeologists to inquire if land development and plow farming, coupled with erosion, had eliminated traces of the Gillis trading post complex or the Delaware villages.

TABLE 9

SITES REVISITED OR IDENTIFIED DURING THE 1999 AND 2000 FIELD SEASONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Survey Strategy</th>
<th>Cultural Affiliation</th>
<th>Early-19th Century Component?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23CN3</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Late-19th/Early-20th Century</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal Detector Shovel Test</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Historic</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN13</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Historic</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal Detector Shovel Test</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Late-</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN86</td>
<td>19th/Early-20th</td>
<td>Pedestrian Metal Detector</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Shovel Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN454</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Shovel Test Holders Metall Detector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN455</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Archaic, 19th Century</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Pedestrian Metal Detector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN570</td>
<td>Late-19th/Early-20th</td>
<td>Pedestrian Metal Detector</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Shovel Test Test Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN571</td>
<td>Archaic, Mississippian, Early-19th Century, Late-19th/Early-20th Century</td>
<td>Pedestrian Metal Detector</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN575</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>Paleolithic, Archaic</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Pedestrian Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN579</td>
<td>Paleoindian, Archaic</td>
<td>Pedestrian Metal Detector</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Shovel Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN590</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Pedestrian Metal Detector</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Shovel Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN750</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Historic, unmarked cemetery?</td>
<td>Pedestrian Metal Detector</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Shovel Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN834</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Late-19th/Early-20th Century</td>
<td>Pedestrian Metal Detector</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Shovel Test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Rees et al. 2000).

There was one property in the middle of the project area that could not be examined due to dissent by the landowner. CAR archaeologists placed a high predictive value of finding early-19th century artifacts on this land because the 23CN1 site was recorded within the boundaries. Also, there was a spring on the property within an old channel of the James River. One letter written by Indian...
Sub-Agent Major John Campbell to his superior, Major Richard Graham, described a spring where he intended to build a house for the Delaware Agency opposite of Chief William Anderson's house (Campbell 1825a). Campbell intended for the structure to mirror the building plan used by James Wilson. Although there was no written documentation about the plan of Wilson's buildings found in any of the probate and archival materials consulted for this research, it is clear that the construction of the Indian sub-agency building cost $500, as reported in the annual expenses of Graham's Indian agency in 1825 through 1826 (Graham 1825c).

Although the property containing 23CN1 could not be surveyed in 1999, there was a property immediately adjacent to the southwest that yielded a few early-19th century artifacts. During September and October 1999, after the close of the field school season, CAR staff went to the site 23CN455 to conduct a pedestrian and metal detector survey after the field had been plowed. They located four historic artifacts near the tree line, consisting of bottle glass and a glass button (Rees et al. 2000:39, 2003). The few findings at this site put it on the top of the list of properties to be investigated during the next field season.

One archaeological site surveyed during the 1999 field season warrants further discussion, although the site does not contribute directly to the focus of this dissertation. Upon examining 23CN750, CAR archaeologists noted a slightly elevated landmass in a grove of trees in the Wilson's Creek floodplain. Within this grove, a few unmarked fieldstones rested, which caused the archaeologists to suspect that this small grove was an unmarked historic-era cemetery dating
from the 1830s to the 1840s (Rees et al. 2000:59, 2003). This site was called the Wilson Cemetery (23CN750) and is believed to contain the remains of James Wilson, a female slave, and possibly a Cherokee chief who died while passing through the area during the Trail of Tears period (A. Holly Jones 2007, pers. comm.; Venter et al. 2011). During the summer of 1999, no early-19th century artifacts were identified, and the site was not investigated any further as part of the Delaware Town Project. However, in 2006 and 2007, the CAR received a grant through the National Parks Service to survey sites associated with the Cherokee Trail of Tears in Southwest Missouri. During that time, CAR archaeologist A. Holly Jones conducted remote sensing investigations using ground penetrating radar at 23CN570. The report of the investigation of 23CN570 was published through a travelling museum exhibit in 2007, although the GPR investigation of the Wilson Cemetery was inconclusive (A. Holly Jones 2007, pers. comm.). Lastly, in October and November of 2011, the CAR performed additional excavations in the area surrounding 23CN1 and unsuccessfully attempted to identify additional archaeological sites associated with Delaware occupation as part of a National Park Service Historic Preservation Fun Grant awarded to the Delaware Tribe of Indians in Bartlesville, Oklahoma (Venter et al. 2011).

During the 2000 summer field season, CAR archaeologists Mark A. Rees and Gina S. Powell continued the search for the Gillis Trading Post Complex and Delaware Town. In all, CAR visited six sites, but two, 23CN571 and 23CN455, were more intensely investigated, due to the presence of early-19th century
artifacts retrieved from these locales. The results of these preliminary investigations in 1999 and 2000 have been published in a CAR report (Rees et al. 2000, 2003). During the course of the field season, no intact features were identified. Historic-era artifacts were retrieved only from the surface and the plow zone contexts. At 23CN455, historic artifacts were confined to a small 20 m x 40 m area at the tree line adjacent to the river, indicating that the artifacts had been displaced due to plowing and subsequent erosion. The historic-era artifact assemblages from the 1999 and 2000 field seasons are summarized below (Table 10). In all, only sixteen ceramic, metal, and glass artifacts and less than a handful of unidentifiable iron scraps were retrieved in two field seasons at 23CN455. Just north of the Wilson's Cemetery 23CN750, site 23CN571 yielded 120 ceramic sherds, although many of them were from the late-19th century. No earlier 19th century features or artifacts were identified during the project because they may have been disturbed by later building activities (Rees et al. 2000:53). For the two years following the close of the 2000 field season, no further work was done by CAR within the Delaware Town Project area. In 2011, limited archaeological survey was conducted by CAR in conjunction with the Delaware Tribe of Indians, but no new additional archaeological sites or features associated with early-19th century Delaware occupations were identified (Venter et al. 2011).

TABLE 10

EARLY-19TH CENTURY ARTIFACTS RETRIEVED FROM THE 1999 AND 2000 FIELD INVESTIGATIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23CN455</td>
<td>Glass, bottle Aqua, translucent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glass, button Black, opaque</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron, harness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron, cut nail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron, knife</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron, unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic, Pearlware Undecorated</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic, Whiteware Flow blue decoration</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic, Whiteware Blue, hand painted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic, Whiteware Undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic, Pearlware Undecorated</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN571</td>
<td>Ceramic, Whiteware Blue, hand painted</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic, Whiteware Undecorated</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic, Pearlware Undecorated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN750</td>
<td>Iron, cut nail</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson's Cemetery</td>
<td>Bone, polished Bead fragment?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN834</td>
<td>Glass, bottle Colorless</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic, Pearlware Undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Rees et al. 2000).

**The Delaware Town Archaeological Project, 2003-2005**

The site of 23CN1 is located in present-day Christian County, Missouri (historically, a part of Greene County until 1859) at Township 27N, Range 23W, and Section 12 on the Republic 7.5 minute Quadrangle (USGS 1975b). In 2003, the land upon which 23CN1 exists was sold to a landowner more amenable to archaeological research. CAR archaeologist Gina S. Powell re-initiated the 274
Delaware Town Archaeological Project. All investigations during the 2003 field season took place within a 40-acre quarter of a quarter-section in Christian County, Missouri. Shovel test probes at 20 m intervals spanned both the property northeast and southwest of the old channel of the James River that cuts through the flood plain. The shovel tests revealed subsoil under the plow zone with containing mostly prehistoric lithic flakes. Amateur archaeologist Doug Porter with the local chapter of the Missouri Archaeological Society coordinated and led the extensive use of metal detectors in the fields. The use of metal detection permitted a more focused search for historic-era materials in the form of metal objects. All property surveyed using the metal detectors on the west side of the old James River channel was devoid of any historic-era materials. This landform has been modified significantly from the early-19th century due to alluvial cutting and deposition. Any historic features on this property are either more deeply buried under alluvial sediment and would require deeper testing strategies to locate them, were lost to the river due to erosion, plowing, or flooding, or both. Figure 16 details the lands surveyed during the 1999, 2000, and 2003 field seasons on the Republic 7.5 minute topographic quadrangle map (USGS 1975b).

The shovel tests units, in general, were not successful in identifying early-19th century historic artifacts or features. They were far more useful in finding prehistoric lithic flakes, which are ubiquitous to this landscape. The data gathered using the metal detector survey was much more effective in visualizing and demarcating concentrations of metal (especially iron) material culture.
Unfortunately, most of the iron recovered in the metal detector survey was no
diagnostic to the early-19th century or was modern agricultural machinery or
fencing scrap that post-dated Delaware Town. With the combination of shovel
testing and metal detection, a locus of potential Delaware or trading post
occupation was identified on a slight rise approximately 3.8 m (10 ft.) above the
northeast half of the floodplain (Figure 17). It was on this landform that
diagnostic material remains were recovered and identified as belonging to the
Delaware Town-era. As the floodplain lowers towards the James River, its
elevation drops between 6.1 to 9.1 m (20-30 ft.) compared to the landform where
Delaware Town sits. An index of all metal detector finds from 23CN1 during the
2003-2005 field seasons is located in Appendix G.

The metal detector survey guided the placement of 15 1 m² test units that
ultimately revealed both prehistoric and historic artifacts and two features
(Feature 1 and 2) under a 25-28 cm deep plow zone. The majority of the other
test units revealed sterile subsoil below the plow zone. Seven liters of fill from
Feature 1 and 20 liters of fill from Feature 2 were saved for flotation back at the
CAR. The features and their contents will be discussed in further detail in a
separate section below. After the initial identification of early-19th century artifacts
attributed to the Delaware occupation of Southwest Missouri, I became formally
involved with the Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research
(CAR) in the investigation of 23CN1 and assisted in the planning and execution
of the next two years' field schools.
In 2004, I received grant assistance from the College of William and Mary Department of Anthropology and extensive support from Missouri State University to continue excavations at 23CN1. In the 2004 field season, there were two goals for the Delaware Town Project. The first goal was to investigate the nature and extent of Feature 2 located during the previous field season. The second goal was to survey several properties near the confluence of Finley and James Rivers in Stone County for possible Delaware-era archaeological sites and features. CAR’s Gina S. Powell and I continued using metal detector survey and intensive exploratory excavations within the 23CN1 field on a small rise southwest of Feature 2 in an attempt to find more artifact-rich features (Figure 18). An index of all metal detector findings at 23CN1 during the 2003-2005 field seasons is located in Appendix G.

We excavated five 1 m² test units (TUs 16-20) in order to discover the boundary of Feature 2 and to determine if there were additional intact features. During the 2004 season, 90 liters of Feature 2 fill was saved for flotation analysis. We soon found that there was a large additional feature (Feature 3) surrounding and encompassing the artifact-rich Feature 2. More than 50 liters of Feature 3 fill was saved and processed back at the CAR lab for flotation analysis. Feature 3 was relatively devoid of artifacts and consisted of a darker anthropogenic soil lens between the plow zone and the sterile subsoil. In order to identify the extent of Feature 3, we excavated 27 additional 1 m² units and one 40 cm² unit (Figure 19). Within this area, we bisected or fully excavated one post feature (Post 1) and two natural post-like features (Post 2 and Post 3) and three non-cultural
features (Features 4-6). The cultural features will be discussed in detail in a separate section below. All soil recovered below the plow zone (25 cm below surface) was water screened through fine mesh at a station near the James River southwest of 23CN1. All Feature 2 fill was collected for flotation while a quarter of Feature 3 fill was collected for flotation due to its large size.

In order to pursue the second goal of the 2004 Delaware Town Project field season, the project area was expanded by 160 acres (64.75 hectares) approximately 6 miles (9.656 km) south of the main 23CN1 site. The William Marshall probate and correspondence from the Richard Graham Papers indicated this area as a likely location for the William Marshall trading post, which was a short distance from another Delaware settlement called Rostingear’s (or Roasting Ear’s) Town (Greene County Archives and Records Center [1998]; Menard 1826a). Although no sites directly related to the early-19th century were found during the Stone County survey, we identified and recorded three unrelated multi-component sites (23SN1991, 23SN1993, 23SN1994) and one previously unrecorded historic cemetery (23SN1992).

We identified sites 23SN1991 and 23SN1994 while surveying the yards of two residences on the north side of Equine Valley Road. This area was selected because it is situated in the primary river terrace on the north side of the Finley River just below the bluff line. At 23CN1991, we excavated eighteen shovel test units and two metal detector “hits” isolated at the northern end of the property, closest to the steep slopes leading into the uplands to the north (Figure 20). There were historic artifacts at the site, but most of them dated from the late-19th
century to the early-21st century. Many of the non-diagnostic lithic artifacts found here were probably displaced from the uplands due to erosion and re-deposition. Table 11 details the artifacts recovered from 23SN1991 site.

At 23SN1994, 28 shovel tests placed around the farmhouse revealed a light lithic scatter and a large 20th century historic scatter associated with the farmstead (Figure 21). Across the street from the house, 17 shovel tests were continued in hopes to find areas not impacted with more recent deposits. In the field east of the farmstead, the light lithic scatter continued, but historic artifacts dating to the 20th century were found only near the road. The historic-era scatter consisted of primarily litter and objects associated from traffic on the road. Artifacts recovered from this site are detailed in Table 11. No cultural features or early-19th century artifacts were identified at this site.

The last locale investigated during the Stone County portion of the 2004 field season was an equestrian ranch south of Equine Valley Road. The area is on a slightly raised terrace above the primary floodplain on the north bank of the Finley River (Figure 22). The historic Yoachum Cemetery (also called Old Wall Cemetery and 23SN1992) is located on private property. It is a 27 m x 27 m (approximately 90 ft. x 90 ft.) cemetery surrounded by a local field stone wall that was collapsing down the slope on its southern end (Figure 23). This family cemetery served the Yoachum family whose farmstead was probably located east of the cemetery site nearer to the river. The Yoachum Cemetery houses only two extant headstones (Figure 24), although there are likely African slaves and possibly others also buried within. Oral history reports that there were as
many as 20 field stones marking the graves of slaves at the cemetery, who built the cemetery wall from local stone gathered from the bluff line to the north (Henson 1964). The gravestones read:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALCEY</th>
<th>GEORGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIFE OF</td>
<td>WIFE OF</td>
<td>WIFE OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>GEORGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORN</td>
<td>BORN</td>
<td>BORN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 23, 1805</td>
<td>Oct. 14, 1848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIED</td>
<td>Age 52yr 6m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 12, 1837</td>
<td>28d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gon too Haven</td>
<td>In Haven I rest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to documentary sources, both of these individuals' parents lived in the area during the Delaware occupation of Southwest Missouri. George Yoachum was the son of Solomon Yoachum (also spelled Yokam, Yokum, Yoachum, and Yoakam in the primary sources used in this research). Alcey Yoachum was the daughter of Augustine Friend, both of whom are mentioned in the historical documents reviewed for this dissertation (Campbell 1825f; Graham 1826g, 1826h, 1826i). It is very likely that both George and Alcey lived in the area with their parents during the time of the Delaware occupation.

Solomon Yoachum (1773-1850) is a peripheral figure in the documentary sources related to Delaware Town because he is mentioned numerous times for creating peach brandy and selling it and other liquor to the Delawares (Campbell 1825f). He is also behind the legend of the Yoachum Silver Dollar, where he claimed to have found a silver mine in the area and minted his own currency. Historian Artie Ayers suggests the source of the silver was from the illicit trade in
alcohol from the silver annuity money received by Delawares (and others) (Ayers 1982). Solomon Yoachum was one of the squatters permitted to stay on the Delaware lands and was constantly running into trouble with Indian Sub-Agent John Campbell, primarily for the sale and distribution of alcohol. Likewise, Augustine Friend (born in the 1770s) acted as a witness at the annuity distributions to the Peorias, Piankeshaws, and Weas in June 1826 at Delaware Town.

We excavated nine shovel test units within the walls of the cemetery that revealed a very light lithic scatter that is likely attributed to the prehistoric 23CN1993 site that the cemetery sits upon. No fieldstones were identified during this survey that would indicate the presence of other graves. Any stones, however, may have been removed or buried under the soil. This site is an ideal candidate for remote sensing using ground resistivity or ground penetrating radar. Yoachum (or Old Wall) cemetery, 23SN1992, is one of the oldest cemeteries in Stone County, Missouri and is eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. The cemetery is located in the midst of a lithic scatter 23SN1993. We surveyed the landform immediately surrounding the Yoachum Cemetery (23SN1992) to the east and west using pedestrian survey in areas of high visibility and 43 shovel tests measured the extent of a lithic scatter (Figure 25). Very few historic artifacts were recovered from this landform. The artifacts recovered from 23SN1991-1994 are listed in Table 11.

TABLE 11
ARTIFACTS RECOVERED FROM THE STONE COUNTY PROJECT AREA
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>23SN1991</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge House</td>
<td>Ceramic, Whiteware</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279-1</td>
<td>Glass, vessel, blue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glass, vessel, colorless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron, cut nail</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron, staple</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron, unidentified</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic, flake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23SN1992</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoachum</td>
<td>Iron, wire, twisted together</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Glass, vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279-2a</td>
<td>Lithic, hematite</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic, polychrome</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic, projectile point or knife</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic, flake</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12SN1993</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279-2b</td>
<td>Glass, vessel, transparent, colorless</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glass, vessel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glass, flat, transparent, colorless</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic, whiteware, slip-on-polychrome</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron, staple</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic, sandstone</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic, point</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic, flake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic, biface perform</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic, stone notched projectile point or knife</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic, projectile point or knife</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic, flake, utilized</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic, flake</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23SN1994</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow House</td>
<td>Ceramic, stoneware, brown slip</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic, Whiteware</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Between the 2004 and 2005 field seasons, a not-yet-surveyed four acre field to the east of Delaware Town (called 23CN1 Area B) became the subject of two remote sensing electronic resistivity surveys to attempt to identify intact
subsurface features. It was believed that this small field had not been as extensively plowed in the recent past and might yield more intact archaeological information than the largely disturbed surrounding fields. This field was also of interest because it was adjacent to a spring in one of the old channels of the James River and it was known that Chief William Anderson and Sub-Agent John Campbell’s cabins were located northeast of two freshwater springs (Figure 26).

I conducted the two separate resistivity surveys during the spring of 2005, the results of which are detailed in a separate section below. During the 2005 season, excavations began in the 23CN1 Area B to coincide with electronic resistivity anomalies identified during the surveys. In all, 17 1 m² test units attempted to “ground truth” the resistivity results. Also, metal detection survey continued in the adjacent field at the site of northeastern edge of the 23CN455, immediately south-southeast of the 23CN1 Area B field.

During the 2005 field season, excavation also continued at the main site of 23CN1. Investigating the puzzling lack of definition to the north side of the cabin floor Feature 3, six 1 m² excavation units (TUs 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54) were opened to the north of the Feature 3 cabin area to look for additional trash deposits with little success. It was suspected that the north side of cabin feature would be preserved from plow destruction based on stratigraphy information from the prior field season. Unfortunately, the ground seemed to be disturbed by deep roots scars from trees that were likely cleared for planting by burning or by bulldozer. More information about Feature 3 is located in a separate section below.
Excavations also took place to the east of 23CN1 in an area called “Area B” (Figures 27 and 28). At 23CN1 Area B, Feature 11 was filled with burned clay, charcoal, and large pieces of undecorated native pottery, which was the most significant find of the 2005 field season. Feature 11 is discussed in more detail in a separate section below. Overall, the 2005 field season was disappointing as an investigation into historic-era remains from the early-19th century because the only historic-era artifacts were found above the plow zone. However, the identification of early-Mississippian era prehistoric ceramics was exciting and significant. Such large prehistoric ceramic sherds in an open field site context are unheard of in Southwest Missouri. It is likely that the ceramics are part of a heretofore-unknown site from an early-Mississippian peripheral workshop related to the Steed-Kisker or the Pomona variant of extreme eastern Kansas (O’Brien and Wood 1998:274).

Also, during the 2005 field season, metal detector survey continued in the south portion of 23CN1 Area B inside the tree line and southeast along the north bank and floodplain of the James River to site 23CN455. The first copper/cuprous cut arrow point was recovered as an isolated surface find. In the course of the metal detector survey, 134 shovel tests were excavated on the south-southeastern edge of 23CN1 Area B and the southern edge of 23CN455. Of these metal detector anomalies, the largest proportion of finds were unidentifiable iron fragments or more recent iron agricultural parts. Only seventeen historic-era artifacts were recovered: 12 artifacts were copper/cuprous, a piece of transparent brown bottle glass, 2 small pieces of
silver, and 2 ceramics – a blue transfer print rim sherd and piece of undecorated Whiteware. Notably, the survey crew identified 14 pieces of lead waste along the southern edge of 23CN455. The presence of lead waste might imply some metalworking activity at the site, although there were no other artifacts related to metal manufacture. These remains may be evidence of Henry Schoolcraft’s visit to the area in 1818 where he examined and utilized a lead mine, the Delawares’ and/or white settlers’ exploitation of local lead resources, evidence of government appointed blacksmith James Pool, the activity of prehistoric American Indians or Osages, or the by-products from lead brought into the area by the traders and Indian Agents. Alternatively, this lead waste could be related to Franz Sigel’s August 1861 advance to the Wilson’s Creek Civil War battlefield one mile north of 23CN1. Overall, 23CN1 Area B was disappointing in its sparse density of historic artifacts and lack of features, but it proved to be a useful exercise in remote sensing. Appendix G details all of the 23CN1 and 23CN455 metal detector finds during the 2003-2005 field seasons.

Three field seasons at 23CN1, mostly excavating a single early-19th century cabin feature and engaging in extensive efforts to locate more features, reveals the ephemeral quality of these early-historic period native sites in Southwest Missouri. In Indiana, years of archaeological survey, guided by much more comprehensive historical documentation regarding the whereabouts of White River Delaware settlements, resulted in the identification of exactly zero sites of Delaware ethnic identity and only a few sites of the late-18th century that were of indeterminate (likely non-native) ethnicity (McCord 2002; Wepler 1980a,
1980b; Yann 2009). In fact, there are no known archaeological sites in the United States of known Delaware patrimony between Delaware Town (23CN1) and the Playwicki site in Pennsylvania (Moore 2008; Stewart 1999). Other archaeological sites are noted in Kraft's *The Lenape, Archaeology, History, and Ethnography* (1986), Grumet's *Historic Contact: Indian People and Colonists in Today's Northeastern United States in the Sixteenth Through Eighteenth Centuries* (1995) and Yann's *In Search of the Indiana Lenape: A Predictive Summary of the Archaeological Impact of the Lenape Living Along the White River in Indiana From 1790-1821* (2009).

Standard archaeological survey methodology using pedestrian surface survey and shovel test probes were ineffective in both Indiana and Missouri (McCord 2002; Rees 2000; Rees et al. 2000, 2003; Wilkie 1984; Yann 2009). Additionally, the use of electronic resistivity survey as a finding tool had very little success both in the amount of time required to gather resistivity data and process it and the time-intensive nature of setting up a remote sensing survey (Eaton and Mickus 2006). The most effective locational technology for 19th century artifacts was the metal detector survey in high probability fields chosen through the evaluation of primary sources. It is possible that early-19th century archaeological deposits may be more deeply buried in the floodplain of the James River Valley, but to-date no deep archaeological survey has been conducted.

Major flaws of the Delaware Town archaeological data set are the small sample size of a single household and that most of the artifacts come from a single-use or short-term use trash pit feature filled toward the end of the
Delawares' occupation. Fortunately, in terms of the number and diversity of materials found, excavations at Delaware Town can still be very informative in revealing daily practice and choices related to the strategic use of ethnic identity even in this very ephemeral context. Particularly, this archaeological data set, coupled with documentary resources, is highly informative in interpreting the complex social and political networks, the practice of identity, and the navigation of social relationships in this final chapter of this dissertation.

**Remote Sensing**

During the 2003 and 2004 field seasons, no shovel testing or metal detecting work was performed on a small 4-acre (1.618 hectare) field immediately east of the main 23CN1 site. This site has been referred to as 23CN1 Area B. This land was set aside by the project directors for remote sensing because it was in an area of high expectation for intact features related to Delaware occupation. It was an ideal candidate for remote sensing because it had never been shovel tested during the previous field seasons and was located immediately northeast of two running springs. Additionally, it had not been plowed in recent history and may have been left fallow for more than fifty years. Likewise, because it was a relatively small pocket of level land surrounded by tree lines, it was possible that this 4 acre field might not have been as extensively or as deeply plowed as the rest of the floodplain since the 1830s. We were very excited about the potential of this small field. So, the prelude to the 2005 field season began with the initiation of two separate electronic resistivity surveys in 23CN1 Area B.
Under the tutelage of Missouri State University Geologist Kevin L. Mickus, I performed the first survey with a MiniRes Earth Resistivity and IP Instrument. This instrument is a shallow DC resistivity unit machine and survey can be conducted with minimal personnel (minimum 1). The probes were aligned using the Schlumberger array and the results recorded by hand. The numeric results could be input and graphed through a RESPAC software package. The Schlumberger array permits a deeper penetration into the soil, dependent on the space between the instrument’s probes, which permits it to produce readings at different depths to create a stratigraphy profile to a depth of one-half meter, which was the maximum spacing used for this survey (Figure 29). The Schlumberger array, which is commonly used in geology, has a tendency to miss tightly aligned features like walls and ditches if the transect is positioned parallel to the features (Aspinall and Gaffney 2001).

In order to measure stratigraphy, readings were taken at each station several times. Each reading would place the probes further apart for the resistivity to be measured at deeper depths. In order to calculate the depth at which the resistivity meter recorded the electric current, the distance between the electrodes could be measured and divided in half (i.e., if the probes were placed 1 meter apart, the instrument was reading the electric resistivity at a depth of $\frac{1}{2}$ meter below the station).

One large disadvantage to this method is that it is slow. It would take about 15 minutes to finish a single station because of the number of measurements that had to be recorded by hand. Also, the readings had to be
taken when the soil was somewhat moist. During dry conditions, the instrument would not take a reading at all. At the end of the MiniRes survey, 6 north-south-aligned transect lines measured 179 stations within a 25 m² area (Figure 30). The raw data from the MiniRes survey can be found in Appendix J.

The results of the MiniRes resistivity survey (Figures 31 and 32) indicated subsurface anomalies north-northeast of a spring within an old channel of the James River. Using the data gleaned from the MiniRes transects, I set up five 1 m² units to explore the anomalies. Test Unit 66 was positioned at areas of acute spikes of high ohm resistivity at the north side of the survey area. Test Unit 66 had light scatters of charcoal and one very large piece of fire-cracked rock. Also, a 10 cm wide piece of burned animal bone with cut marks was also recovered from the unit. We positioned Test Unit 58 above a small anomaly of high resistivity at the south end of the survey area. Within the excavation unit for Test Unit 58, a large hearth feature (Feature 11) with burned charcoal, burned clay, and large prehistoric ceramics sherds was identified. Feature 11 is discussed in more detail in a separate section below.

Three Test Units (55, 57, and 62) were placed to check the intense areas of low resistivity in the southern third of the survey area. Both Test Units 55 and 57 had no observable features, but had very light amounts of charred wood, projectile points, flakes, and two historic-era artifacts: a sherd of undecorated Whiteware and an iron fragment. The historic-era materials were recovered from the plow zone. At Test Unit 62, two small fragments of glass were recovered from
the plow zone, including a light green bottle fragment, but the majority of artifacts were prehistoric lithics.

One promising anomaly on the MiniRes survey that was not investigated during the 2005 field season at 23CN1 was a conspicuous spike of high resistivity approximately three meters north of Test Units 64 and 65. This survey line (Transect F) was measured during the summer field season while excavations were taking place and the results were not processed until the fall of 2005. The exploration of this uninvestigated anomaly may be extremely useful for archaeologists interested in better understanding the prehistoric ceramic component of the site assemblage. This anomaly at the north end of MiniRes survey Line F is similar to the only anomaly caused by the only significant prehistoric feature (Feature 11) investigated from these six MiniRes explorations.

The second resistivity survey was performed on three 20 m² grids with a Geoscan RM4 machine and mapped with Geoplot software. The west half of Grid C overlapped with the MiniRes resistivity survey. The machinery for this survey was made available via a short-term loan from Missouri State Parks archaeologist Larry Grantham. A twin-probe array was used with this device and the probes were positioned 10 in. (25 cm) apart. The depth of penetration by the electrical current is roughly equal to the distance between the probes. This means that the MiniRes could only read the plow zone, since the plow zone was 25 cm deep in the adjacent field of 23CN1. It was unlikely to detect sub-plow zone features. Unlike the Schlumberger array, discussed in more detail above, the twin-probe array is a standard method used in archaeological geophysical
survey, the mechanisms of which are explained in the geophysics literature (Aspinall and Gaffney 2001).

A significant disadvantage with this survey method is that it required a much larger crew to set up the grids properly with measured rope (minimum 3). Even with one archaeologist handling the Geoscan machine and two assistants moving and relocating the ropes that marked the grid rows, each 20 m² grid took several hours to set up, record, and dismantle in ideal conditions. Due to time constraints in returning the machine to Missouri State Parks, only three grids (labeled A, B, and C) were measured immediately prior to the 2005 field season.

The Geoscan survey produced a surface map of that revealed few anomalies (Figure 33). Grid A and B were recorded on the same day and Grid C was recorded a week later after a heavy rainfall. Ground moisture is very important with electronic resistivity surveys, which is why Grid C’s readout appears very different from Grid A and B. One interesting anomaly seen at the southwest corner of Grid C and the southern edge of Grid B is an area of high resistivity. Test Unit 58 investigated the portion within Grid C, which was also noted as an anomaly in the MiniRes Line C. That test unit revealed the early-Mississippian era hearth feature with ceramics (Feature 11). It is possible that future investigations into the early-Mississippian component of 23CN1 can utilize the rest of the resistivity data at the southern edge of the Geoscan survey area.

Other anomalies at the northeast quadrant of Grid C were investigated in tandem with high ohm anomalies found in the MiniRes survey. Test Units 63, 64, 65, and 67 tested several anomalies of low resistivity within Grid C that were not
redundantly surveyed with the MiniRes equipment. Virtually no material remains from the occupation of Delaware Town were recovered from these four Test Units except for a piece of corroded iron, clear glass, and an artifact of cut silver with hammered banded decoration from the plow zone of TU 67. No features were identified in any of these units, but three small fragments of early-Mississippian grit tempered pottery were recovered from Test Unit 64. For future work, the extreme southern portion of the Geoscan survey might indicate additional areas ripe for further “ground truthing”. Although the resistivity survey proved more useful in identifying subsurface features from prehistoric time periods, there is the potential to further investigate this little known component to the assemblage of 23CN1.

**Principal Features**

During the 2003-2005 field seasons at 23CN1, eleven features and three posthole features were identified and excavated. Table 12 summarizes the feature type, its cultural affiliation, the year of excavation, and whether any feature fill was examined using flotation techniques. Of the features excavated, many of them proved to be non-cultural in nature. The confusion about these non-cultural features stemmed from the fact that many of them were the results of bioturbation caused by roots. As the roots were cleared or burned for agricultural purposes, a great deal of ash and sediment was transported downward to the level of the cultural features. In addition to the stratigraphic disturbances caused by roots, there was also considerable mixing caused by rodent burrows throughout nearly every test unit. In some cases, rodent activity
transported objects into cultural features from above as well as likely bringing some buried deposits to the surface. Only the cultural features, historic or prehistoric, are discussed below.

TABLE 12

DELAWARE TOWN 23CN1 FEATURE DESIGNATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Number</th>
<th>Cultural Affiliation?</th>
<th>Excavated</th>
<th>Flotation Sample?</th>
<th>Feature Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature 1</td>
<td>Middle or Late Woodland</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7L</td>
<td>Pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 2</td>
<td>Historic, 1820s</td>
<td>2003, 2004</td>
<td>40L</td>
<td>Subfloor storage/trash pit/former hearth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 3</td>
<td>Historic, 1820s</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>10L</td>
<td>House floor depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 4</td>
<td>Non-Cultural</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rodent burrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 5</td>
<td>Non-Cultural</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 6</td>
<td>Non-Cultural</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 7</td>
<td>Non-Cultural</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ash deposits/Root disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 8</td>
<td>Non-Cultural</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashy/Root disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 9</td>
<td>Non-Cultural</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashy/Root disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 10</td>
<td>Non-Cultural</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Root disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 11</td>
<td>Early Mississippian</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>20L</td>
<td>Hearth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 1</td>
<td>Historic, 1820s</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Half</td>
<td>Structure support post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 2</td>
<td>Historic, 1820s</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Support post?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 3</td>
<td>Non-Cultural</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rodent burrow?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excavated in 2003, Feature 1 is a small pit feature discovered below the plow zone (20 cm below ground surface) in Test Unit 13 (Figures 34 and 35).
Feature 1 is a circular pit measuring 15 cm x 15 cm that extended below the base of the plow zone at 22 cm to 28 cm below ground surface. Figure 36 details a plan and south profile drawing of the feature. All Feature 1 fill, consisting of 7 liters was saved for flotation back at Missouri State University CAR. Gina S. Powell conducted the flotation analysis and identification, detailed in Table 13. No historic-era materials were recovered from Feature 1 and the results of the flotation analysis indicated that the feature dated to the Late Woodland period, due to the presence of maize horticulture and a few flakes.

TABLE 13

ARTIFACTS AND ECOFACTS RECOVERED THROUGH FLOTATION OF 7 LITERS FROM FEATURE 1, A MIDDLE TO LATE WOODLAND PIT FEATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Botanical</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bark</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fungus</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juglandaceae sp.</td>
<td>Hickory family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nutshell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Corn Maize</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feature 1 is difficult to interpret, but may be a posthole for a lean-to, wigwam, or even a small-storage pit. The charred wood and the shape and depth of Feature 1 suggest a posthole. Curiously, all corn elements were from corn cobs and not seeds (Gina S. Powell 2013, elec. comm.). It is possible that the Feature 1 could
just as likely date to the prehistoric or historic period, but the lack of diagnostic artifacts or an AMS date to the 1820s makes clear identification untenable.

The most significant of the early-19th century features is Feature 2, which was first identified in Test Units 14 and 15 at the end of the 2003 summer field season. The feature appeared at 20 cm below the ground surface, beneath the plow zone. It continued to a depth of 47 cm below ground surface. **Figure 37** is a north profile of Feature 2 showing the extent and depth of the plow zone and Feature 2 in Test Units 14 and 15. The feature fill was notably darker due to organic materials and was filled with burned earth and charcoal fragments. All diagnostic artifacts were piece-plotted. Within the Feature 2 fill, numerous artifacts indicative of early-19th century Delaware occupation were identified including copper/cuprous and iron cones, lead balls, gunflints, copper/cuprous and silver decorative items, and numerous faunal remains. Faunal remains were identified using the CAR comparative collection in 2005 by the author. A 110-liter sample of Feature 2 fill was saved for flotation and analyzed by CAR archaeologist Gina S. Powell. The results of the botanical identification for Feature 2 are found in **Table 24** in the Dietary Habits section. The faunal materials are summarized in **Table 25**.

Feature 2 was partially disturbed due to numerous rodent burrows, which likely deposited more recent material culture into the feature fill. The most notable example of bioturbation mixing was a fragment from a celluloid harness spreader ring. Celluloid is a petroleum-based material that was only widely available to consumers after 1870. Two other fragments of celluloid harness
spreader rings were recovered in the first 10 cm level of Test Unit 9 during the 2003 field season. This post-dates Delaware Town by a half century.

Due to a lack of time, Feature 2 was not fully excavated during the 2003 field season, but it was mapped at every level below the plow zone. Figure 38 is a plan view of Test Unit 15, showing the extent of Feature 2 at 24 cm below the surface, including piece plotted artifacts and a large rodent burrow. Figure 39 is a plan view of Test Unit 15 and part of Test Unit 14, showing the extent of Feature 2 at 35 cm below the ground surface. Again, this plan shows piece plotted artifacts and rodent burrows. Figure 40 is a plan view of Test Unit 15 at a depth of 45 cm below ground surface. There are no rodent burrows at this depth, but four piece-plotted artifacts are visible. Figure 41 shows the east profile of Feature 2 in Test Unit 15, which is the direction that excavations occurred in the following year.

In 2005, excavations surrounding Feature 2 continued. Figure 42 is a north profile showing the extension of the profile from the one began in the 2003 field season. Feature 2 was found in Test Units 14, 15, 16, 18, 25, 27, 28, and 30. During that season, 32 1 m² and one 40 cm² test units were excavated in arbitrary 10 cm levels. It is important to note that for much of the area immediately surrounding Feature 2, the plow zone extended down to 25 cm below ground surface, which was deeper than the western edge of Feature 2 (Figure 43). We employed water screening of all feature fill below the plow zone and dry screened the plow zone fill using ¼" wire mesh. The artifact-rich Feature 2 was fully excavated and revealed as a large, oval trash pit (2.3 m x 1.5 m x 55
cm below ground surface). We continued to piece plot diagnostic materials. The contents of Feature 2 included mostly broken or discarded trash, including iron scissors and knives, used gunflints, ceramic sherds, silver jewelry and ornaments, copper/cuprous buttons, copper/cuprous and iron cones, lithic projectile points, and floral and faunal remains. An inventory of artifacts found in Feature 2 is located in Table 14 below.

Although the ceramic sherds in Feature 2 were very small, they were the largest historic ceramics found at 23CN1 because they had not been further broken up by repeated plowing. Even so, it was difficult to determine vessel forms except by using rim sherds on small bowls and plates (Figure 44). In some cases, even the rim sherds were so damaged as to make a vessel shape or circumference determination impossible. Ceramics, as part of the Dietary Habits artifact class are discussed in more detail below.

Upon close analysis, it became clear that Feature 2 intruded into a larger Feature 3, hypothesized to be a partially dug out log cabin floor. Figure 45 is a south profile wall showing the interface between Feature 2 and Feature 3. This profile drawing reveals that Feature 3 was dug out of the subsoil and filled in first. Then, Feature 2 was dug into the Feature 3 fill. Feature 2, the trash pit, cuts into the fill of Feature 3, the cabin feature, which indicates that Feature 2 is of a later date than Feature 3. Feature 2 can be interpreted as a dump used toward the end of the cabin’s use. The organic fill and material goods found in the large trash pit (Feature 2) were likely deposited by a single household in a single event
that may have taken a few minutes or a few days. The lack of internal stratigraphy does not point to a prolonged deposition event.

Other contents of Feature 2 include an interesting mix of trade items of American or European manufacture (nails, scissors, buttons, glass trade beads, silver jewelry, horse tack and shoes, Pearlwares, Whitewares, Stonewares, cutlery, drilled wampum shell beads, glass bottles, and flat glass) and more traditional items of native manufacture (stone pipe bowl, "recycled" prehistoric lithic tools, refashioned silver and copper decorations, copper and iron tinkling cones, and iron conical projectile point tips). Table 14 is a summary of the artifacts found in Feature 2. There are significant numbers of artifacts that qualify as personal, decorative artifacts, including buttons, ornaments, beads, bells, brooches, finger rings, earrings, and tinkling cones.

**TABLE 14**

**SUMMARY OF ARTIFACTS RECOVERED FROM FEATURE 2, NOT INCLUDING BOTANICAL OR FAUNAL REMAINS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Hand painted</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Polychrome</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decorated, unknown style</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shell-edged plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer print</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>Hand painted</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decorated, unknown style</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shell-edged plate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Ball</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned Earth</td>
<td>Burned earth</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Rectangular button or ornament</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disk button with design</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Button, undecorated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finger ring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife handle, filigree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ball-headed straight pin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morris bell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tack</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antler</td>
<td>Antler tool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Disk button</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife handle with cross-hatch design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tubular bead?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Bead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wampum bead</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Round, wound</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faceted, any color</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drawn/Tube, any color</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed, Any color</td>
<td>451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown fragment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorless, transparent</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>Light green, translucent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green, translucent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dark green, translucent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aqua, translucent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorless, translucent</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Cone</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife blade</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife handle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Folding knife</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Square nail or fragment</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cut nail or cut nail fragment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tack</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tack ring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double pot hook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J-hook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horse shoe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scissors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified scrap</td>
<td>828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin-plated Iron</td>
<td>Earring cone</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earring ball</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earring loop</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ring brooch</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finger ring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heart-shaped brooch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molded bead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convex disk with two holes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ornament</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified scrap</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Earring cone</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earring ball</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earring loop</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ring brooch</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finger ring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heart-shaped brooch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molded bead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convex disk with two holes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ornament</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified scrap</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Ball or fragment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pewter</td>
<td>Convex button front with two holes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Button fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Projectile Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landon, corner-notch (Middle Woodland)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scallorn, expanding stem (Late Woodland)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standlee, stemmed (Middle Woodland)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White River, side-notch (Middle Archaic)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tool Biface or fragment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biface tool</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biface drill tool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uniface tool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hammerstone/Core</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firearms Gunflint, English import</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gunflint, French import</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>Stone pipe with linear decoration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Burned limestone</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Sandstone cobble fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandstone fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire-cracked chert</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celluloid**</td>
<td>Harness spreader ring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a large amount of burned limestone was lost due to water screening and washing.
**Celluloid post-dates Delaware Town. Its presence is due to bioturbation.**

In addition to metal tools, the presence of stone tools in the Feature 2 assemblage is thought provoking. The ubiquitous nature of flakes in the entire river valley explains the high number of flake debitage in the feature. Yet, there are numerous stone tools curated or discarded in the Feature 2 pit. There are 10 projectile points, 8 biface tools, one drill, and one uniface scraper. The diagnostic projectile points are local to Missouri and date from the Middle Archaic period (7,500-5,000 years B.P.) to the Late Woodland period (1,600-1,000 years B.P.). There is also an antler tool in Feature 2 that may have been used in re-touching these tools or decorating the incised lines on the "cottonrock" stone pipe bowl. The conspicuous presence of lithic tools in such a number raise interesting questions about why Delawares possibly utilized, kept, and discarded them. Did Delawares find and keep them out of a sense of native affinity, to exert cultural legitimacy, or for practical economic reasons? These lithic tools form an important piece of data to analyze the practical politics of Delaware identity and will be analyzed and discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

The artifact list also points out a few cultural modifications to natural stone or earthen clay at the site that may point to the use of the Feature 2 pit. First, there were 104 fragments of burned earth that could indicate that the pit was, at one point, used as a hearth or could have been a trash pit where burned earth was later deposited. Second, there are four large fragments of burned limestone that was likely used as cabin chinking. Unfortunately, the use of flotation and
water screening methods destroyed all non-piece-plotted fragments of burned limestone because they dissolved quickly in water.

Additionally, the food remains reveal an interesting mix of cultivars and wild plants, wild game, and foodstuffs purchased from traders (e.g., eggs, chicken bones). The botanical and faunal remains found in Feature 2 are summarized in more detail below in the section concerning the Dietary Habits artifact category.

Figure 46 is an east profile wall drawing of Feature 2. This profile reveals how much deeper Feature 2 is on the south side as compared to the north. On the north side of the profile, Feature 3 is not fully excavated, which causes the drawing to appear to show Feature 3 as considerably thinner on the north side.

After finding the extents of Feature 2 and becoming aware of Feature 3, the remainder of the 2004 field season was dedicated to finding the extents of Feature 3 (Figure 47). Due to the size of Feature 3, it was bisected twice with four 25 cm wide “slot trenches” (called the NW, NE, SE, and SW Slot Trenches) in order to determine stratigraphy, depth, and to isolate a quarter of the Feature 3 fill to save for water screening and flotation. The southeast quarter of the Feature was selected and fully excavated for water screening (Figure 48). The rest of the feature, with the exception of the slot trenches, was excavated to the base of the plow zone, the extents of the feature were marked, and the rest was left for future researchers. Unfortunately, choosing the southeast quarter was a poor choice because of the thinning and obliteration of the south end of Feature 3 due to plow disturbance. Figure 49 shows the western profile of Feature 3 from the
Southwest Slot Trench. Clearly, the southern end of the feature on the left has been impacted by plow activity. Also, in the Southwest Slot Trench, a posthole (called Post 1) was identified and excavated. This figure shows one profile drawing of Post 1. It is discussed in more detail below.

One interpretation of Feature 3 that is strongly supported by the archaeological evidence is that it represents the fill of a log cabin floor. Based on the depth of the feature, the cabin was probably dug out as a semi-subterranean habitation. The dimensions of the cabin are approximately 8 m x 3.5 m (26 ft. x 11.5 ft., or 300 ft.\(^2\)) and it is aligned on a north-south axis (Figure 50). Feature 3's depth varies from only a few centimeters to 18 cm below the bottom of the plow zone. After the excavation of the floor or basin of Feature 3, at some point, the basin was filled in with clean (relatively chert-free) fill through human activity or via flood deposition. Lack of internal stratigraphy suggests that the event that filled Feature 3 occurred rapidly.

There are few square nails and fragments of flat glass, which suggests that this cabin was built from logs, which do not require fasteners like nails or screws, and it could have had at least one (or no) window. The logs constituting the cabin walls were placed in a wall trench on the west and east sides, which is evident from the profile drawings for Feature 3. Figure 51 is a north profile drawing made at the Northwest Slot Trench. On the left (west) side of the drawing, the wall trench is clearly marked and even had a large stone placed in the bottom of the trench. Likewise, the north profile drawing of the Southeast Slot Trench, in Figure 52, shows the eastern wall trench on the left. This drawing also
shows the thinning of Feature 3 on the east and south sides due to plow disturbance.

While the southern and eastern edges of Feature 3 were impacted by deep plowing, the north side of the feature was equally difficult to identify and interpret due to bioturbation from roots. The extent of damage from bioturbation can be seen in the east and south profile wall drawings of Test Unit 39 (Figure 53). The northwestern side of Feature 3 appears to be the best preserved. Figure 54 shows the east profile drawing of the Northeast Slot Trench. The Northeast Slot Trench had to be extended to find the extent of the feature. Figure 55 shows the east profile wall of the extension as well as more bioturbated and disturbed soil to the immediate north of the cabin although the end of Feature 3 is clear. The slight depression in Test Unit 47 could represent another wall trench, but it is more likely root or rodent disturbance. Lastly, Figure 56 is a north profile of Test Units 45 and 46, attempting to show the lens of Feature 3 as well as a matrix of ashy fill underneath Feature 3. The appearance of the ashy lens under Feature 3 can be seen in Figure 57. Because this ashy soil is found underneath and extending to the north of Feature 3, it is probably the result of some burning or clearing of brush immediately prior to the creation of Feature 3 and was probably done by Delawares or John Campbell, who complained about having built most of the cabins at Delaware Town in a letter in July 1825 (Campbell 1825b).

After water screening a portion of the Feature 3 fill, specifically from the southeast quarter, and taking a 5-liter sample for flotation, it is evident that the
amount of material culture in this cabin floor is sparse compared to Feature 2. In all, 2,971 artifacts or ecofacts were recovered from the fill processed from Feature 3, including 1,694 flakes, 1,050 botanical remains (from both the flotation and water screen samples), and 65 faunal elements. The flotation sample was processed by CAR's Gina S. Powell and is detailed in below in Table 15.

**TABLE 15**

**BOTANICAL REMAINS RECOVERED FROM 23CN1 FEATURE 3**

Flotation Identification performed by Gina S. Powell. Water screen identification made by CAR staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Flot</th>
<th>Water Screen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuel/Construction</td>
<td><strong>Wood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grass/Herb stem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bark/Fungus</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nut</td>
<td><strong>Carya sp. nutshell, thick</strong></td>
<td>Hickory</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Juglans sp. nutshell</strong></td>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Juglandaceae sp. nutshell</strong></td>
<td>Hickory family</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Quercus sp. nutshell</strong></td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Corylus sp. nutshell</strong></td>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Unknown</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td><strong>Zea mays</strong></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeds</td>
<td><strong>Vitus sp.</strong></td>
<td>Common Grape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Polygonum sp.</strong></td>
<td>Knotweed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Asteraceae sp.</strong></td>
<td>Aster/Sunflower</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indeterminate seeds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are numerous plant species represented in the Feature 3 samples, including maize, various species of tree nuts, grape seeds, etc. Because many of these seeds are charred, they show evidence of being culturally processed through cooking and are not deposited here through natural means. Also, the botanical collection from Feature 3 reveals a small amount of charred wood that was likely from the burning wood in a cooking fire. Notably, no hearth feature was identified in the cabin floor, unless Feature 2 was utilized as a hearth at one point. It is possible that the hearth simply was not uncovered during the excavation since three-quarters of the feature was unexcavated. There were five very large pieces of burned clay (fired earth) recovered in Feature 3. All five pieces were found in peripheral excavation units (Test Units 41, 42, 43, and 48) on the outer edge of the house or house wall. This may be all that remains of the hearth for this cabin. There is no evidence of a brick or stone fireplace associated with this cabin, but Delaware cabins east of the Mississippi River are known to have had holes in the roof to permit smoke to escape.

The faunal remains from Feature 3 were identified by the author using the CAR's comparative collection and also represent animals that were utilized as part of the diet by the people who lived in and visited this cabin. Table 16 details the faunal remains identified in the flotation and water screen samples. Faunal remains from Feature 3 were very sparse and very small. This is likely due to the probability that the residents of the cabin regularly swept the floor clean of larger bone debris, leaving only very small (and nearly all unidentifiable) remains.
behind. The only recognizable diagnostic piece of faunal evidence was the tooth of a white-tailed deer. Other bones could have been from deer, pigs, and a few smaller animals based on size classes. The majority of the remains, however, were so small that even the size of the animal could not be determined. The following size classes were used to provide some basic information about the size of the animal except in the case of the smallest of bone fragments. Size class I represents rodent to rabbit-sized animals. Size class II or III represents bones that could have been for medium to medium-large-sized animals like pigs and deer, but are not complete enough to make a clearer identification. Size III represents deer or black bear-sized animals. Size IV would be for bison or elk-sized animals, although none were found in this sample.

TABLE 16

INVENTORY OF FAUNAL REMAINS FROM 23CN1 FEATURE 3

Identification performed by Melissa A. Eaton. Numbers in parentheses indicate a separate total for burned or charred remains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>NISP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Mammalia</em>, Size Class III</td>
<td>White-tailed deer</td>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mammalia</em>, Size Class II or III</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mammalia</em>, Size Class I</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Long Bone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metapodial/Phalange</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mammalia</em>, Size Class</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>42 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Indeterminate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 details the artifacts found in the water screening and flotation samples taken of Feature 3. Of course, only a sample of the feature was excavated, so these results are incomplete.

There is something important to note about the presence of burned limestone. In Feature 3 and to a lesser extent in Feature 2, there were numerous small and large fragments of a fine-grained, dull gray burned limestone associated with this cabin. Its function is not clear, but it was probably used as chinking for the cabin or as a base for a stove or fireplace. Figure 58 is a photograph depicting the southern view of the Northwest Slot Trench. Next to the slate sign is a typical fragment of this burned limestone. Unfortunately, much of this limestone that was not piece plotted and removed was obliterated in the process of water screening and flotation because it dissolved quickly in water. Only three large pieces and numerous small pieces of burned limestone from Feature 3 remained after processing to be cataloged. More than a dozen pounds were likely lost.

**TABLE 17**

**SUMMARY OF ARTIFACTS RECOVERED FROM FEATURE 3, NOT INCLUDING BOTANICAL OR FAUNAL REMAINS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Hand painted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Polychrome</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Tubular bead with four incised</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Object Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bead Round, wound</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed Any color</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flat Colorless, transparent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vessel Pale aqua, transparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorless, translucent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Cone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Square nail or fragment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cut nail or cut nail fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified scrap</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Earring cone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ring brooch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified scrap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Projectile Point or knife, Afton, corner-notch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corner-notch, fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tool Biface or fragment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biface tool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandstone metate, fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metate fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Burned limestone</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Cobble</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandstone cobble fragment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandstone fragment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire-cracked chert</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a large amount of burned limestone was lost due to water screening and washing.

Again, the artifact assemblage of Feature 3 reveals the presence of stone tools as was present in Feature 2. The types of tools, however, are somewhat different. There are three projectile points (one is diagnostic from the Late Archaic period, 5,000-3,000 years B.P), 18 biface tools, three fragments of
metates, and artifacts indicative of stone tool production (some of which are part of the background "noise" from the prehistoric past). It is possible that Delawares were creating some stone tools to process nuts or grind corn and were finding and recycling projectile points and biface tools present on the landscape.

Because of the utility of these stone tools in answering the questions of identity and practical politics asked in this dissertation, this artifact category is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

In addition to the trash/storage pit (Feature 2) and the cabin floor fill (Feature 3), three possible structural posts were also identified. Post 1 was found in the middle of Feature 3 about 25 cm east of the Feature 2 floor pit in Test Unit 16 along the north-south midline of the cabin (Figures 59 and 60). The fill of Post 1 appeared at 40 cm below ground surface and continued to a depth of 58 cm below surface, which corresponds to the base of Feature 3 in that area (Figure 61). The fact that Post 1 is contained within the Feature 3 fill indicates that the cabin floor was partially dug out by the builders, filled with clean fill or flood alluvium, and the structural supported excavated into that fill.

Post 1 was a square/rectangular post hole/post mold 22 cm in diameter that was probably one of the central structural supports for the cabin. Compared to Feature 3 fill, Post 1 fill was filled with charcoal inclusions. In order to better understand the botanical component of Post 1, the southeast half of the feature was saved for flotation. However, there is no recorded data for Post 1 identified at the Missouri State University CAR lab. It is likely that the contents contained
little to no botanical data and the sample was discarded. Alternately, the sample may have been lost.

Post 2 is located in Test Unit 36 and first appeared immediately below the plow zone (25 cm below surface) and extended 60 cm below the ground surface. It was easily distinguished from surrounding soils due to being filled with charcoal inclusions and oxidized soil. Initially, the diameter of Post 2 was 13 cm, but as the fill was excavated, the diameter expanded to 21 cm. Figure 62 shows the southern wall profile of Post 2. The base of the fill tapered off, which caused some doubt that the feature was a burned root and not cultural (Figure 63). There is the possibility that Post 2 is a legitimate post hole with the center representing the post mold and the tapered segment representing the posthole initially excavated before positioning the post. All fill from Post 2 (approximately 20 liters) was saved for flotation and identified by Gina S. Powell. Table 18 represents the findings after analyzing the flotation sample.

**TABLE 18**

**BOTANICAL REMAINS RECOVERED FROM 23CN1 POST 2**

Identification of botanical elements performed by Gina S. Powell.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Charred?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuel/ Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fungus</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nut</td>
<td><em>Carya</em> sp. nutshell, thick</td>
<td>Hickory</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Juglandaceae</em> sp. nutshell</td>
<td>Hickory family</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Quercus</em> sp. nutshell</td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td><em>Zea mays</em></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chenopodium berlandieri</em></td>
<td>Goosefoot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vitis sp.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Common Grape</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate seeds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the trickiest determinations about whether this Post 2 feature is cultural or non-cultural is that the flotation sample revealed charred nuts and cultigens consistent with the botanical findings from Features 2 and 3. Based on the presence of these cultigens in addition to the possibility that the profile represents a post mold and a tapered posthole, it is possible that Post 2 is culturally affiliated with Delaware Town. On the other hand, the Post could indicate a natural root that burned and transported the maize and other cultivars down into the feature after Delaware Town was abandoned.

Post 3 is found in Test Unit 43 where there is considerable evidence of bioturbated soils that have impacted the clarity of Feature 3. At the base of the plow zone (20 cm below surface), a 15 cm diameter post-like feature appeared and was partially excavated. A lack of charcoal inclusions, artifacts, and the shape of the walls indicated that Post 3 was probably created through rodent activity.

An additional circular feature (Feature 4) was found under/within the cabin Feature 3 in Test Unit 20, but it appeared to be a large rodent burrow or tree root. **Figure 64** is a south wall profile drawing showing the disturbance of the bioturbation through a very shallow Feature 3 and into the subsoil. **Figure 65** is a photograph of this feature. This profile also reveals how thin Feature 3 is on its eastern side due to destruction by the plow. Feature 5 (in Test Unit 20) and Feature 6 (in Test Unit 27) also proved to be rodent burrows. The results of the
flotation analysis are summarized in Table 19. There are numerous flakes of lithic debitage in this bioturbation feature as well as three very small fish-like bone fragments. If the bones are fish, which is very difficult to tell due to their fragmented condition, they would represent the only fish present at the site. Notably, there is also a lot of charcoal from wood and bark, nutshell, and *Datura* seeds, which may have been used for medicinal or ceremonial purposes.

**TABLE 19**

**ARTIFACTS AND ECOFACTS RECOVERED FROM 23CN1 FEATURE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Charred?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Fuel</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bark/Fungus</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nut</td>
<td><em>Carya</em> sp. nutshell, thick</td>
<td>Hickory</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Juglandaceae</em> sp.</td>
<td>Hickory family</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Corylus</em> sp.</td>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Quercus</em> sp.</td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td><em>Zea mays</em></td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeds</td>
<td><em>Datura</em> sp.</td>
<td>Jimson Weed, Angel’s Trumpet</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Rubus</em> sp.</td>
<td>Blackberry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vitis</em> sp.</td>
<td>Common Grape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indeterminate seeds</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td>Size Class I</td>
<td>(possible) Fish bones</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feature 4 represents soils disturbed due to bioturbation instead of being a true posthole/post mold due to its irregular shape. Yet, the feature fill does contain some botanical elements associated with Delaware Town occupations that were carried in from Feature 2 or Feature 3 contexts.
At the commencement of the 2005 field season, excavations at the north side of the Feature 3 cabin revealed a lot of disturbance. Initially, many features (Feature 7-10) were mapped and profiled before concluding that they were simply evidence of bioturbation from rodents and burned root activity.

Feature 11 was identified in 23CN1 Area B when attempting to "ground proof" anomalies from the two electric resistivity surveys. The feature appeared at the base of the plow zone (23 cm below surface) and extended to a depth of 49.5 cm below surface. The feature extended beyond the walls of Test Unit 58 and was not completely excavated (Figure 66). The eastern half of Feature 11 was only excavated to a depth of 30 cm below surface before stopping, but the western half of Feature 11 was excavated to the bottom of the feature. The fill of the feature included heavy inclusions of burned clay, charcoal, burned limestone, and several large pieces of undecorated prehistoric ceramics made from local clay. Figure 67 is a west profile drawing of Feature 11 that shows the Feature 11 and the two flanking areas are the subsoil. A 20-liter sample from the northwestern corner of the test unit was saved for flotation, but was not analyzed since the feature was not associated with early-19th century occupations (Figure 68).

During the end of the 2005 field season, 46 ceramic sherds from the early Mississippian era were recovered from Test Units 58, 59, 64, 67 and 68 (34 sherds of this number from Test Unit 58/Feature 11) (Figure 69). Upon original consideration of these artifacts, the possibility that they could be related to early-19th century Delaware occupations seemed like an improbable scenario.
However, the possibility had to be eliminated and a small sample from a charred hickory nut was isolated from the charcoal remains excavated from the fill of Feature 11. This sample was sent to the NSF – Arizona AMS Lab at the University of Arizona in Tucson. The results, obtained in December 2009, revealed an uncalibrated 14C date of 874 +/- 39 BP (Appendix H). Using the CALIB Rev 6.0.0. calibration program with the INTCAL09 curve at the 2-sigma level (Reimer et al. 2009), Feature 11 dates to A.D. 1041-1109 or A.D. 1116-1252 (Appendix I). This clearly predates the 19th century Delaware occupation of Southwest Missouri and marks Feature 11 as contemporaneous to other early-Mississippian archaeological cultures, such as Steed-Kisker or Pomona.

The data gained from Feature 2 is the most useful in answering this dissertation’s research questions, due to its richness in the variety of artifacts and ecofacts and the fact that a majority of the feature remained intact. It is possible that the trash pit was excavated and filled at the time of the settlement’s abandonment as part of the Supplementary Treaty of St. Marys (also known as the Treaty of Council Camp) in 1829 when the Delawares ceded their lands in Southwest Missouri for more annuities and lands in the Kansas City area (Cooley et al. 1975; Tong [1958], 1959; Weslager 1978a). If so, the artifacts within Features 2 and 3 (and Post 1) would contain information about daily household trash as well as other indicators of social status, identity, and agency. Indeed, an unbroken “cottonrock” (a fine-grained dolomite limestone) stone pipe bowl of native design was recovered at the middle and top of the Feature 2 pit where it intersects with the plow zone (Figure 70). It was situated in a way that appears
intentional rather than accidental. The conspicuous placement of this pipe bowl in the middle of a trash pit may hold some special meaningful significance related to a broken treaty, a rejected political alliance, rejection of traditionalism, or as part of some ritual practice.

The lack of artifacts in the cabin (Feature 3) sharply contrasts with the richly filled trash pit. Besides for a handful of artifacts and the discovery of the square hole Post 1 along the midline of the north-south axis of the cabin, the domestic area was kept relatively clean. The fill that deposited over time in the Feature 3 is remarkably devoid of artifacts except for tiny tertiary flakes. When comparing the location of the cabin on the metal detector survey readouts, Feature 3 is notable for being almost devoid of metal artifacts. This near-absence of material culture may be useful as a locational device for nearby cabins when looking at the metal detection surveys. There are at least three rectangular areas in the metal detector survey that may indicate another swept-clean residence floor, but there are no other concentrated areas of metal analogous to a trash pit like Feature 2 within these possible features.

The artifact assemblages from Features 2 and 3 and Post 2 comprise the archaeological data set for this research. The entire flotation assemblage, which includes additional features beyond the data set, was analyzed by Gina S. Powell of Missouri State University's Center for Archaeological Research. Other botanical identification as part of water screen samples was performed by CAR staff. Tables 24, 15, and 18 present the botanical data from flotation analysis that consists of 110 liters of fill from Feature 2, more than 50 liters of fill from Feature
3, and the fill from Feature 4 that was processed using flotation techniques at Missouri State University. Glass beads, ceramics and faunal elements from Features 2 and 3 were catalogued and analyzed by the author and are presented below in Tables 27, 22, 23, 25, and 16. These major artifact categories are discussed below.

There are a few artifacts that are important for helping to date the site to the early-19th century that do not fit into the identity-based artifact classes that are discussed below. As such, the following paragraphs will briefly discuss the following two artifact categories excavated at Delaware Town: square and cut nails and flat glass.

It is known in the historical record that there was a government-employed blacksmith at Delaware Town who was provisioned through the Indian Agency and supplied with housing, iron, and tools. Likewise, there are no listings for iron nails found on the invoices disclosed by William Gillis or Louis Vallé. It can be assumed that most of the iron nails found in the early-19th century features at Delaware Town were manufactured by the local blacksmiths for use in building fasteners and fasteners of other uses. Upon examining the artifact assemblage from Features 2 and 3 and Post 2, wrought iron nails of square or rectangular cross-section make up only 25 pieces in the collection. Many of these are highly fragmented and laminar. There were also seven fragments of a drawn and cut ferrous wire that could have been a nail, but was too damaged to identify with certainty. The log cabin building technique requires few (if any) nails, which may explain the infrequent appearance of nails in the archaeological record. Instead
of utilizing their iron ration and the labor of a blacksmith for nails, the Delawares likely utilized Beauvais and Pool for primarily for horseshoes and gun repair.

When comparing the wrought, square nails at Delaware Town that were complete enough for comparison to Louisiana nail types described by Tom Wells in his 2000 article "Nail Chronology: The Use of Technologically Derived Features," it is possible to describe five specimens (22%) of the sample. Table 20 represents the nails that could be compared to the Louisiana nail types.

**TABLE 20**

**NUMBER OF NAILS FOUND AT 23CN1 AS COMPARED TO THE LOUISIANA NAIL TYPOLOGY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Louisiana Nail Type</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Number Found at 23CN1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>AD 1731-1805</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>AD 1769-1820</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>AD 1791-1836</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>AD 1809-1834</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 5</td>
<td>AD 1805-1836</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 6</td>
<td>AD 1820-1840</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Wells 2000)

By comparing the diagnostic nails at 23CN1, it is clear that they are comparable to other late-18th century and early-19th century wrought or forged nails found in Louisiana. Of course, Type 2 is different from Types 3-6 because the grain of the iron moved up and down the nail shaft, whereas it is against grain of the nail shaft in the later types. This difference in technique at Delaware Town may be explained by the presence of at least two blacksmiths. Mr. Beauvais was the government blacksmith early during the early 1820s and was replaced by James Pool.
Flat window glass is more difficult to deal with at Delaware Town. Randall Moir (1987) developed a window glass chronology for the period ranging between 1810 and 1915, but it requires a larger sample size of glass than Delaware Town provides. In Feature 2, over 100 fragments of colorless, transparent flat glass was recovered, whereas in Feature 3, only 12 pieces were recovered. It is probable that the most wealthy or high status Delawares could afford a glass window or two. Even William Gillis' dog-trot cabin had one glass window, according to the Gillis probate case. It is likely that these 115 fragments represent one window since the fragments are very small. Upon the event of the window breaking, most of the fragments made their way into the Feature 2 trash pit while a few shards lingered in the southeastern corner of the Feature 3 basin. It is important to remember that only the southeast section of Feature 3 was excavated, so it would not be appropriate to hypothesize that a window was located in that portion of the cabin without further sampling.

Artifact Categories and Analysis

Analysis of the material culture at Delaware Town began by sorting and cataloging the archaeological materials into four broad categories based on categories described by Stephen Silliman (2001:193). Silliman's groupings reflect the social aspects that are most likely to influence and be influenced by doxa and include dietary habits, bodily attire, production, exchange, burial practices, and sexual relations. The latter two categories are dramatically underrepresented in the archaeological record of 23CN1. As a result, I do not use Silliman's categories of burial practices and sexual relations in the artifact analysis related
to this study. However, sexual relations do appear in the historical record as part of archival materials (Chapter 3) and will also be discussed in the following chapter (Chapter 5).

The categories detailed above constitute a departure from the functional classification described by Stanley South (1977); however, some of the categories overlap (e.g. dietary habits and "kitchen" and "bone," bodily attire and "clothing" and "personal," production and exchange with "activities"). Additionally, some of South's categories, notably architecture and furniture, are absent from my modified classification system primarily because the sample size of one house context and an absence of furniture at 23CN1 does not warrant them. My purposes for creating this classification system is to move away from South's processual, functional-objective categories and create artifact groups that may better service a model of practical politics in interpreting theories of practice. Yet, despite moving away from South's processual and functional scheme, Silliman's categories are still functional categories that focus on categories that would have been instrumental in expressing doxic relations, such as identity. As such, much of this analysis below will be analyzed at the feature-level with Feature 2 consisting of a subfloor storage/trash pit and Feature 3 as a house basin.

The remainder of this chapter concerns the description of the four artifact classes that will be analyzed and described in context, setting the stage for further discussion in Chapter 5. Ultimately, the purpose of these artifact classes is to use them, in conjunction with the documentary record, to investigate how people at the Delaware Town communities practiced ethnic identity and
presented themselves in a larger social and political environment through daily practices. Using the Silliman's model of practical politics (2001:194) as a focus of the larger theories of practice and structuration, these seemingly innocuous artifacts of quotidian life illuminate the expressions of habitus and collusio, doxa, and practical consciousness at Delaware Town.

**Dietary Habits**

Artifacts and ecofacts associated with dietary habits are some of the most significant indicators of identity used by archaeologists for decades as artifact categories in both prehistoric and historical archaeology. Beyond fulfilling a subsistence function, materials related to foodways can also be used as signifiers of wealth, power, status, and ethnic identity (Deetz 1977). There is some ethnographic evidence describing Delaware foodways prior to immigration into Missouri that may be valuable in understanding behaviors in Southwest Missouri.

Direct observation of early-19th century Delaware food preparation and behaviors appears in missionary documents. In particular, Gipson described that Delawares ate only two meals a day although a kettle with food was available at all times for visitors and children who wanted to eat (Gipson 1938:599). Likewise, Gipson also noted that Delawares did not use forks and spoons to eat. Wooden spoons or tin dippers would serve food, but only knives and fingers were used as eating utensils (Gipson 1938:599). Documentary evidence related to eating utensils indicates that knives, tin plates, and kettles were sold, but not forks and spoons (Appendices C, D, and E).
Delaware diets have been described since the days of William Penn and probably changed little in the ensuing 200 years. Penn detailed that corn was one of the central elements of Delaware diets and was prepared in a variety of ways: roasted, boiled, baked, and fried (Myers 1970:27). Moravian missionaries also described supplementary foods such as fish, game, and other plant-based foods (both wild and domesticated) (Heckewelder 1881:193). Meat that was harvested could be broiled, roasted, or boiled. Yet, most of the deer was hunted for skins as part of the fur trade instead of for meat (White 1991:490). Again, there was probably not much in the way of major changes in diet during the early-19th century with the exception of the increased use of domesticated animals like hogs, chickens, and cattle.

At Delaware Town, the Dietary Habits class of artifacts consists of material culture associated with the preparing, storing, and serving of food and drink. It includes ceramics, cuprous cooking containers, tin cups and pans, utensils, and glassware (Table 21). It also includes plants and animal remains processed and consumed. In this section of the study, I focus my discussion primarily on the ceramic, floral, and faunal assemblages as these represent the largest segments of the artifacts and ecofacts at Delaware Town 23CN1.

**TABLE 21**

**DIETARY HABITS INVENTORY FROM 23CN1 FEATURES 2 AND 3, NOT INCLUDING PLANT OR ANIMAL REMAINS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utensils</td>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Cartouche knife filigree handle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Delaware Town ceramic assemblage includes 76 total ceramic sherds from the test units levels containing Feature 2 (58 sherds) and Feature 3 (21 sherds). When I opted to eliminate the ceramics disturbed by the plow zone and recovered from water screening, only 55 sherds make up the data set. Out of concern for sample size, I choose to include ceramic artifacts within the feature and those found nearby in the plow zone within the immediate vicinity of Feature 2. My reasoning for including ceramic sherds located in the plow zone is because artifacts are not typically moved a horizontal distance of more than 3 m² after being disturbed by the plow (Roper 1976). I chose to only include sherds found in level 3 (20-25 cm below surface) of the plow zone and feature fill for this sample.
Utilizing this strategy raises the total number of sherds analyzed in this study to 79.

The condition of the ceramic assemblage at 23CN1 made it very difficult to determine function or the minimum number of vessels (MNV), which are two measures typically used in the ceramic analysis of historical sites. The majority of sherds are smaller than 2 cm², especially those in the plow zone, but even the better-preserved sherds found within Feature 2 are rarely larger than 4-5 cm². Additionally, refitting was rare. The two sherds that could be refit are counted as two sherds in the following analysis. Figure 44 is a photo of a sample of ceramics found at 23CN1, but not all sherds in the picture are included in the sample to be discussed in this dissertation due to being found in the plow zone. For example, there were a few sherds from a yellow alkaline-glazed ceramic mug found in the plow zone and are depicted in the photograph, but they will not be discussed beyond this in the course of the study.

Diagnostic features, such as rim and foot sherds, served as the primary means by which I classified ceramics according to function, however, most vessel functions were incalculable. Those ceramics whose forms could be identified tended to fall into the following categories: plates, cups, bowls, saucers, and mugs. At Delaware Town, ceramics were used for serving and consuming food and not for long-term food storage. There is not much variety in the types of ceramics used at Delaware Town, but there are several different kinds of decoration including undecorated, shell-edged, hand painted, transfer printing, sponge decoration, and annular wares. Table 22 details the identification of 325
ceramics found in Feature 2 and Table 23 describes the ceramics recovered from Feature 3. No ceramics were identified in Post 1.

**TABLE 22**

**CERAMIC INVENTORY 23CN1 FEATURE 2 AND ADJACENT LEVEL 3 PLOW ZONE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earthenware Type</th>
<th>Vessel Type</th>
<th>Decoration type</th>
<th>Color/Motif</th>
<th>Vessel Part</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Hollow ware</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>Body or Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hand painted, underglaze</td>
<td>Blue Chinoise motif</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue indeterminate motif</td>
<td>Base/ Foot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dipped/Annular and Hand painted underglaze</td>
<td>Annular: olive Hand paint: blue indeterminate motif</td>
<td>Body or Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annular: blue Hand paint: blue floral motif</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dipped/Annular</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Base/ Foot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Molded edge, Royal Pattern</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molded Shell-Edge, Scalloped</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified form</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>Body or Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hand painted, underglaze</td>
<td>Blue floral motif</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body or Unknown</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue dot and dash</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue indeterminate motif</td>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body or Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware Type</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Molded, Shell-edge</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>Hand painted, underglaze</td>
<td>Dipped/Annular and Hand painted, underglaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified form</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Body or Unknown</td>
<td>Blue indeterminate motif</td>
<td>Annular: blue Hand painted: blue floral motif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped/Annular</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Body or Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped/Annular and Hand painted, underglaze</td>
<td>Annular: blue Hand painted: blue floral motif</td>
<td></td>
<td>Body or Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PEARLWARE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whiteware Type</th>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Molded, Shell-edge</th>
<th>Undecorated</th>
<th>Hand painted, underglaze</th>
<th>Dipped/Annular and Hand painted, underglaze</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified form</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Body or Unknown</td>
<td>Blue indeterminate motif</td>
<td>Annular: blue Hand painted: blue floral motif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped/Annular</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Body or Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand painted, underglaze</td>
<td>Blue indeterminate motif</td>
<td></td>
<td>Body or Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue floral motif</td>
<td>Body or Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Body or Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipped/Annular and Hand painted, underglaze</td>
<td>Annular: blue Hand painted: blue floral motif</td>
<td>Body or Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL WHITEWARE**

**TABLE 23**

**CERAMIC INVENTORY 23CN1 FEATURE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earthenware Type</th>
<th>Vessel Type</th>
<th>Decoration type</th>
<th>Color/Motif</th>
<th>Vessel Part</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearlware</td>
<td>Unidentified form</td>
<td>Undecorated</td>
<td>Body or Unknown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out of a total of 79 sherds, the Delaware Town ceramic assemblage is primarily Pearlware (59 sherds or 74.7% of the sample). The remainder of the sherds is Whiteware (20 or 25.3% of the sample). In the United States, Pearlware was widely available after 1790, popular by 1810, and was being replaced by Whiteware by 1820 (Nöel Hume 1972:236).

There are only three sherds from a shell-edged plate in the sample (Figure 71). Two of the Pearlware plate rims are blue with an impressed, scalloped design, which was popular between 1802 and 1832 (Miller 1987). The Whiteware plate scalloped rim is also blue, but its impressed design is straight-lined, which was popular between 1809 and 1831 (Miller 1991). The majority of ceramic decorative style at Delaware Town consists of blue underglaze hand painted floral designs, which were very popular in the between 1800 and 1820 (Figure 72) (McCorvie 1987:203). By the 1820s, blue underglaze transfer print motifs were increasing in popularity, which is another type of ceramic found at Delaware Town in small amounts (Figure 73). The transfer printed wares are
decorated using a stippling pattern in blue, which corresponds to the popularity of blue painted floral designs in the 1820s (Miller 1991:9).

The earthenware types, styles, and colors place this assemblage firmly in the 1820s, which corresponds with the Delaware occupation of Southwest Missouri. There is one aspect about the ceramics that remains puzzling, however. Based on the three inventories of goods available for purchase from William Gillis and Louis Vallé, there were no ceramics on these lists (see Appendix C, D, and E). It is possible that traders felt that ceramics were at too great a risk for breakage during transporting to Delaware Town via wagon over such rough terrain. If ceramics could not be purchased directly from the local traders, where did these few fragments come from? It might be possible that prominent Delawares purchased these ceramics from the trading factory at Piqua, Ohio, from trading houses in Ste. Genevieve or St. Louis, or may have already owned them while residing in Indiana and transported these goods to Delaware Town. Nevertheless, the presence of imported ceramics at this Delaware Town cabin indicates that this household was high status and wealthy. Although Miller’s CC Index indicates that bowls and plates were not the most expensive on the market, the United States had levied a 20% tariff on imported, refined earthenwares during this period (1991:3-4). It is difficult to fully utilize Miller’s CC Index on this assemblage due to the highly fragmented nature of the ceramics and uncertain minimum vessel count (MVC).

Another category of artifacts that fall within the Dietary Habits class are the tin-covered iron fragments that were recovered from Feature 2. In all, there
are 26 highly corroded fragments from tin cups from the 23CN1 assemblage. In his 1827 invoice for trade at James Fork, William Gillis offered six tin cups at a cost of 60 cents apiece and 11 tin pans in three sizes for $2.25-4.75 (Appendix C). Gillis’ Three Forks invoice for 1827 included only 5 tin cups and 11 pans at the same cost (Appendix D). This price and quantity is mostly consistent with Louis Vallé’s invoice for his Sac and Osage trading post although Vallé also offered dozens of tin pans in three sizes for 20-45 cents apiece (Appendix E). It is clear that Gillis’ prices for tin pans were significantly higher than Vallé’s prices for the same goods. Because Gillis was the local trader in Southwest Missouri, people at Delaware Town likely did not purchase goods at Vallé’s store at the confluence of the Sac and Osage Rivers. The rarity of inexpensive tin cups and very expensive tin pans indicate that only high status and wealthy Delawares might have been able to afford to purchase them (especially pans). Also, tin cups and pans would have been less fragile than ceramics and could have been transported on hunts or while moving through the Ozarks. Due to the condition of the artifacts, it is impossible to tell whether the fragments from Feature 2 represent cups or pans.

Glass vessels at Delaware Town seem to be rare. In the Feature 2 and Feature 3 assemblages, there are only 27 fragments. Figure 74 is a pie graph showing the frequency of different colors of vessel glass fragments found 23CN1. More than three-quarters of the assemblage is a type of colorless translucent and transparent glass that may represent two vessels. The second most common type of glass is a light green translucent glass found in Feature 2 that may all be
from the same vessel. Glass vessels were not offered on Gillis or Vallé's trading inventories and probably represent bottles used to store alcohol or "spirit glass". There are two reasons that glass bottles are probably absent from the inventories of traders. The first reason is the extremely fragile nature of glass and the need to transport it over very difficult terrain by wagon into Southwest Missouri. The second, and more important, reason is that the Indian Intercourse laws and trading licenses forbade the sale and distribution of alcohol, which was the primary use of glass vessels in this region and time period. The documentary record of Delaware Town indicates numerous problems with white squatters distilling alcoholic beverages and selling them to native peoples living there. John Campbell, the Indian Sub-Agent living at Delaware Town noted in many letters to his superior Richard Graham the effects of alcohol and its availability.

Other 23CN1 artifacts related to the Dietary Habits class include hunting/trapping equipment such as lead shot (Figure 75), lithic projectile points, gunflints (Figure 76), biface tools, uniface scrapers, and iron cones that may have served as arrow or spear tips (Figure 77). Hunting for meat or furs was a significant part of the subsistence and economy at Delaware Town. Not only did the fur trade supplement incomes from annuity payments, furs also helped purchase goods and were used to pay off debts. Folding knives and uniface scrapers would have helped to process those hides or butcher animals in the field. William Gillis' trade invoice lists additional items related to hunting and trapping that are not included in the archaeological record (Appendix C). He offered ten butcher knives at $2 apiece, five "Wilson's" butcher knives at $1.50
apiece, and 25 beaver traps at $3.50 apiece. Because of Gillis' involvement in the fur trade and the practice of running up Delaware debts, it makes sense that he would encourage trapping so heavily.

Utilizing iron cones as hunting tools as well as recycling prehistoric projectile points presupposes the use of bows and arrows at Delaware Town. This assertion cannot be supported in the documentary record or through archaeology beyond the presence of the projectile points. The materials from which bows would have been produced would not have survived in the archaeological record. Yet, the documentary record indicates that the Osages were using bows and arrows (as well as rifles) in letters exchanged between Chief William Anderson and General William Clark. In particular, William Anderson made the claim that his son Sesocum was killed by being shot with bow and arrow (Anderson and Killbuck 1826). It is reasonable to suggest that Delawares still had bow and arrow technology upon moving to Southwest Missouri and continued to use it (or increased its use) to counter the economic requirements of using rifles.

When considering the iron cones or recycled prehistoric projectile points as hunting implements (instead of the iron cones as personal decoration), it is important to understand the economics of hunting with rifles. According to William Gillis’ 1827 invoice for his James Fork trading house (Appendix C), double trigger rifles cost $14 and single trigger rifles cost $12 apiece. The expendable goods required to fire rifles were considerably less expensive. One hundred pounds of gunpowder was $30, 100 pieces of lead shot were $5, and
100 gunflints were $3.50. The issue was the quantity. For the entire year, Gillis only brought 10 double trigger rifles, 12 single trigger rifles, 500 pounds of gunpowder, 1,000 pieces of lead shot, and 200 gunflints. Of these items, the gunpowder was the most likely to run out. In 1826, when Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) sent requests for assistance to defend against Osage hostilities, he requested for gunpowder to be provided to Delawares and withdrawn from the Osages. The cost to repair or maintain the rifles was gratis due to the government-provided blacksmith and iron ration. A receipt for a gun repair tool kit for the blacksmith for the Delawares was identified and is found as part of Table 5 (Menard 1822c).

Artifacts related to Dietary Habits class that were more suited to the homestead included knives, pothooks, and stone metates. (Figure 78). Stone metates may have been used to process tree nuts or to grind agricultural goods like maize. It is likely, though, that much of the Delaware corn was transported to William Marshall's mill at Finley River for grinding or that Delawares purchased milled foodstuffs from nearby whites or trading posts. Likewise, the presence of corn cobs in Feature 2 and Feature 3 indicates that Delawares had cobs of corn on hand in their homes. Of course, food is absent from the three trading invoices of Gillis and Vallié. The presence of a fancy copper-handled cartouche style knife, a bone-handled knife, and numerous iron knife fragments, but no indication of spoons or forks, indicates that eating was primarily done with knives and hands. This corresponds well with how Moravian missionaries in Indiana described Delaware eating habits at the mission towns. "The household utensils consist of
a number of copper or brass kettles, iron pans, wooden bowls, tin-pails and dippers. For eating[,] they usually employ a knife only, their fingers serving them as forks" (Gipson 1838:599). These fancy knives appear on Gillis’ James Fork invoice, so it is possible to understand their value. In 1827, Gillis brought eight cartouche knives for $1.75 apiece and six inlaid knives at $3 apiece. The presence of two of these knives in Feature 2 enhances the supposition of the wealth and status of the individuals living here.

An important aspect of the Dietary Habits utilized by Delawares in Southwest Missouri involves food. There is relatively little directly recorded about diet in the documentary sources beyond provisioned food during relocation. At one point in 1822, Indian Agent Richard Graham establishes three month’s worth of rations for 2,400 Delawares on the Current River as 6 oz. of corn, 5 or 6 oz. of flour, and 2 oz. of meat per day (Graham 1822d). The documentary record also mentions consumption of deer, pork, corn, flour, pumpkins, and beans. When comparing to Delaware lifestyles in Indiana, missionary Heckewelder described Delaware diets:

The principle food of the Indians consists of the game which they take or kill in the woods, the fish out of the waters, and the maize, potatoes, beans, pumpkins, squashes, cucumbers, melons, and occasionally cabbages and turnips, which they raise in their fields; they make use also of various roots of plants, fruits, nuts, and berries out of the woods, by way of relish or as a seasoning to their victuals. (1820:193)

A large part of the Feature 2 and Feature 3 assemblage includes floral and faunal remains recovered through excavation, water screening, and flotation. All
botanical identifications were made by Gina S. Powell (2004, 2005) and all faunal identifications were made by the author. The botanical and faunal materials from Feature 3 were already presented in Tables 15 and 16.

Feature 2 contained the richest materials for organic remains, such as ecofacts, due to its role as a trash pit. The botanical data from Feature 2 is summarized in Table 24. There are at least two types of cultivated plants represented in the Feature 2 sample including corn and squash. There are also wild tree nuts, berries, fruits, and wild herbaceous plants. A significant number of these seeds or plant elements were charred, indicating they were burned or cooked. The seeds that were not charred may not have been cooked or could have been deposited in the feature by natural (not human) means. Datura, a hallucinogenic plant, may have served a ritual function to achieve an altered state of consciousness or as a healing medicine by smoking it.

TABLE 24

| Identification of Flotation elements performed by Gina S. Powell. Identification of Water Screen elements performed by CAR staff. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Flot Count</th>
<th>Water Screen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuel/Construction</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,677</td>
<td>1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bark</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bark/Fungus</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arundinaria gigantea</td>
<td>Giant cane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fungus</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twig/Vine</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grass/Herb</td>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nut</td>
<td>Carya sp. nutshell, thick</td>
<td>Hickory</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carya sp. nutshell, thin</td>
<td>Hickory</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juglandaceae sp.</td>
<td>Hickory family</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juglans sp. nutshell</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutshell</td>
<td>Quercus sp. nutshell</td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corylus sp. nutshell</td>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>Zea mays</td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Squash, rind</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buds?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeds</td>
<td>Amaranthus sp.</td>
<td>Amaranth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambrosia artemisiifolia</td>
<td>Ragweed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambrosia sp.</td>
<td>Ragweed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chenopodium berlandieri</td>
<td>Goosefoot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Datura sp.</td>
<td>Jimson Weed, Angel's Trumpet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diospyros virginiana</td>
<td>Common persimmon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fragaria virginiana</td>
<td>Wild strawberry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypoxis sp.</td>
<td>African potato/Yellow star</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panicum sp.</td>
<td>Switchgrass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paspalum sp.</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phalaris caroliniana</td>
<td>Maygrass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phytolacca americana</td>
<td>American Pokeweed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poaceae sp.</td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polygonum lapathifolium</td>
<td>Curlytop Knotweed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polygonum sp.</td>
<td>Knotweed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prunus sp., cherry size</td>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranunculus sp.</td>
<td>Buttercup</td>
<td>1, Possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhus sp.</td>
<td>Sumac</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubus sp.</td>
<td>Raspberry</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solanum ptycanthum</td>
<td>Black Nightshade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicia sp.</td>
<td>Vetch</td>
<td>2, Possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vitis sp.</td>
<td>Common grape</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbena sp.</td>
<td>Verbena</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified seeds</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although burned plant remains for fuel constitute the largest category of botanical remains, seeds from plants used for dietary purposes were isolated and analyzed separately. From Feature 2 and 3 there were 7,544 identified botanical elements sorted according to type of plant, as shown in Figure 79. The largest category of edible plant remains are charred tree nuts of various species (39%), followed by maize (31%). The third most numerous dietary botanical element comes from flowering shrubs, fruit bearing plants, or vines (17%). *Datura*, the hallucinogenic plant, represented 2% of the total edible plant remains, although it was likely to have been smoked. The remaining 11% of the sample came from grasses, gourds, cereals, flowering plants, succulents, and herbaceous plants. There is still some evidence of more traditional plant use, such as squash, goosefoot, maize, pokeweed, and purslane, including the opportunistic foraging of tree nuts and wild fruits. Of course, corn cobs were stored and sold by the traders, even though it was not part of their official trading invoice. Menard warned William Clark on 15 February 1824 that the price of a bushel of corn was rising from $1 to $2 at Delaware Town (Menard 1824).

The faunal remains from Feature 2 are summarized in Table 25. When looking at the faunal assemblages from Features 2 and 3, it is evident that the diet is far more varied than the documentary record suggests. Many of the faunal elements are very small and fragmented and were recovered during water screening and flotation. Because of the poor condition of many of these bones, it was difficult to make identifications to the taxon-level using the comparative collection at the Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research. In
some cases, unidentified fragments could be placed into size classes such as rabbit- or rodent-sized Class I, coyote- and pig-sized Class II, and deer-sized Class III. Bison would classify as Size Class IV, but none were found in this study.

**TABLE 25**

**INVENTORY OF FAUNAL REMAINS FROM 23CN1 FEATURE 2**

Identification performed by Melissa A. Eaton.
Numbers in parentheses indicate separate count of burned or charred remains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>NISP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mammalia, Size Unidentified</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rib:</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long Bone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Podial</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black bear</strong></td>
<td>Canine tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White-tailed deer</strong></td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radius</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ulna</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandible (with teeth)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Podial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phalange</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mammalia, Size Unidentified</strong></td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class II or III</strong></td>
<td>Cranium</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long bone</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phalange</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mammalia, Size Unidentified</strong></td>
<td>Long bone</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class II</strong></td>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phalange</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pig, domestic</strong></td>
<td>Mandible (with teeth)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tooth, molar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pig, juvenile</strong></td>
<td>Mandible (with teeth)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mammalia, Size Unidentified</strong></td>
<td>Long Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class I</strong></td>
<td>Femur</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tooth, incisor</td>
<td>Tooth, molar</td>
<td>Tooth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juvenile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton-tailed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rabbit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey squirrel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juvenile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern mole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodent,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indeterminate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammalia,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juvenile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird/Aves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When counting both features, 3,207 faunal elements or ecofacts were recovered. They included bones or elements from species including black bear, white-tailed deer, domestic pig (including juvenile pigs), cotton-tailed rabbits, grey squirrels, squirrels (including juvenile squirrels), eastern moles, rodents, wild turkey, chicken, turtle, freshwater mussel, and fish. By far, the most common elements come from Size Class II and Class III, from pigs or deer, although there is notable presence of ecofacts from chicken eggs and freshwater mussel shell. 

**Figure 80** is a pie chart showing the percentages of identified faunal remains in the collection of Features 2 and 3 based on the number of identified specimens (NISP). The chart disproportionately weighs both the chicken eggshells and the fresh water mussel shell fragments. Yet, the chart shows that a majority of the meat came from animals ranging from pigs to deer with some supplement of small mammals and fish. There are no bison, cattle, or horse bones at the site,
which likely indicates that cattle might not have been at the site, that horses were not eaten even in starvation conditions, and that any yield from bison hunting was not transported all the way back to Delaware Town.

Documentary sources reveal that major seasonal hunts in the late summer and possibly in winter were occurring at Delaware Town. Of course, the primary reason for this hunt was to find valuable fur-bearing animals, whereas hunting for meat was a secondary concern. According to several letters, hunting in southern Missouri was poor and, as a result, Delawares went on long-distance excursions into the southeastern Missouri Swamp, into Arkansas, into present-day Oklahoma, and Kansas Territory (Rolette 1822). The prospects of hunting so far outside of the assigned Delaware lands was dangerous, partly because of trespassing on the lands of neighboring native groups. Occasionally, government or military officials attempted to ameliorate this conflict. For example, on 29 October 1824, the commander of Cantonment Gibson Matthew Arbuckle sent the following missive to Delaware hunting parties traveling in his jurisdiction:

To the Osages, Cherokees, & other Indian Tribes on the West side of the Arkansas:

This is given to a party of Delawares [sic] Indians on their way to a Hunt between the Arkansas and Red River. I shall expect that they shall be treated with Friendship by all white men or Reds that they meet with & that no harm or injury will be done to them, their desire is to be friendly with all. (Arbuckle 1824)

Many of the deaths that occurred during the height of the conflict with the Osages occurred outside of Delaware lands while families were traveling for the hunts.
Based on correspondence, primarily from Sub-Agent John Campbell, the Winter Hunt seemed to occur between September and October (Graves 1949; Graham 1821b). The Summer Hunt took place between February and March. Apparently, Delaware Town was nearly empty during the seasonal hunts.

Menard wrote to William Clark on 15 February 1824, while most of the Delawares were gone hunting:

I past [passed] at the Dalawar [sic] on James Fork five day[s] ago. All the Dalawars [sic] Exsepte [except] [William] Anderson and five or six Famely [families] have goone [sic] to the wood to suporte [sic] them self [sic] having no corn nor games [sic] near the vilage [sic]....

Ther[e] is at this place two very hold [old] men one of them interely [sic] Being Two [sic] Cripled [sic] not very hald [old] and Seven old women. Al[l] neked [sic] and starved the[y] are in the Bound[ary] of the State of Messaung [Missouri].... (Menard 1824)

The hunts were important economically as well as for subsistence and entire families were absent from the villages for three or four months of the year, except for a few families, including Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund).

In Chapter 5, the Dietary Habits category of artifacts and ecofacts will be used to ask questions about choices being made at Delaware Town regarding the appropriation and consumption of food. Part of this discussion will involve inquiries into why Delawares at his household might have chosen to pursue some elements of traditional horticulture as well as why hunting and trapping were also considered essential elements to a Delaware ethnic identity. I will also pose questions about why the horse was so essential to Delaware subsistence...
practices to the point where it was verboten even at the point of starvation-level conditions.

**Bodily Attire**

In the artifact analysis of 23CN1, items from the Bodily Attire class are included as important indicators of personal dress and adornment, ethnic identity, gender, and class. In the context of one Delaware Town household, this group consists of trade silver, earrings, brooches, silver wire, tinkling cones, bells, and glass trade beads (Table 26). The Bodily Attire artifact class illuminates more intimate aspects of daily life at Delaware Town and may also facilitate an examination of practical politics through displays of symbolic capital, wealth, and personal identity. The Bodily Attire category partly overlaps with South's "personal" group (1977). These items are powerful in helping to illustrate the *habitus* of individual actors or agents living at Delaware Town. These artifacts are also important in understanding the expression of political and cultural view, especially in concepts of identity.

Ethnographically, there is some documentary evidence from Moravian missionaries and trading factories that describes Delaware dress and adornment in the late-18th and early-19th centuries. Heckewelder described "the present dress of the Indians... consist[s] in blankets, plain or ruffled shirts and leggings for the men, and petticoats for the women, made of cloth, generally red, blue, or black" with single-seam moccasins made of deer skin (1881:203). Likewise, Gipson described calico cloth purchased by Delawares was used to make coats, skirts, and shirts (Gipson 1938:295). For many Delawares, clothing was trimmed
in feathers, beads, silk ribbon work, and silver brooches (Gipson 1938:381, 506; Heckewelder 1881:202-203). Silver jewelry worn by Delawares included rings, bracelets, arm bands, and necklaces (Thompson 1937). Traditional clothing that was mostly discontinued or extremely rare in the early-19th century included feather blankets and mantles, porcupine quill work as trim (Newcomb 1956:90).

Within the Delaware Town assemblage, the Bodily Attire group includes cuprous and silver adornments, buttons, jewelry, and beads.

TABLE 26

BODILY ATTIRE INVENTORY FROM 23CN1 FEATURE 2 AND FEATURE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Button</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Convex button, no backing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Disk-shaped button backing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disk-shaped button with 5 holes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Button with attachment loop, RIO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GILT stamped on face, S Andard stamped on back</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Button with attachment loop, dash and dot stamped on face, PLAQUE PARIS ++S++ on back</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Button with attachment loop, starburst pattern surrounding “41” on face</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Button face with hammered circular shell pattern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Button with hammered floral design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Button, no attachment loop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Morris bell</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornament, clothing</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Oval/round faceted bead, any color</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Round molded bead, any color</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Round wound bead, any color</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rounded bead, any color</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faceted seed bead, any color</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seed bead, any color</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indeterminate bead</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tubular bead, any color</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Tubular bead</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Doughnut-shaped ornament with</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attachment hole
Flat bell-shaped ornament with attachment hole with impressed dashed line decoration
Flat rectangular ornament with attachment loop with impressed linear decoration
Flat semi-circle ornament with hatching decoration
Flat silver cut in triangular-shape with attachment holes
Flat square with beveled corners and attachment hole
Attachment hoop for ornaments

Copper/Cuprous
Flat rectangular ornament with attachment holes
Attachment hoop for ornaments

Silver
Heart-shaped brooch with attachment pin and rocking decoration
Ring brooch, complete
Ring brooch fragment
Ring brooch pins

Copper/Cuprous
Attachment pin
Ball-headed pin
Tack fragment
Tinkling cone

Personal jewelry
Silver
Finger ring

Copper/Cuprous
Finger ring

Silver
Earring attachment loop
Earring ball
Earring ball and attachment loop
Earring cone
Complete ball and cone earring with attachment loop

Unknown
Silver
Unidentified scrap/fragment
Unidentified wire

Copper/Cuprous
Unidentified scrap
Unidentified wire

*Table 26 organizes all of the artifacts from the Bodily Attire class into 14 buttons, 3 Morris bells, 491 beads, 5 clothing ornaments, 23 brooches, 1 tinkling cone, 2 finger rings, 32 ball and cone earrings, and miscellaneous or unidentified scrap.
fragments. Each one of these items would have been used to decorate one's body or clothing to express personal or group identity as part of daily life or ritual occasions.

A significant part of the Bodily Attire category consists of trade silver. Many of these objects are objects cut and incised or punctured from scrap or refashioned silver such as the triangular-shaped ornaments in Figure 81. Others are manufactured ball and cone earrings (Figure 82) and ring brooches (Figure 83). The ball and cone earrings, fashioned using molds, were very fragile. Many of the attachment loops joining the ball and cone were found as well as many crushed or deformed silver balls and cones. The ring brooches are the same as was described by Nathaniel Dodge when he observed hundreds of them adorning Chief Anderson's clothing (Graves 1949). The Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research (CAR) inquired as to the quality of the silver being used to make this jewelry. In order to determine the quality of the silver and to see if the objects were made of “German silver,” some of the artifacts were tested by C.A.I.R.N. (Cave Archaeology Investigation and Research Network) using X-Ray Florescence (XRF) in 2011. The results indicated that the silver was of very high quality (Missouri Caves and Karst Conservancy 2011). Neal Lopinot of the CAR believed the silver could not have been obtained locally and would have to have been transported westward into Missouri (Missouri Caves and Karst Conservancy 2011). Yet, the documentary record is clear that the government distributed 150 small silver ear bobs as gifts at Delaware Town on at least one occasion (Menard 1825c). Other objects in the Bodily Attire category include
copper/cuprous and silver buttons, Morris bells (Figure 84), and a tinkling cone. While silver brooches and tinkling cones are not on trade inventories, William Gillis sold ten bunches of Morris bells at his James Fork trading post for 40 cents apiece (Appendix C). It is possible that Delawares and/or blacksmith James Pool manufactured the tinkling cones on site by repurposing copper goods.

It is important to recognize the abundance of beads, including very small seed beads, as significant in the identification of Delaware Town as not simply an early-19th century white settler homestead but also as constituting a category of clothing adornment (Figure 85). In all, we recovered 491 beads from Feature 2 and Feature 3 contexts at Delaware Town, many of them in the flotation samples. Glass trade beads are almost ubiquitous at post-Contact period indigenous sites and were used to decorate clothes, bags, and other objects with culturally significant artistic motifs. Although these beads were detached from their original context and found separate, with a few exceptions strung on an iron wire (Figure 86), we can see a few patterns in the types and sizes of beads found at Delaware Town. Two beads are tubular and made of bone. One of these beads has incised and stained linear decoration. Ten beads are glass and tubular in shape (created using pulled and cut glass). Also, 27 beads were created with a combination of wound glass and molding facets. Yet, the majority of all beads (451) are what is known as seed beads. Table 27 summarizes all of the glass beads found in Features 2 and 3 in more detail.

TABLE 27

GLASS BEAD INVENTORY FROM 23CN1 FEATURE 2 AND FEATURE 3
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bead Shape</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Opacity</th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate Black/Dark Purple</td>
<td>Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>5.3 mm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate Colorless Transparent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovoid, faceted Black Opaque</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovoid, faceted Blue Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovoid, faceted Black Opaque</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round, molded, faceted Brown-red Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0 mm</td>
<td>2 pieces, re-fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round, wound, faceted Blue Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.1 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round, wound, faceted Gold-red Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.7 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round, molded Blue, dark Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.1 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round, wound Blue Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.4 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round, wound Blue Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.8 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round, wound Blue Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.0 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round, wound Blue Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.1 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round, wound Blue Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round, wound Blue Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round, wound Blue Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.9 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round, wound Blue Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.2 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round, wound Blue Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.3 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round, wound Blue Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.4 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round, wound Blue Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.6 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounded Colorless Transparent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.4 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounded Colorless Transparent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounded Blue, dark Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubular Colorless Transparent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubular White Opaque</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubular White Opaque</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubular Red Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.5 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubular Black/Dark Purple Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubular Black/Dark Purple Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubular Black/Dark Purple Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubular Black/Dark Purple Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubular Black/Dark Purple Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubular Black/Dark Purple Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed, faceted</td>
<td>Black/Dark purple</td>
<td>Translucent</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8 mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>2.3 mm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 mm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 mm</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 mm</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7 mm</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8 mm</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9 mm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0 mm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua, pale</td>
<td>Translucent</td>
<td>2.2 mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>Opaque</td>
<td>1.2 mm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 mm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Translucent</td>
<td>1.6 mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9 mm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 mm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 mm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7 mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8 mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue, light</td>
<td>Opaque</td>
<td>2.3 mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Dark</td>
<td>Translucent</td>
<td>1.8 mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purple</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 mm</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Opaque</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8 mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9 mm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 mm</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 mm</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 mm</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 mm</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 mm</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 mm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 mm</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7 mm</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8 mm</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9 mm</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0 mm</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glass trade beads appear on the trading invoices, so it is possible to tell how much they cost and how readily available they were to Delawares. In William Gillis' James Fork invoice for 1827, he listed 30 bunches of assorted cut beads to
sell for 30 cents a bunch and 25 bunches of a more "common" type of glass bead for 25 cents per bunch (Appendix C). Louis Vallé provided 25 bundles of cut glass beads for 30 cents, 20 bundles of a "common" glass bead for 25 cents per bundle and 6 bundles of an expensive type of bead for $1.50 per bunch (Appendix E).

Because seed beads are so numerous at this site, there is a larger sample size to draw conclusions from (Figure 87). Seed beads are very small and are easily lost in a standard ¼ inch hardwire mesh dry screening or water screening technique. Most of the smaller seed beads were recovered in flotation samples, and many could have been lost in the section of Feature 2 that was water screened. Figure 88 is a pie chart showing the distribution of colors for seed beads found at 23CN1. More than two-thirds (73%) of the sample consists of opaque white seed beads. Translucent and opaque aqua beads are the second most popular (12%), while opaque and translucent black beads are the third most popular (10%).

Other items that would fit in the Bodily Attire class, but that would not and did not survive in the archaeological record include fabric, feathers, and ribbons. The majority of William Gillis' 1827 trading invoice included items in this category, including 147 blankets ($2.25-$6.50), 3,366 yards of assorted fabrics ($0.12-$2.25 per yard), stroud ($30), Russia sheeting ($10.50), 51 shawls ($1.50-$8), 30 handkerchiefs ($1.50-$4), 12 feathers ($4-$9), and 45 ribbons ($0.60-$1.30) (Appendix C). This emphasis on clothing carried over from purchasing trends demonstrated at the Piqua, Ohio factory house. According to Baerreis, between
and 1804-1806, Delawares spent more than 85% of all annuity money to purchase clothing at Fort Wayne as opposed to the Miamis (30%) and Potawatomi (38%) (Baerreis 1961). Because William Gillis followed the Delawares westward into Missouri, he was already conscious of their consumer habits and stocked his store with mostly fabric items. Unfortunately, the expense to purchase fabric and make clothing means less money to spend on other goods. In 1828, William Anderson complained to William Clark:

[W]e now receive is barely enough to clothe one half of our people with one article of clothing.... And it will continue so until we can make part of our clothing ourselves, we hope that with the assistance of our great Father, it will not be long before we begin to do so. (Anderson 1828a)

It is possible that, in addition to purchasing the fabric, money was being spent to pay someone, perhaps Gillis' slaves, to make the clothes.

One additional element of Bodily Attire that would not have survived in the archaeological record is the pulverized mineral pigment vermillion. Vermillion, as body paint, held a significant ritual and symbolic role to Delawares (Yann 2009:106). In 1827, William Gillis offered ten units of imported china vermillion for $1 per unit (Appendix C). Gillis also offered china vermillion at Three Forks as did Louis Vallé at the junction of Sac and Osage Rivers.

In Chapter 5, the Bodily Attire artifact class is essential in understanding Delaware identity on a more personal level. Although fabric did not survive in the archaeological record, it was an important consumer product for Delawares in terms of the amount of annuity money and furs that were exchanged for fabric to make clothes. In addition to expressing identity through clothing, especially for
those with the financial means, other artifacts related to Bodily Attire such as beads, buttons, and ornaments also reveal choices made for personal and ethnic identity.

Production

The production group includes material culture associated with household production, clothes-making items such as scissors, needles, and pins, agricultural production, hunting and fur trapping implements, metalworking, and metal modification activities. The assemblage at Delaware Town necessitates a bias towards production activities that take place within the household because artifacts associated with hunting and trapping are not well represented within Features 2 and 3. Likewise, the few remnants of lead slag that are possibly associated with limited scale mining activities by the Delawares or blacksmith, James Pool, are poorly understood because lead fragments at 23CN1 could have been locally obtained or purchased lead that was broken or deformed. This is why the 122 pieces of lead slag and 8 pieces of iron slag are not included in this discussion. Table 28 represents the artifacts related to Production from 23CN1. This list does not include the products, which would include a multitude of artifacts ranging from lithic flakes to iron projectile point cones to animal bones. The list restricts itself to items used in production activities related to household economics or used to transform materials.

TABLE 28

INVENTORY OF PRODUCTION ARTIFACTS FROM 23CN1 FEATURES 2 AND 3  

353
I previously discussed artifacts related to hunting and trapping in the Dietary Habits artifact class. Yet, it is necessary to reiterate the important economic role that trapping or hunting animals for furs or skins was to supplement the households and communities. For example, one fur trade receipt from Menard to Lorimier dating 4 April 1822 paid $111.14 for the following items:

- 19 Bags Oil = 1183 lbs
- 198 shaved Deer skins = 473 lbs
- 14 " damaged = 20 lbs
- 2 shaved Bear skins
- 472 shaved Deer skins = 1056 lbs
- 17 [''] damaged = 27 lbs
- 6 Heavy Bear skins
- 2 " good for noth[in]g (sent Back) on 4 April
- 29 Bags Oil = 2019 lbs
- 1540# shaved Deer Skins
- 48# " inferior damgd [sic]
- 20# in hair
- 12 16ea [sic] Bear Skins
- 1 Bag Tallow = 39 lbs
- 22 Bags of Oil = 1331#
There are important items, such as scissors (Figure 89) that were utilized by people in the household to modify copper, silver, and were also probably used to cut fabric and even to help process food. Other Production class artifacts include a deer antler that appears to be a tool for sharpening and re-touching stone tools, but it may have also been used as an awl for leatherworking. Because there are several stone tools, stone cores, sandstone cobbles, and projectile points found in the Feature 2 context with this antler tool, this indicates that some Delawares were utilizing lithic resources and recycling existing points found on the landscape and modifying and using them for their purposes. The prehistoric projectile points could be interpreted as a subtle social exchange with the people who dwelled at the site in the past. Several intact projectile points were recovered from the landscape by Delawares, probably found in the context of preparing fields for planting or from erosion from upland sites. Some of these points were taken back to the household, possibly modified, used and ultimately stored in the subfloor pit. These lithics may have been used as cutting, scraping, or hunting implements or for some other unknown symbolic purpose, including kept out of curiosity or interest.

Although hardly diagnostic artifacts, the presence of 14 pieces of copper/cuprous scrap and 113 pieces of silver scrap found in Features 2 and 3 should not be ignored. Many of these pieces have evidence of cut marks, possibly from the scissors found in the Feature 2 trash pit. Just like the 115
pieces of lead slag, Delawares were utilizing, modifying, and re-utilizing different materials and resources for their own purposes.

In Chapter 5, the Production artifact class will discuss the reasons why household production for personal objects was so important in terms of Delaware ethnic identity. Unfortunately, much of what would be expected in the Production category did not appear in archaeological materials. The documentary record partially explains this absence. Much of the production activity was related to horticulture, hunting, and trapping. Each of these activities took place largely outside of the household and even far outside the villages.

**Exchange**

The Exchange artifact class will refer only to items meant to be used in direct exchange on a personal or inter-cultural level. On one hand, most of the artifacts at the Delaware Town site can be seen as the result of exchange activities due to the fur trade, however, I want this category to focus more clearly on daily practice and practical politics. As a result, this section concerns wampum beads and the stone "cottonrock" pipe bowl in addition to recorded gifts and items of exchange from the documentary record.

Wampum beads (also known as *wampumpeag*) are standardized cylindrical beads drilled and smoothed from shell. Generally, there are two colors of wampum. White wampum is drilled from whelk shell, while black or purple wampum is drilled from quahog shell (Becker 1980; Hewitt 1910). Wampum beads as items of exchange do not appear to be a prehistoric phenomenon and
arise after AD 1615. Ethnographic data indicates that traditional use of wampum was in a personal adornment context (Newcomb 1956:91).

By 1820, wampum invariably lost most of its value as a fur trade commodity, but was still an important cultural product used in reciprocal social and diplomatic exchanges between the United States government and native groups (especially with peoples originally from the eastern half of the nation) and between native groups. Wampum appears conspicuously in the documentary record from this period. In Chapter 3, a document recording wampum gifts to the Cherokees in Arkansas displays the kinds of political and diplomatic relationships fostered by wampum beads ([Cherokee Nation] 1825). At Delaware Town, 10 white-type wampum beads were recovered from Feature 2 (Figure 90).

Much of the wampum distributed by the 19th century was manufactured and sold commercially by non-natives (Hewitt 1910). Ultimately, it was the government that bought and gifted most of the wampum beads at this time to native peoples. For example, Superintendent of Indian Affairs General William Clark purchased 10,000 grains of wampum, 288 pairs of silver earrings, and numerous other gifts in 1824 alone (Clark 1824d). His distributed these items as part of peace treaty and land cession negotiations and to promote good relationships or to attempt to manipulate desired responses from tribal leaders. Yet, native leaders continued to use the wampum as gifts to other native groups to promote support in warfare and in other diplomatic relationships as gifts. The documentary record associated with Delaware Town never indicates wampum exchange from native groups to the government and only demonstrates inter-
tribal exchange. The few wampum beads recovered from the subfloor pit at 23CN1 constitute an important political symbol that is characteristic of a native political identity as "grandfathers" carried by the Delawares (and other eastern native groups) through more than two centuries of migration.

Upon reviewing the documentary record associated with Delaware Town, it is apparent that wampum exchanges occurred frequently in Missouri. Table 29 outlines every mention of wampum exchange involving the Delawares in Southwest Missouri that could be located. The exchange of wampum was a very powerful political device. Pierre Menard corresponded with John Tipton in 1825 regarding the stressed relationship between the Miamis in Indiana and the Delawares in Southwest Missouri over the deaths of several Delawares. When Tipton countered with an offer to pay only a fraction of the blood money that was asked, Menard warned, "The Delawares are very much exasperated, and unless there is a very large quantity of wampum sent, or more specie than the amount you mention to me..., I am afraid the Delawares will not be satisfied" (Menard 1825a). At least in Menard's perception, wampum still had the symbolic and cultural value to be used in lieu of money to pay for the deaths of the Delawares allegedly killed by Miamis. Of course, Menard is a fur trader and may have been clinging to the older use of wampum as monetary exchange as part of the fur trade, a practice that was mostly discontinued by 1825.

TABLE 29
EXCHANGES OF WAMPUM INVOLVING DELAWARES BETWEEN A.D. 1822 AND 1831.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 1822</td>
<td>Delawares in SW Missouri</td>
<td>Stockbridge Nation in New York</td>
<td>Ten one-yard strings of white wampum. Asking for part of annuity money</td>
<td>Hendricks 1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1822</td>
<td>Delawares in SW Missouri</td>
<td>Muheconnuk [Mohican or Stockbridge] Nation in New York</td>
<td>Asking for part of the annuity money gained from land sales (may be the same wampum from February)</td>
<td>Graham 1822, 1822i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1824</td>
<td>Delawares and Other groups supervised by Clark</td>
<td>William Clark, U.S. government</td>
<td>10,000 grains of wampum as diplomatic gifts</td>
<td>Clark 1824d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1825</td>
<td>Cherokees in Arkansas</td>
<td>Various Emigrating groups, including Delawares</td>
<td>1 bunch of white wampum. To encourage unity</td>
<td>[Cherokee Nation] 1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1825</td>
<td>Delawares in SW Missouri</td>
<td>Miamis in Indiana</td>
<td>Request to exchange wampum to settle reparation for Delaware deaths</td>
<td>Richardville et al. 1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1825</td>
<td>Cherokees in Arkansas</td>
<td>Delawares in SW Missouri</td>
<td>Peace wampum sent in advance of Cherokee-Pawnee hostilities</td>
<td>Campbell 1825d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1826</td>
<td>Delawares in SW Missouri</td>
<td>All the surrounding nations, specifically the Cherokees and Sacs</td>
<td>To go to war with the Osages</td>
<td>Graham 1826e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1827</td>
<td>Delawares in SW Missouri</td>
<td>Cherokees in Arkansas and Shawnees in SW Missouri</td>
<td>To ask for Delawares to speak on their behalf to U.S. government about conflicts with Osages</td>
<td>Anderson 1827a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1827</td>
<td>Delawares in SW Missouri</td>
<td>Scattered Delawares living among the Kickapoos</td>
<td>To encourage Delawares to move to Delaware Town</td>
<td>Graham 1827c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location 1</td>
<td>Location 2</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1828</td>
<td>Delaware Nation in SW Missouri</td>
<td>Miamis in Indiana</td>
<td>Request to exchange wampum to settle reparation for Delaware deaths</td>
<td>Menard 1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1830</td>
<td>Sandusky Delawares on the Muskingum River</td>
<td>Delawares in SW Missouri</td>
<td>To building friendship with emigrating Delawares</td>
<td>Menard 1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1831</td>
<td>Delawares in Kansas</td>
<td>Pawnees in Kansas</td>
<td>To cultivate friendship</td>
<td>Dougherty 1831a, 1831b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(delivered in October)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to point out that the Miamis' request to exchange wampum with the Delawares in 1825 and 1828 may or may not have been accompanied with actual wampum beads. In these cases, the letters are not clear on the matter.

Smoking pipes are also included in the Exchange artifact class. Only one stone pipe is part of the artifact assemblage at Delaware Town, although one sherd from a white clay tobacco pipe was found in the plow zone. Tobacco smoking can be thought of as a personal habit of consumption, but I argue that this particular pipe was probably used as part of social and diplomatic relations, probably with the Cherokees in Arkansas in 1825 or 1826. In a few pieces of correspondence, wampum beads were also sent with tobacco and, presumably, with pipes (e.g., Anderson 1827a).

Likewise, William Clark purchased and used tobacco as a gift in preparation for land cession treaties (Menard and Vallé 1828). The Delawares received one keg (196 lbs.) of tobacco in that exchange. Pipes, although not like the stone pipe at Delaware Town, were also part of William Gillis' trade invoice.
for his James Fork establishment. In 1827, he took 24 pipe tomahawks to sell for $3 apiece. Of course, there are also numerous accounts of tobacco being delivered to Delaware Town for trade or as provisions. In 1821, Menard charged the Indian Agency $231 for transporting seven loads of goods, including tobacco, to the Delawares (Menard 1821d). In 1821, 25 lbs. of tobacco was worth $5 and a keg was worth $30.75 (Menard and Vallé 1821a, 1821c). Tobacco was symbolically powerful as a medium of gift exchange at Delaware Town.

Thus, 10 wampum beads and a stone pipe bowl constitute the artifacts in the Exchange class. Gift giving or reciprocal exchange is an important part of relationship maintenance and the gaining or maintaining of status. Although gift-giving behavior is not easily visible in the archaeological record, with the assistance of the documentary record, some evidence of important social, symbolic, and political exchanges can be gleaned from the information obtained in this research. In fact, just a few small objects from 23CN1, wampum beads and a stone pipe bowl, will speak a lot in terms of the practical politics of Delaware Identity in the final chapter.

Artifact Conservation

In 2005, with the financial support of the Missouri Archaeological Society and the Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research (CAR), many iron artifacts recovered from the field investigations surrounding Delaware Town were subject to active stabilization and conservation techniques. In all, 32 iron artifacts were stabilized between February and June 2005 at the Center for Archaeological Research. Some of these artifacts came from 23CN1 Feature 2,
others were found in the metal detector survey the Feature 2 context or piece plotted artifacts recovered from the plow zone.

Each of these 32 artifacts underwent active conservation measures to stabilize them from further oxidation and deterioration using mechanical cleaning, passive soaking techniques in de-ionized water to remove chlorides, chemical dehydration, and the application of a plastic consolidant barrier. A full draft report of the goals, methods, and results of these conservations efforts is located in Appendix K.

Conclusions

Between 2003 and 2005, the Delaware Town Archaeological Project accomplished something that had not been done despite decades of investigations: locate solid evidence of historic Delaware occupations outside of Lenapehoking. In all, during the 2003-2005 field seasons, 69 1 m² and one 40 cm² excavation unit were opened, revealing, 6 cultural features and 3 “post hole” features at 23CN1. The most important of these features for this study is Feature 2, the storage or trash pit that may have been used as a hearth at one time, and Feature 3, the dug-out, rectangular cabin floor aligned on a north-south axis.

Yet, this chapter also reveals how difficult it was for archaeologists to find Delaware Town in the first place. After decades of research into the lives of white traders and the Delaware villages in Southwest Missouri, 23CN1 was labeled as Delaware Town long before any evidence of Delaware occupation had been excavated or even collected in surface collections. Pedestrian survey, shovel test probes, and metal detector survey searched the area surrounding the James
River intensively for two years in 1999 and 2000 with few early-19th century artifacts to show for it. In 2003, in the very last week of the field school season, metal detector survey indicated a high probability area on Peridge soils on the eastern side of an old James River channel. Thus, Delaware Town was finally found in the artifacts from a partially uncovered Feature 2.

During the 2004 field season, more intensive excavations completed the investigation of Feature 2 and uncovered a cabin floor, Feature 3, as well as other features and posthole features. Yet, during that season, efforts continued to try to locate other Delaware village settlements or trading houses further down the James River at the mouth of the Finley River. As a result, four new sites were recorded, although none of them were associated with Delaware Town.

Before the start of the 2005 field season, two separate electronic resistivity surveys were initiated by the author in an untested field called 23CN1 Area B with the assistance of the Missouri State University Department of Geology and the Missouri State Parks Archaeology Division. Using two different machines configured in two different ways. The MiniRes survey using the Schlumberger array was slow, but far more informative than the Geoscan survey because the former could penetrate deeper than the plow zone at the site. In an effort to "ground truth" the results from these two resistivity surveys, several test units investigated the anomalies. Although no additional Delaware-era sites were located during the 2005 season, a significant early Mississippian hearth feature with prehistoric plain-bodied ceramics was uncovered.
The difficulty of finding Delaware Town and the failure to find additional Delaware-era sites is not a new problem. Duncan Wilkie with Southeast Missouri State University searched for early-19th century Shawnee and Delaware sites along Apple Creek for a decade with no success despite the longer occupation and far less agricultural disturbance than in Southwest Missouri. Also, William Wepler and Beth McCord searched for Delaware sites along the upper west fork of White River in central Indiana for decades without success due to agricultural and urban destruction of those sites. Even in Lenapehoking, more recent Delaware sites had been obliterated by the chisel plow and only the more deeply buried gravesites or habitation deposits have been excavated.

Despite the luck of finding intact cultural deposits in plowed agricultural fields in Southwest Missouri, the deep plowing at the site (20 cm or more) deeply impacted the site of Delaware Town. If the cabin floor (Feature 3) had not been substantially dug out and the trash pit (Feature 2) dug into that floor, it is likely that the entire cabin site would only exist as scattered and mixed remnants in the plow zone. Indeed, that might be the fate of many of the other houses and wigwams that occupied this early-19th century landscape. Even Feature 3 shows signs of obliteration on its southern and eastern sides by a thinning of the cultural feature due to the plow following the slope of the landform towards the river. Likewise, the north end of the cabin is disturbed because of intense bioturbation from rodents and roots.

Finding additional sites and expanding excavation in the 23CN1 area is also compounded by difficulties arising from the cherty soil and the ubiquitous
background “noise” of prehistoric flakes on every surface. Digging in Southwest Missouri is slow and finding features is difficult due to the large amounts of chert and limestone in every shovel test and test unit except in the loess of the flood plains. Also, the efforts to bypass the difficult digging in Southwest Missouri soil by using remote sensing strategies was generally a failure with the exception of metal detection. Although, metal detection often found more recent historic artifacts than diagnostic early-19th century objects.

An additional challenge to finding Delaware town is the dispersion of the villages up and down the river. Having to look for multiple, small clusters of houses surrounding important clan leaders along an area of several miles is challenging. In addition to the dispersed settlement pattern, Delaware Town was not occupied intensively for long. Arguably, houses would have been used for only 6 or 8 years before being abandoned for Kansas. Also, many of the houses were abandoned for part of the year while Delaware families engaged in long-distance hunts. Documentary records indicate that at certain times of year, the villages were depopulated except for the elderly and the invalid.

Further excavations need to take place due to the danger posed from rapid urbanization expanding south from the Springfield-Nixa-Ozark metropolis. These building projects often flatten the terrain using bulldozers, which would impact and destroy sites in the uplands. A continued threat in the area is flood plain horticulture, which has mostly been discontinued in the area immediately surrounding Delaware town except for fields close to Highway 13. The continued
cycle of plowing and soil erosion bode poorly for any remaining intact sub-
surface cultural features, historic and prehistoric.

The archaeological finds from 23CN1, although representing a single
household, are revealing in terms of the daily lives of Delawares who are poorly
represented in the scant documentary record association with the 1820s. The
artifacts and ecofacts were sorted into four general categories based on Stephen
Silliman's method to illuminate *habitus* and practical politics at Rancho Petaluma.
These four categories were Dietary Habits, Bodily Attire, Production, and
Exchange. Feature fill from Features 2 and 3 are especially enlightening of the
choices being made in terms of diet, personal adornment, and identity. The latter
two categories had fewer artifacts to analyze. One issue is that much of the
production at Delaware Town probably occurred outside of the household.
Hunting and fur trade activities likely occurred in the field, although production of
personal adornments of copper or silver and re-using prehistoric lithic tools from
the surrounding landscape took place in the household context. With these four
artifact classes, it is possible to ask and answer questions about Delaware
identity and the *habitus* of practical politics, which will be the focus of Chapter 5.

Many 19th century American Indian sites associated with the fur trade are
evaluated based on the level of acculturation or adoption of non-traditional
technology and lifestyles over native lifeways. Instead of asking questions about
acculturation, this study finds it more interesting to view this fascinating mixture
of native and European goods in terms of ethnic strategies and choices related to
group affiliation. When using the instrumental approach interpretation of ethnic
identity in quotidian behaviors and garbage, we can begin building on understanding of the complex relationships involved in everyday practices like choosing to pursue traditional agriculture or purchasing foodstuffs in order to spend the resulting free time metalworking or long distance hunting and fur trapping. Also, this study will use this data to hypothesize about why some choices were made. Did the Delawares have their resident blacksmith produce conical iron projectile point tips because of a shortage in firearms, to emulate the Osage, or to reinforce their identity as “Indians”? Were prehistoric stone tools recycled because they were convenient, because they were trying to connect with people from the past, or because they were attempting to reclaim a more traditional hunting or hide processing tool? How do these choices fit into the web of identity politics as it is understood for the 1820s?
FIGURE 11. Location of Delaware Town Project Area in Christian County, Missouri. (Map from Republic Quadrangle 7.5 Minute Series, USGS 1975b. Courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 12. Project Area in Stone County at the Confluence of James River (left) and Finley River (center). (Map from Highlandville Quadrangle 7.5 minute Series, USGS 1975a. Drawing by author.)
FIGURE 13. Relief Map of Ozarks Mountain Region. Delaware Town is just south of Springfield, Missouri in the Springfield Plateau. (Map courtesy of Public Domain, Tosborn 2007, based on SRTM 3 arc second DEM.)
FIGURE 15. Typical Pattern of Soils and Parent Material in the Peridge-Huntington (now Peridge-Dapue) Association. 23CN1 is located on Peridge soils. (Image from Dodd 1985.)
FIGURE 16. Delaware Town Project Area in Christian County, Missouri Indicating Locations Investigated During 1999, 2000, and 2003 Field Seasons. (Map from Republic Quadrangle 7.5 minute Series, USGS 1975b. Courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 17. Topographic Map of 23CN1 Showing the Location of Metal Detector Finds and Test Units 1 through 15. Metal Detector finds are marked by the light-toned numbers. Test Units are indicated by squares. The two 1 m² units in the upper left are Test Units 14 (left) and 15 (right) where Feature 2 was identified. (Courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 18. Photo of 23CN1 Excavations at Feature 2. Photo is looking southeast and the James River is located in the tree line on the right. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 19. Map of Test Units at 23CN1, not including Area B. Each TU, except 26, is 1 m$^2$. (Drawing by author.)
FIGURE 20. Map of Shovel Test Units at 23SN1991. (Drawing by author.)
FIGURE 21. Map of Shovel Test Units at 23SN1994. (Drawing by author.)
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FIGURE 22. Photo Taken from 23SN1994 Looking Southeast to 23SN1992. Photo is taken from Equine Valley Road and 23SN1992 is in the grove of trees on the right. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 23. Map of Shovel Test Units at 23SN1992. (Drawing by author.)

Grave 1 — George Yoachum
Born Mar 16, 1796
Died Oct 14, 1848
Age 52y 6m 28d
In Haven I rest

Grave 2 — Alice Wife of
George Yoachum
Born Apr 23, 1805
Died Mar 12, 1837
Gone Too Haven

Oral history reports nine unmarked slave burials here.
FIGURE 24. Photo of Headstones at Historic Yoachum (Old Wall) Cemetery 23SN1992. Photo is looking eastward. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 25. Map of Shovel Test Units at 23SN1993. (Drawing by author.)
FIGURE 26. Photo of Freshwater Spring Located South of 23CN1 Area B. Photo is looking northeast. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 27. Map of Test Units Excavated at 23CN1 Area B. (Drawing by author.)
FIGURE 28. Map Showing Test Units Excavated at 23CN1 Areas A and B. (Drawing courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 29. Illustration of Electrode Alignment in the Schlumberger Array for MiniRes Electronic Resistivity Survey at 23CN1 Area B. The potential electrodes, marked P, remain stationary. The two current electrodes, marked C, move to locations marked C1, C2, C3, and C4 to take readings at increasing depths. (Drawing by author.)
FIGURE 30. Map of MiniRes Survey Transects and "Ground Truthing" Test Units at 23CN1 Area B. (Drawing by author.)
FIGURE 31. MiniRes Transect Lines A, B, C, and E at 23CN1 Area B.
(Courtesy of Kevin L. Mickus.)

Line A. 37 m transect. North is right.

Line B. 37 m transect 1 m west of Line A. North is right.

Line C. 37 m transect 1 m west of Line B. North is right.

Line E. 20 m transect 7 m east of Line D. North is right.
FIGURE 32. MiniRes Electronic Resistivity Transect Lines F and D at 23CN1 Area B. (Courtesy of Kevin L. Mickus.)

Line F. 10 m transect 5 m east of Line E. North is right.

Line D. 38 m transect 5 m east of Line A. North is right.
FIGURE 33. Results of Geoscan Resistivity Survey. Grid A is Center. Grid B is right. Grid C is left and was surveyed immediately after rainfall. Grid C overlaps with MiniRes Transect Lines A, B, and C. Top of page is south. (Courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 34. South Profile Drawing of Test Units 13 and 11, including Feature 1. (Drawing by author.)
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Figure 35. East Profile Drawing of Test Units 12 and 13, including Feature 1.

(Drawing by author.)
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FIGURE 36. Plan View and South Profile Drawing of Feature 1. (Drawing by author.)
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FIGURE 37. North Profile Drawing of Feature 2 in Test Units 14 and 15.
(Drawing by author.)

Ap = 10YR 4/6 silt loam – inclusions include ceramics, bone, flakes, PPK, iron nails
Feature 2 = 10YR 3/3 silt loam, abundant charcoal, burned earth, flakes, PPK, ceramics, cuprous and iron cones, bone, copper bell, bone button, lead
B = 7.5YR 5/8 clay loam, sterile
FIGURE 38. Plan View of Test Unit 15 and part of Feature 2. (Drawing by author.)
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FIGURE 39. Plan View of Test Units 14 and 15, including part of Feature 2. (Drawing by author.)

23CN1
TU 14, 15
Feature 2
24 cm bd

PP7 Bone
23cm bd
PP8 ceramics
24cm bd
PP9 bone
24cmbd
PP10 PPK
25cm bd
PP11 ceramics
26cm bd
PP12 deer bone
23cm bd
PP13 Iron cone
30cm bd
PP14 Iron cone
30cm bd
PP15 Bone
29cm bd
PP16 Gun Flint
32cm bd
PP17 bone
30cm bd
PP18 Scraper
32cm bd
PP19 limestone
27cm bd
PP20 Deer
mandible
34cm bd
PP21 bone
29cm bd
PP22 Iron rod
31cm bd
FIGURE 40. Plan View of Test Unit 15, level 4, including part of Feature 2. (Drawing by author.)
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FIGURE 41. East Profile Drawing of Feature 2 in Test Unit 15. (Drawing by author.)
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FIGURE 42. North Profile Drawing of Feature 2 in Test Units 30 and 16.
(Drawing by author.)
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FIGURE 43. Photo of East Profile of Partially-Excavated Feature 2. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 44. Photo Displaying the Variety of Ceramics Recovered from 23CN1, including Plow Zone Finds. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 45. South Profile Drawing of Northwest Slot Trench showing the Interface of Features 2 and 3. (Drawing by author.)
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FIGURE 46. East Profile Drawing of Features 2 and 3. The north side of Feature 3 was not excavated to the base. (Drawing by author.)
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FIGURE 47. Plan View of Features 2 and 3. Bisecting lines represent location of slot trenches. (Drawing by author.)
FIGURE 48. Photo of Excavated Feature 2 and Partially Excavated Feature 3. Photo is looking east. Note the excavated Northeast Slot Trench is Visible on the left side of Feature 3. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 49. West Profile Drawing of Feature 3 in the Southwest Slot Trench. (Drawing by author.)
FIGURE 50. Plan Drawing of Features 2 and 3, including Test Unit Numbers. (Drawing by author.)

[Plan Drawing Image]
FIGURE 51. North Profile Drawing of Features 2 and 3 at the Northwest Slot Trench. (Drawing by author.)
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FIGURE 52. North Profile Drawing of Feature 3 from the Southeast Slot Trench. (Drawing by author.)

Feature 3 = 7.5 YR 4/4 silty loam, flakes and charcoal inclusions
Subsoil = 7.5 YR 5/6 silty loam, manganese nodules

408
FIGURE 53. East and South Profile Drawings of Test Unit 39 and Feature 3. (Drawing by author.)

East Profile:
- **PZ** - 7.5 YR 4/4 silt loam, flakes, ceramics, iron nails
- **Feature 3** - 7.5 YR 4/4 silt loam, burned clay, charcoal, flakes
- **Bioturbation** - 5 YR 8/8 mottled with 7.5 YR 6/2
- **Rock**

South Profile:
- **PZ** - 7.5 YR 4/4 silt loam
- **Feature 3** - 7.5 YR 4/4 silt loam
- **Bioturbation** - 7.5 YR 4/4 mottled with 10YR 5/3
- **Rock**
FIGURE 54. East Profile Drawing of Feature 3 at Northeast Slot Trench.

Drawing by author.
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FIGURE 55. East Profile Drawing of the Extension of the Northeast Slot Trench. (Drawing by author.)

Feature 3 = 7.5YR 4/4 silty
Subsoil = 7.5YR 4/6 clay loam

FIGURE 56. North Profile Drawing of Feature 3 in Test Units 45 and 46. (Drawing by author.)

Plow Zone = 7.5 YR 5/6 silty loam
Feature 3 = 7.5 YR 4/4 silty loam, ashy fill
Ash Fill = 15YR 4/3 silty loam
FIGURE 57. Photo of Test Unit 46 showing Ashy Disturbance in Level 4. Photo is facing westward. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 58. Photo of Burned Limestone in Test Unit 30. Note the Northwest Slot Trench cutting through the Test Unit. Photo is facing south. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 59. Photo of Post 1 in the Southwest Slot Trench. Photo is facing north-northwest. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 60. Photo of Bisected Post 1 and Profile. Note the large flake in the wall. Photo is facing south-southeast. The slate incorrectly reads Feature 2 and should read Feature 3. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 61. South Profile Drawing of Post 1. (Drawing by author.)

Feature 1—7.5YR 4/4 with charcoal inclusions
Subsoil—7.5YR 5/8 silty loam
Feature 3—7.5YR 4/4 silty loam
FIGURE 62. South Profile Drawing of Post 2 in TU 36. (Drawing by author.)
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FIGURE 63. Photo of Bisected Post 2 and Profile. Photo is facing north. 
(Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological 
Research.)
FIGURE 64. South Profile Drawing of Bioturbation/Feature 4. (Drawing by author.)
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FIGURE 65. Photo of Bisected Bioturbation/Feature 4. Note the charcoal inclusion and the irregular shape of the feature. Photo is looking east. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 66. Plan View of Test Unit 58 and Feature 11 in 23CN1 Area B. (Drawing by author.)
FIGURE 67. West Profile Drawing of Feature 11, the Prehistoric Hearth.
(Photo by author.)
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FIGURE 68. Photo of Bisected Feature 11. Note the prehistoric ceramics in north wall. (Photo Courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 69. Photo of Early Mississippian Ceramics Recovered From Feature 11. The body color is an oxidized orange. The darker areas are carbonized from contact with fire. (Photo by author.)
FIGURE 70. Photo of Stone Pipe Bowl *in situ*. Found in Test Unit 30 at 20 cm below ground surface. Photo is facing west. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 71. Photo of Three Impressed Blue Shell-Edged Plate Rims. The two on the left are Pearlware and the one on the right is Whiteware. The sherd on the bottom is a mug handle fragment found in the plow zone. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 72. Photo of Hand Painted Underglaze Floral Ceramics. The three sherds on the left are rims from small bowls. The sherd on the left is from a cup or mug and is green. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)

FIGURE 73. Photo of Blue Underglaze Transfer Print and Blue Hand Painted Underglaze Ceramic Sherds. The three sherds on the left are from plates. The two sherds on the left are transfer printed. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 74. Pie Graph Showing the Proportion of Vessel Glass Colors.
(Figure by author.)

Glass Vessels at 23CN1

- Light Green, Translucent: 14%
- Green, Translucent: 1%
- Dark Green, Translucent: 3%
- Aqua, Translucent: 1%
FIGURE 75. Photo of Lead Shot from 23CN1. The Minie Ball in the upper left was from the plow zone and may be related to Franz Sigel's forces near the Battle of Wilson's Creek. The three objects on the bottom row were also found in the plow zone and are a lead shot, a piece of cut and flattened lead, and an iron gun sear from a rifle. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 76. Photo of Imported Gunflints found at 23CN1. The two gunflints in the top row were found in the plow zone. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 77. Photo of Metal Cones Found at 23CN1. These iron and cuprous cones have been alternatively explained as tinkling cones or as projectile point tips. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 78. Photo of Two Iron Knives Found at 23CN1. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 79. Pie Graph Showing the Proportion of Floral Remains at 23CN1, not including Unidentified Elements. Plants are lumped together in the broader categories mentioned in Table 4-2. (Figure by author.)

Botanical Elements from 23CN1

- Gourd Grass 3%
- Cereal 1%
- Vespertine plant 2%
- Flowering plant 1%
- Legume 1%
- Succulent plants 1%
- Fruit-bearing plant 7%
- Flowering shrub 10%
- Herbaceous plants 4%
FIGURE 80. Pie Graph Showing the Proportions of Faunal Remains at 23CN1, Not Including Unidentified Elements. Mammal size class III includes deer and bear. Size class II includes coyote and pig-sized creatures. Size class I includes rabbits, squirrels, and rodents. Mammal size class II or III are unidentified mammal remains that could be class II or III. The disproportionate size of the fowl category is due to the number of egg shell remains. (Figure by author.)
FIGURE 81. Photo of Trade Silver Bodily Attire Ornaments from 23CN1. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 82. Photo of Silver Balls from Ball and Cone Earrings. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 83. Photo of Silver Ring Brooches Found at 23CN1. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 84. Photo of Copper/Cuprous Ornaments from 23CN1. There are two Morris bells on the left and three buttons. The tab on the lower right was found in the plow zone. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 85. Photo Glass Beads found at 23CN1. Most of these beads are lamp wound and/or faceted. The colors of the top row are (from left to right) black, white, with the remainder being blue. The bottom row (from left to right) is black, white, red under orange enamel, and brown-red. The last two beads are from the plow zone. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 86. Photo of Opaque Aqua-Colored Glass Wound Trade Beads found on an Iron Wire. The beads are 9 mm in diameter. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)

FIGURE 87. Photo of Glass Seed Beads found at 23CN1. Top row colors are (left to right) aqua, aqua, blue, black, black. The rest are white. The right-most specimen on the second row from the bottom is a crinoid stem. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 88. Pie Graph Showing Proportions of Glass Seed Bead Colors. (Figure by author).

Seed Bead Colors at 23CN1
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FIGURE 89. Photo of Production Artifacts from 23CN1. Two iron scissors, a butcher knife, and a folding knife were found in Feature 2. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
FIGURE 90. Photo of Drilled Shell Wampum Beads from 23CN1. (Photo courtesy of Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research.)
CHAPTER 5: PRACTICAL POLITICS AT DELAWARE TOWN

After presenting research produced from both historical documentary research and archaeological research pertaining to the early-19th century site of Delaware Town on the James Fork of White River in Missouri, this final chapter of the dissertation consists of both a thorough discussion of the findings and a conclusion discussing the limitations and significance of this research. The discussion focuses on the research questions posed in Chapter 1, follows up on the four historical themes presented in Chapter 3, and explains the four artifact classes established in Chapter 4 in terms of the theoretical frameworks of practical politics, ethnic identity, practice, and borderlands outlined in Chapter 2. This chapter weaves the various threads of evidence together into an interpretive narrative that asks the ultimate questions: What was the functional utility of a Delaware identity at Delaware Town, how was it constructed through daily practice, and what could it be used to accomplish?

I argue that Delaware ethnic identity and cultural representations are an extremely important framework through which Delaware Town must be interpreted. It is in southern Missouri that a fundamental aspect of Delaware identity, such as their status as preferred clients to the government and as "grandfathers" to other eastern native groups, becomes threatened due to initial
non-recognition by both the western Superintendency of Indian Affairs and through encounters with new groups like the Osages. Ultimately, this dissertation claims that Delawares in Missouri went through conspicuous and material efforts to re-exert their ethnic identity status and corresponding social capital as "grandfathers" in order to subvert challenges to, and devaluation of, their long-held station. Moreover, as this discussion will attempt to demonstrate, the 1820s is a period of re-assertion of traditional Delaware ethnic identity politics in multiple ways and levels, even within daily practice seemingly unrelated to the political arena, in order to force recognition and acknowledgement of the power of Delaware ethnic identity.

In Chapter 3, I outlined four hallmarks of Delaware identity. First, Delaware ethnic identity was balanced with both intrinsic and extrinsic social and political dynamics. The intrinsic dynamic involved three semi-independent phratries—Turtle, Turkey, and Wolf— that co-governed even after the adoption of a principal chief. The extrinsic dynamic was the metaphoric kinship status as "grandfather" to other eastern native groups which implied certain reciprocal relationships and affinity that can be read as a kind of social capital, as defined by Bourdieu (1986). This cultural status as "grandfathers" involved Delawares into the business of neighboring groups, necessitating tributes, consultations in times of war, peacekeeping roles, and deference. Of course, "grandchildren" could influence Delawares to act on their behalf or render aid due to the reciprocal nature of the metaphoric kinship relationships.
The second hallmark of Delaware identity was related to the role of religion. Especially after the massacre at Gnadenhütten, many Delawares in the main body of the nation eschewed Christianity despite the presence of missionaries among them. Likewise, after 1805, Delaware religious revitalization movements re-imagined and re-configured traditional religion into new forms, like the Gamwing or Big House Ceremony. While some splintered Delaware (or closely related groups) like the Brotherton Indians and Stockbridge-Munsees embraced Christianity much earlier, Delawares in the main branch that immigrated to Missouri were conspicuous and intentional in their avoidance of Christianity in favor of more traditional forms of religion.

A third hallmark of Delaware identity involved the importance of warfare and the ability to engage in warfare. After being stripped of the ability to go to war and sell lands by being labeled as “women” by the Iroquois in 1742, breaking away from the Six Nations was the firebrand by which the Delawares forged a distinct ethnic identity in the 1750s. Through the process of separating from the Six Nations and “masculinizing” themselves, Delawares reinstated their right to go to war in addition to their traditional peacekeeping role. Although almost every conflict after 1750 that the Delawares engaged in involved their presence on the losing (or neutral) side, the importance of, and reasons for, engaging in warfare is a significant part of Delaware identity. As such, I argue that the unique Delaware taboo against conflict (kwulakan) does not appear to be in place at Delaware Town (Obermeyer 2003; Speck 1931). Kwulakan, as it is practiced today, probably emerged (or re-emerged as traditional ideology) during the
1850s in Kansas after Presbyterian and Baptist missionaries established themselves on Delaware lands.

The fourth aspect of Delaware ethnic identity is by no means exclusive to Delawares. It involves the thoughtful and strategic utilization of their social capital and identity in order to play two rivals against one another, build alliances, educe relationships for benefits, and eschew non-productive (or no longer productive) relationships. The Delawares were already adept at exercising their identity and station as “grandfathers” for gain, long before immigrating to Missouri, and continued to utilize their station at Delaware Town.

With these four pillars of Delaware ethnic identity in mind, I wish to reiterate how these points clearly resonate with the definitions and processes of identity and ethnicity formulated by the instrumental and interactionist theories of identity as espoused in Chapter 2. All four of these identity features involve an imagined and constructed ethnic identity that emerges and adapts to other groups and constitutes the borders of such groups, as stated in the model of Fredrik Barth. When the Delawares immigrate into Missouri, they must deal with many new socio-political configurations. They had to negotiate with new governmental structures and officials, the Osages, and emigrated eastern native groups in Missouri. Within these new contexts, the essence of Delaware identity had to be reinforced and re-exerted through social, political, and symbolic interaction and practices in order to maintain and attempt to enhance the instrumental value of such relationships.
Now, the reason that Delawares (and others) attempt to maneuver for social position is that they were accustomed to operating in what Richard White calls "the middle ground," an inclusive frontier or zone of interaction, which is a seminal framework for understanding White-Indian relationships in the 17th and 18th centuries (1992). Groups living and interacting in the middle ground "sought to accommodate each other's interest in order to further their own" (Cayton and Teute 1998:8). This dynamic process of accommodation led to "creative misunderstandings," agency, cultural mixing, new cultural and symbolic meanings, and numerous exchanges (White 1992). Yet, White concludes, as Americans begin dominating the middle ground after winning wars over other European powers, the inclusivity of the frontier grows sharply less creative and accommodating to native groups as the frontier transitions into more exclusive borderlands (1992). This is the context of Missouri in the 1820s. As Faragher already noted, the French and Spanish middle ground in Missouri with Apple Creek Shawnees and Delawares was already gone (1998). Still, I argue in the following discussion that, while becoming bordered, the remoteness of Southwest Missouri still permitted some "creative misunderstandings" and accommodations during the Delaware occupation of the 1820s.

Lastly, when contemplating the daily material conditions in a single Delaware archaeological household, I will be using Stephen Silliman's model of practical politics to interpret the archaeological assemblage (2001). To reiterate, practical politics refers "to the negotiation of politics and social position and identity in daily practices" (Silliman 2001:194). I utilize four artifact classes
outlined and analyzed in Chapter 4: Dietary Habits, Bodily Attire, Production, and Exchange, to connect my research questions pertaining to Delaware ethnic identity to the practiced and structured daily lives at Delaware Town. Silliman’s model utilizes Bourdieu’s constructs of doxa and habitus to explain the material practices of people through practice theory as espoused by Pierre Bourdieu and Anthony Giddens. As such, this dissertation asserts that the doxic universe in play concerns Delaware ethnic identity. I discuss and interpret Delaware behavior (habitus) through that lens below.

As I support in the following discussions, I argue that Delaware ethnic identity is what Bourdieu would call a field. As described in Chapter 2, field theory is a game of configured social relations. In this dissertation, the field of the game is Delaware ethnic identity. Doxa is the understanding that the game is worthwhile. Illusio is the investment or interest in the game, and habitus is the subconscious “feel” that people have for the game that guides people to act in a way that makes sense (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992:98-100). When the “game” or field of Delaware ethnic identity is questioned, threatened, or its social capital devalued, this impacts the doxa. As Silliman points out, as the rules of the game or the “taken for granted,” aspects of doxa are called into question and enter the doxic universe where the “taken for granted” is actively questioned (2001:194). As people re-open debate over doxa, some people will attempt to reinstate or replace doxa in orthodoxy. Others, however, will challenge the status quo and advocate for alternatives or multiple avenues in heterodoxy. Either way, once the rules for the game (doxa) are called into question (into the doxic universe),
consideration and debate ensues, whether orthodoxy or heterodoxy until it sinks back out of the doxic universe and back into a subconscious "rule of the game." In this dissertation, I argue that the doxa of this field involves the hallmarks of Delaware identity, in particular the special social capital and status related to their position as "grandfathers" and as preferred clients with the government.

The remainder of the discussion section of this chapter is organized into six lines of reasoning configured in a way to deal with thematic issues related to Delaware identity on multiple scales that ties the documentary and archaeological evidence into the theoretical framework entailing practical politics described above. First, I will outline the motivations and processes by which Delawares fight for recognition of their status as Delawares after moving into Missouri. Second, I elaborate on the various unifying and diverging forces impacting Delawares in Southwest Missouri. It is important to reiterate that there has never been a singular Delaware group, and it is necessary to explore this dynamic at Delaware Town. Third, I utilize information from the documentary record to examine discourse as it relates to metaphoric kinship and friendship terms used in various pieces of correspondence. This terminology is necessary to understand types of relationships and expectations of reciprocity being utilized by Delawares and others in the early-19th century. This section also examines non-linguistic symbols embedded in the Bodily Attire and Exchange artifact classes. Fourth, I consider other roles enmeshed in the daily lives of Delawares in the 1820s, including as farmers, hunters, and trappers. This section also includes a discussion of the Dietary Habits and Production artifact categories.
Fifth, I present a view to the increasingly exclusive borderland of Missouri and its portrayal of Delawares as "Indians" and as outsiders. The closing of the "middle ground" in Missouri is especially evident in the aggressive efforts to remove all native persons from within the bounds of the state, but it also encompasses a discussion of the intentional and material ethnic identity boundaries that Delawares established in Southwest Missouri that mark themselves as different from even the Apple Creek Delawares. Lastly, I wrap up the discussion of Delaware identity in the context of warfare in both the literal sense of built alliances and conflicts and in the symbolic sense of fighting to maintain their identity as "grandfathers" in Missouri and even after their removal to Kansas.

**Negotiating Delaware Identity**

As stated above and in Chapter 3, a fundamental aspect of Delaware ethnic identity and cultural representations are their metaphorical kinship status as "grandfathers" to other eastern native groups. Pierre Bourdieu would call this status a form of social capital, as defined in Chapter 2 (1986). I argue that the loss (or the perceived loss) of this social capital triggered an intensely motivated series of processes amongst the Delawares in order to re-exert that identity, reinforce alliances using such representations, and also to force others to recognize that relationship. In Chapter 3, I previously discussed the advantages of this kinship status and the resultant clientage privileges were gained from having this recognized status. The remainder of this discussion will focus on ways that Delaware identity was asserted and recognized in Missouri.
The documentary record is clear that most of the government officials in the east were familiar with the privileged clientage status of the Delawares before they moved to Missouri. Although William Clark balked at the exorbitant cost of emigrating and provisioning Delawares in December 1820, Secretary of War John C. Calhoun especially pointed out that the Department of War was “disposed to act liberally towards the Delewares [sic]” in the assignment of lands as well as provisioning them for a full year after settling on their yet-to-be-designated lands (Calhoun 1820). Delawares had been given generous terms for removal in the Treaty of St. Marys in 1818, including fully paying off debts to traders, a two year grace period before being required to remove, property in Indiana for half-breed Brotherton Delawares, annuity money, a government paid and supplied blacksmith, and secret annuities for two chiefs.

Acknowledgement of the Delawares’ status as “grandfathers” also meant a recognition that they were highly influential in the matters of eastern native groups. This was one motivation for the government to treat them so liberally. For example, William Clark understood that it would be extremely difficult to get the Kickapoos, Piankeshaws, Peorias, and Weas to remove from Missouri without first convincing the Delawares to move. The hesitation of the Delaware leadership, particularly Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) stalled land session talks for more than two years until the terms were more preferable. Part of those terms for the Supplemental Treaty of St. Marys included additional lifetime annuities. Another example of using preferred client status to influence native groups occurred in 1826 when Richard Graham transferred the deceased
Lapinihilie's lifetime annuity to his brother Captain Ketchum (Tawhelalen) in order to attempt to halt or delay war with the Osages.

One important manifestation of the Delawares' actions to re-exert and force acknowledgement of their status as "grandfathers" is evident in the Treaty of Peace and Friendship signed in September 1822 between the Delawares, their "grandchildren," and the Osages (Kansas Historical Society 1822). Immediately after recognizing that the Superintendency of Indian Affairs under William Clark and their Indian Agent Richard Graham were not aware of, or were ignoring that aspect of their ethnic identity, Delawares rallied their "grandchildren" and made sure that "grandfather" ended up in official treaty language. This action distinguished their role, not only for themselves and the U.S. government, but also for their "grandchildren" and the Osages. In particular, this treaty is significant in that it permits a certain level of political authority to the Delawares in the dispute-resolution and adjustment process involving conflicts between "grandchildren" and Osages. This is power that is ceded by the government to the Delawares that can be read as an accommodation made in the still-existent "middle ground" (White 1992).

Even though the Delawares are successful at maintaining their recognized status as "grandfathers" early in their immigration process into Missouri, I argue that constant wearing away and devaluing of this social capital necessitates that Delawares constantly re-enact their status. This means that Delaware identity moved into an active negotiation of orthodoxy as it passed into the contested space of the doxic universe. One example in which Delaware status
was undermined involved a clear bias in treating Osages as preferred clients by many Indian Agency officials (many of whom were also traders). Another example occurred when Osage involvement in the death of Sesocum was questioned, which attempted to invalidate the justice component to Delaware hostilities. Lastly, there is considerable interference and manipulation in the Delaware claims against the Miamis in Indiana which, in turn, subverts Delawares' "grandfather" status for years and probably exacerbated the issues between the two groups more so than the impact of the original claim.

Unifying and Dispersing Delaware Identities

Because it is important to recall that there has never been a unified and singular native group known as the Delawares, it is necessary to illuminate two unifying forces in Delaware identity politics as well as two dispersing forces occurring at Delaware Town. While this dissertation argues an interpretive framework based on identity, the expression of identity is not homogeneous. While some forces drew in formerly splintered groups, others grew increasingly alienated. Likewise, contingent groups of Delawares, particularly phratries, often had divergent interests that manifested in the documentary record.

For example, it is well-documented that a contingent of Delaware and Shawnees moved westward into the Apple Creek area in southeastern Missouri during and after the Revolutionary War partially to avoid living under American governments and partly to take advantage of the more inclusive frontier and trading opportunities within Spanish, and later French, territory. Therefore, the branch of Delawares that settled at Delaware Town constituted a second group
of Delawares moving westward across the Mississippi River. Some of those Apple Creek Delawares and Shawnees moved out of Missouri shortly after the Louisiana Purchase to live in present-day Texas and Oklahoma. Typically, the split between the various Delaware groups in this period is seen as relatively rigid and permanent, but there is evidence of inter-group membership exchanges both into and out of this main body of Delawares.

When Reverend Jedidiah Morse toured Missouri in 1820, he reported to the Secretary of War John C. Calhoun that there were already 1,800 Delawares encamped on the Current and White Rivers (1822:366). From the river ferry crossing at Kaskaskia near Ste. Genevieve, emigrating Delawares likely followed the Natchitoches Trace southward into the Apple Creek area on their way to the Current River. The Trace followed older prehistoric trails spanning the St. Louis area all the way to Natchitoches, Louisiana. Later, the Trace became the basis for the Southwest or Military Road (Schoolcraft 1853:139; Houck 1908a:227; Price and Price 1981:239). Some communities of as many as 800 Delawares were still present according to the 1817 Indian Census of Missouri (Western Historical Manuscript Collection 1817). Just three years later, only 400 Delawares and Shawnees were reported on Apple Creek (Temple 1966:181). Some of this number probably joined with the Delawares led by Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund). At least one major chief, Patterson (Meshaquowha), plus Twehullahlah, Lapanihilie, Tawhelalen, and Natcomin joined the White River Delawares. Other Delawares who lived on Apple Creek and joined the Southwest Missouri groups were Captain Pipe
There is also some evidence of families separating from Delaware Town. For example, the documentary record indicates that one of the small villages along the James River was Roasting Ear's village whose family left to join other western Delawares in Texas. Also, a splinter group of Delawares led by Chief Buck (Asheppan) settled north of Delaware Town with the Kickapoos until his death in 1827 (Graham 1827c). Many Delaware families were drawn south into Arkansas Territory to settle near Cherokee allies and also to the area on Red River in present-day Oklahoma. Presumably, some families wished to pursue what they felt were better lifestyles out on the Plains or even outside of the territory controlled by the United States in a more inclusive frontier zone. Indian Agent Richard Graham complained about the exodus to Red River and blamed it on fur traders who were enticing Delawares to relocate there permanently (1826e). Even William Anderson (Kikthawenund) acknowledged that many Delaware families opted to stay or remove to Red River or in Spanish Territory (Texas) rather than remove to Kansas (Anderson 1831).

This fragmentation brings up a very important question about the motivations to consolidate all of the scattered Delaware peoples onto one land (and presumably under one leadership structure). Some Delaware scholars, such as Ferguson (1972) and Schutt (1995), argued that it was the intention of Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) to unite all of the Delawares, including the Brotherton and Stockbridge-Munsees, and that this effort for unification was the
thrust of his cultural revitalization movement for the Delawares. I argue that this view is incorrect. As presented in Chapter 3, I demonstrate that there is compelling documentary evidence that it is truly the intention of government leaders, like William Clark, to relocate all Delawares (especially those still east of the Mississippi River) onto the same allotment. Based on this letter from William Clark, it is apparent that the goal of unification is desired and more beneficial for the government:

I am inclined to believe that we shall not succeed in preventing entirely depredations or disagreement of a hostile nature between these Tribes, while they are scattered in every direction through the Country. At this time a considerable portion of the Delawares, Shawnees, Kickapoos, Piankeshaws and other Tribes are scattered from the [Great] Lakes to Texas. (Clark 1826b)

Consolidation of all Delawares in one place might have seemed to Delaware leaders as a culturally strengthening move. Clark might have sincerely believed that unity equaled strength or he may have simply fostered this belief in the groups he was attempting to influence. Additionally, this move would have precluded any further need to bargain for land deals or pay for different groups to emigrate in the future. It would have also placed all of the Delawares under one leader and in a situation that could be better monitored by the Indian Agency and the burgeoning military fort system. Certainly, William Anderson (Kikthawenund) had to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of this situation. On one hand, having more Delawares to strengthen the numbers of the group could have translated into more political power and strength in warfare. Yet, more people meant more mouths to feed, more strain on local resources, increased reliance
on unpredictable agricultural yield, and annuity money that would have to be distributed amongst more people. In fact, based on William Anderson's own speeches resisting Delaware removal to Kansas in 1827 and 1828, Anderson uses Clark's desire for Delaware unification as a bargaining chip, even though Anderson appears to know that the Kansas land and the annuity money would be hard-pressed to accommodate all of his relations.

Delawares at Delaware Town were already dealing with the problem of "poor Indians" versus "rich Indians," and increasing the population would only make matters worse. Of course, due to the private annuities set forth in the 1818 Treaty of St. Marys and later in the 1829 supplemental treaty, some Delaware leaders received at least $100 a year, separate from the tribal annuity money. Also, in the documentary record, there are only a few letters that discussed the dilemma of some of the "big" Delawares, who acquired most of the annuity money, and the "little" Delawares that did not have access to that money (Campbell 1825b, 1825d). The example presented in Chapter 3 discussed the letters pertaining to Captain Killbuck, the leader of the Wolf phratry, who (along with other influential members of his phratry) would run up debts with the traders and the poorer or less influential kin would be forced to go without. More importantly, the Wolf phratry seemed to hold considerable power to pursue economic activity independent from the rest of the Delawares by engaging in trade with the traders who would be paid directly out of the annuity money.

One unifying force that was an important part of Delaware political identity was the tripartite leadership structure with, one Captain from each phratry, that
later included a Principal Chief. Certainly, Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) was the principal chief for this group of Delawares. There is also a lot of evidence that the three phratry captains were still present for much of the Southwest Missouri occupation, although there is a lot more uncertainty about the Turtle phratry than the other two. Important Turkey phratry leaders included William Anderson (Kikthawenund) and Captain Beaver (Punchhuck). Turtle leadership included Lapanihilie, Captain Ketchum (Twehullahlah), another Captain Ketchum (Tawhelalen), Ketchum (Kockkatowha), and Sarcoxie. Lastly, the Wolf phratry leadership included Captain Patterson (Meshaquowha), Captain Natcomin, Captain Killbuck, Captain Suwaunock, Captain Pipe (Tahunqueecoppi), Nonondoquomon, Pooshies, Secondine, and Toletahsey. At Delaware Town, the Turkey and Wolf phratries were always represented in major treaties and correspondence, but there were some important documents highlighted in Chapter 3 with no clear Turtle phratry representation. Also, as mentioned above, there were some economic transactions and one letter to the government signed only by members of the Wolf phratry.

While much of this section has focused on forces intrinsic to the groups and phratries of the Delawares, it is necessary to note the important unifying force acting on Delawares as they are engaging in reciprocal “grandfather-grandchildren” relationships with neighboring communities, as well as when they are joining or establishing regional confederations to deal with issues such as hostilities with the Osages. I am confident that, just as the government is aware
of the influence of the Delawares, so are the Delawares and their "grandchildren." Thus, they are surely strategically negotiating for better terms of removal from Missouri, even if it is not overt in the documentary record. One case is clear in a speech from Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) when he spoke on behalf of his grandchildren to William Clark in 1827 in matters regarding conflicts with the Osages (Anderson 1827a).

Building and maintaining close social and political relationships with neighboring "grandchildren" ethnic groups was an extension of the strength of multi-tribal regional confederations that Delawares participated in with the Five and Six Nations, the Ohio or Old Northwest Territory native alliances, with the Auglaize communities, with the revitalization movements in the early-19th century, and many other initiatives. Again, Delaware leaders used these confederations to elicit positive effects for the constituent groups. The alliance was no longer fighting against European (or American) forces, but did amass a sizable fighting force to the point where the Indian Agency was assured that the Osages would be crushed. Also, while attempting to work with, within, and (occasionally) outside of the confines of the Superintendency of Indian Affairs structure, the Delawares actively challenged and questioned policy related to removal and numerous attempts to interfere in justified warfare.

As Grandfathers, Brothers, and Children

The language, kinship, and friendship terms in particular, provide an additional point of discussion involving identity in the documentary record pertaining to Delawares in Southwest Missouri. There are numerous instances in
the primary documents studied for this research project where speakers and writers used the terms “friend” and “brother” when referring to relationships between Delawares and non-Delawares. These terms were primarily directed toward personnel employed by the Superintendency of Indian Affairs. In letters authored by non-Delawares, only two individuals, Indian Agent Richard Graham and Sub-Agent Pierre Menard directly write to the Delawares and refer to their relationship as alternatively “friends” and “brothers.” Whereas, when primary sources are authored by Delawares, Superintendent of Indian Affairs William Clark, Indian Agents Richard Graham, Pierre Menard, and Sub-Agent for the Delawares John Campbell are called “friend” and “brother.” Of course, all of this correspondence is passed through the filter of an interpreter and researchers cannot be certain which Unami (or Munsee) words were actually being spoken in the discourse.

Using this kind of kinship and friendship terminology connotes a close bond with an expectation of reciprocity. Typically, when the non-Delawares speakers use this terminology, they are attempting to influence the Delawares to act in a way that achieves a particular goal, whether requesting cooperation, vouching for traders, or to instigate removal or treaty negotiations. Delaware speakers, however, tended to use the kinship terminology more broadly and frequently. This embedded usage implies a habitual and purposeful action concerning the maintenance of the social relationship. While these affinities cannot be considered egalitarian, even when using kinship terms with other native groups, they were used to continuously foster relationships. Some of the
goals of these communications, of course, were intended to manipulate an outcome or relay information.

The terms "brother" and "friend" are the most common terms used in Delaware speeches to the government, so it is notable that the term "Father" is used in a much more careful and considered way. With the frequent usage of metaphorical kinship relationships apparent in the primary sources, the role of Delawares as part of a parent-offspring relationship should also be considered. The parent-child relationship is a special one with implications of protection, obedience, provisioning, accommodation, and very close familial bond. In one letter, Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) is called "Father" by Captain Killbuck, with whom no known consanguineal or affinal relationship existed. The term is used to demonstrate a link to Delaware leadership and Anderson's support when addressing William Clark. In the letters and speeches authored by Delawares, Superintendent of Indian Affairs William Clark, and Secretary of War Lewis Cass are the only non-Delaware individuals with whom the term "father" is used. Also, the kinship terms are not universally applied to these two men, because Clark is also called "brother" on occasion.

When Delawares, especially William Anderson (Kikthawenund), used the term "Father" in speeches, it occurred only when the Delawares were in extremely poor and desperate conditions. One example was when Delawares were starving from failed crops on the Current River. A second example was uttered after arriving in Kansas during the winter before any money was appropriated for their support during removal. Using the term "father"
promulgated the vulnerability and desperation of the Delawares during those
times and they used the parental metaphor to elicit a quick response for
protection and provisions on the behalf of obedient "children". Of course, the
"performance" of weakness is enhanced by using the term "Father" when asking
for succor.

Additionally, the term "Great Father" was continuously used in treaty
language and other primary documents to refer to the United States in general
and to the President in particular. The term "Great Father" had been in use for
decades with natives to facilitate obedience and pseudo-familial relationships. It
also reflects the attitude of paternalism held between the government and native
groups that intensified during the administration of President Andrew Jackson.
Because American Indians were not citizens of the United States, the
government and its agents acted on behalf of their "wards" in terms of "civilizing"
efforts, financial investment, education, and governance. Most often in the
primary documents consulted, the term Great Father was used in a threatening
or punitive measure to coerce cooperation or to pacify warriors with legitimate
claims for justice. The most overt example of using this relationship to influence
Delaware activity was the letter admonishing Delaware leadership and warriors
from pursuing justice as petulant children while presenting the Osages as model,
obedient children (Graham 1826j).

In most of the primary sources from Delaware authors or speakers, the
term "grandchildren" is used to overtly present a protective affinity over smaller
groups that implied tribute and a promise of aid in warfare. Yet, as was detailed
in Chapter 3, “Grand Child” was used with the Miamis in Indiana in a way that might be interpreted on one hand as coercive and on the other hand as punitive. Certainly, Delaware leadership, Lapanihilie’s family in particular, felt justified in admonishing the behavior of Miamis accused of murdering Delawares and who also balked at the requests to settle the matter financially. It is clear that the issue was antagonized by the length of time it took to relay correspondence in addition to the John Tipton’s confessed acts of meddling in the affairs. Surely, Tipton had his own financial interests in mind and not simply the wish to preserve the friendship of two intermarried groups. Removing $2,000 or $3,000, as was originally requested, from the Miamis’ accounts would have been a significant blow to the local economy. Tipton was willing to let go of $500.

An additional explanation for the strained relationship between the Delawares and the Miamis over the request for financial atonement involves another side to the “grandfather”/“grandchildren” relationship. The Miamis were no longer physically proximate to the Delawares. The relationship was occasionally strained over who had rights to the lands while in Indiana, but when the Delawares traded lands in Indiana (and extinguished all native claim to those lands) for lands in Missouri, this marked a closing of the relationship. The Miamis were already uncomfortable in the relationship because they did not feel adequately compensated by the Delawares for quitting claim to lands did not belong to them. This conflict was a major strain on the relationship of “grandparent”/“grandchild.” Furthermore, once in Missouri, Delawares had a host of new issues to deal with, particularly conflicts with the Osages, and may not
have felt adequately supported by their grandchildren still in Indiana. So, when
the issue of the six Delaware deaths was not handled swiftly and reverentially by
the Miamis, and the Delawares' requests seemed burdensome and not solicitous
to the Miamis, the reciprocal metaphoric kinship relationship (the doxa) was
drawn into the questioned and debated realm of the doxic universe. Although
Chief Richardville's (Peshewa) son Joseph Richardville (Wahpemunway)
attempted to reaffirm the language and spirit of the relationship, it is clear that the
relationship had fallen into heterodoxy or was shattered.

If Delaware ethnic identity is constructed as "grandfathers" to the Miamis
as "grandchildren," field theory is appropriate in understanding this relationship.
The symbolic relationship itself is the field or game, but the Miamis were losing
the illusio or investment and interest in the field at the same time as Delawares
were de-emphasizing their illusio when fostering their kinship relationship with
the Miamis. When the doxa, or understanding that the "game" is worthwhile was
called into question, the habitus of participating in the game in a way that made
sense was mostly discontinued for that particular relationship. While the Miamis
requested twice to exchange wampum with the Delawares to reconstitute their
affinity, as far as the documentary record suggests, the Miamis did not actually
initiate the wampum exchange (nor did the Delawares).

Yet, wampum exchange was occurring at Delaware Town, even if the
Miamis were not involved as part of symbolically powerful exchange systems that
reinforced reciprocal relationships and also asserted Delaware identity. It is
possible to observe the material components of this relationship in the Exchange
artifact class from Chapter 4. Chapter 4 described the wampum beads and stone pipe bowl found in Feature 2 as part of a trash pit in a log cabin at Delaware Town. There is also information gleaned from primary source documents about the various groups exchanging wampum and the strategies behind the exchanges. By considering the artifacts of social and political negotiation in a household context, it is evident that the framework of Silliman's practical politics is informative here. He points out that "politics constantly surround[s], but do[es] not always infiltrate, daily practice" (Silliman 2001:194). In the case of the Exchange artifact class, these objects represent overtly political and social exchanges that are embedded in the _habitus_ of the _field_ of social relations.

One potential explanation for the continuity of wampum and tobacco exchange is that was still a symbolically powerful act of reciprocity used to build and reinforce kinship-like relationships between groups. Likewise, the exchange and use of these artifacts were directly linked to a larger identity category as "natives" from the eastern United States where wampum and tobacco exchange had been present and reproduced for generations. Yet, wampum was a system of exchange adopted and partly produced (and reproduced) by government officials. William Clark procured more than 10,000 wampum beads prior to initiating negotiations to move all native groups west of the Missouri boundary. Wampum and tobacco exchanges between closely allied groups, or to build a new relationship, as Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) attempted in exchanging wampum with the Pawnees after arriving in Kansas, were part of the cultural _habitus_ (or _collusio_) of the Delawares (and others) as ways to "get by"
and socially maneuver in ways that made sense in the negotiation of identity and in social exchanges.

As Farmers, Hunters, and Traders

Another set of loci in which it is possible to view and interpret Delaware identity involves relationships with the modes of subsistence, as farmers, as hunters, and when engaging in the fur trade. Here, it is important to illuminate the role of the natural environment and remote landscape of Southwest Missouri as part of the milieu in which the Delawares navigate their lives in Bourdieu's construct of habitus (1977, 1990) and also to “go on” in the world as stated in Giddens' framework of “practical consciousness” (1979, 1984).

Southwest Missouri was an extremely remote landscape in the early-19th century. It was impossible to travel there by boat, so a grueling overland route that traversed very rugged and dangerous stony, mountainous terrain was required. When the Delawares were first moving into Missouri after the Treaty of St. Marys, the group initially took an easy route down the Natchitoches Trail into southern Missouri and started into the Ozarks Mountains, which were lands that were not desirable to white settlers. Even though the final designation of Delaware lands in Southwest Missouri had not been made, many Delawares kept moving west into the White River Valley. This was in part because the amount of game was so poor along the Current River and also because unshod horses had a very difficult time traveling as far as was needed for meat and fur/skin hunting. Yet, the Current River was probably perceived of as “too close” to existing
settlements in New Madrid County and also as too close to the Natchitoches Trail.

So, who was it, exactly, who selected Delaware lands on the James Fork of White River? Was it Richard Graham and William Clark, or were Delawares who started settling there before the designation was made responsible? I argue that Delawares chose their lands as much as the Superintendency of Indian Affairs. I believe that Delawares were instrumental in the selection of Delaware Town lands because of the relatively rich bottomland, its remoteness from white civilizations (and missionaries), and its natural resources including the nearby lead deposits.

Unfortunately, the lands (while better than those on the Current River) were not ideal for agriculture. Farming was not possible on the steep and stony uplands. The less stony, and flatter, bottomlands were prone to frequent flooding, which made the prospect for reliable subsistence questionable. Tilling the floodplain soil, in combination with flooding, was also problematic in that erosion could carry the thin topsoil away. In addition to the difficulties involved with farming, there was not as much wild game in Southwest Missouri as the Delawares were accustomed to in Indiana and Ohio. So, families had to go further afield during their seasonal hunts to do all of the hunting necessary for obtaining meat and skins.

Hunting for meat was not only necessary for subsistence, but it was more important economically in the fur trade. The only way Delawares were able to purchase desired goods like cloth from trading houses was through the use of
annuity money or by producing furs, skins, and animal oil. As a result of the
government trading factory system being dismantled in the early 1820s, there
was a lot of private money to be made in exchange with native groups. In fact,
most of the Indian Agents, including Superintendent William Clark, had major
financial interests in the fur trade and encouraged this activity. Even private
traders, like William Marshall and William Gillis, were outfitted by Pierre
Menard’s trading house Menard & Vallé, which was aligned with the Missouri Fur
Company as well as the Chouteau trading empire.

Because fur trade activities required long-distance travel, horses were an
extremely important part of life for Delawares at Delaware Town. Although it is
clear that horses were already important in Indiana, the fact that so many horses
were provided by the government immediately prior to emigrating from Indiana
suggests that the need for horses may have been less in Indiana than in
Missouri. Also, the multitude of claims for reimbursement after horse thefts is not
merely for financial compensation. Horses were essential for survival. Even
during starvation conditions, horses were significant enough to never eat in
desperation because they were necessary for traveling over the rugged and
stony terrain for hunting and procuring skins. Thus, horses and the government-
paid blacksmith, who produced horseshoes and kept firearms in good working
order, were fundamental parts of Delaware subsistence in Southwest Missouri.
Plus, horses permitted Delawares to travel out onto the Plains where they could
more easily engage in bison hunting.
Related to the aspects of Delaware identity concerning farming, hunting, and trading in furs and skins are two artifact categories described in Chapter 4: the Production class and the Dietary Habits class. Starting with a discussion of the Production artifact class, it is clear that the Delawares are utilizing their resources to hunt and process meat and skins. Moreover, because there were 77 pieces of lead found in the Feature 2 and Feature 3 contexts (and even more in the Metal Detectors finds and the plow zone), I believe that the Delawares were fully taking advantage of the lead ores in the vicinity of Delaware Town that were first reported by explorer Henry Schoolcraft. William Clark anticipated native mining which is why he wanted to exclude the mines from the Delawares’ reserved lands prior to finalizing the allotment. Being able to utilize the local lead resources permitted Delawares to direct the money (or skins) necessary to purchase lead shot towards something else. Also, the iron scissors from Feature 2 were certainly used to produce many of the unidentifiable copper/cuprous and silver scraps in the trash pit. Delawares used the tools to fashion and transform copper, silver, lead, and iron into new forms of decoration or into utilitarian objects.

One very interesting aspect of the Production class pertinent to the explanatory framework of practical politics involves the large number of projectile points and other tools in Feature 2. Their presence may indicate recycling of lithic materials to hunt with in lieu of rifles that require gun powder, shot, and flint. In the documentary record, there are a few letters from Delaware leadership requesting more lead shot and powder to be given (presumably as gifts or at no
cost), particularly in 1825 and 1826 when the tensions between the Delawares and Osages intensified. The presence of stone tools may represent identity as "native" instead of for a practical reason. In terms of Silliman’s practical politics, the peculiar use of lithic artifacts (especially local prehistoric tool types) may represent heterodoxy alternatives to orthodoxic habitus. In this way, Delawares could be using the tools as a form of resistance against or avoidance of the necessity to rely on traders for hunting and processing tools. Delawares could also be using the tools as an identity marker or an ethnic boundary (as per Barth) to contrast themselves as part of ethnic identity.

The Dietary Habits artifact class informs this study in terms of daily habitus through foodways. Delawares, at least in this household, continued using tin-covered pans and cups, some ceramics, and only knives as an eating utensil. This was a practice continued from Indiana. Another interesting point regarding the Dietary Habit artifact class is that there are artifacts present that were not sold or traded at any of the local trading posts, such as glass vessels and ceramics. Therefore, these items would have been acquired elsewhere and transported into Missouri or traded through avenues not recorded in the documentary record (such as illicit alcohol sales). Alternatively, some of these artifacts may have been given as gifts by the traders who lived at or near Delaware Town.

In terms of diet, as far as can be ascertained from the botanical and faunal remains, there are several domesticated cultigens and animals (such as pigs, chicken, eggs, maize, beans, and squash) as well as foraged or hunted foods
(like tree nuts, herbaceous and flowering plants, deer, fish, and freshwater mussel). I wish to focus on and discuss two trends. First, there were not as many cultigens (especially maize) as I would expect to see from a household trash pit located next to agricultural fields. There were more of the hallucinogenic *Datura* seeds and charred tree nut remains. It is probable that Delawares were choosing to lower agricultural production. This would be made possible by the 5-10 bushels per acre of produce that all traders and white squatters were required to pay the Delawares. Relying on these food payments would have permitted more members of Delawares households to journey out for more productive and lucrative fur trade-related hunting and processing, especially in the fall. Second, because there were not very many diagnostic animal remains (and many were pulverized to the point where not even size class could be determined), meat was likely being processed out in the field, and most bones were left behind. There are no bison bones at this site, although it is probable that Delawares were participating in bison hunting on the Plains at this time.

In terms of practical politics, Dietary Habits utilize elements of more traditionally established foodways and methods of serving and eating food. While there is use of trade goods such as Pearlware and Whiteware ceramics, tin-plated pans and cups, glass vessels, and iron knives, there are numerous iron cones and stone tools that are Delaware choices that are *heterodoxic* (the novel use of iron arrow cones and the recycling of stone tools). Both of these items were actively considered and adopted into local practices that partly involved identity as “Indians.” In addition, by placing emphasis on hunting and fur trade
activities over horticultural and agricultural production that were less reliable in the floodplains of the James River, Delawares took advantage of the labor of others' agricultural production in order to focus labor and time on pursuing other activities.

As Indians and Outsiders

As I outlined in Chapter 3, as Delawares were immigrating to Missouri, the territory achieved statehood and relationships with native peoples grew increasingly less inclusive and less accommodating. The creative mixing of cultures and accommodations that made the "middle ground" so dynamic were rapidly vanishing in favor of exclusionist policies that acquired a national platform once Andrew Jackson was elected as President of the United States and helped initiate widespread Indian Removal policies by the early 1830s. Although Missouri politicians like Alexander McNair, Duff Green, and Thomas Hart Benton immediately began to lobby for Indian removal, it is unclear how aware Delawares (and others) were of these political forces moving against them at the state and federal levels.

The remoteness and relative isolation of the Southwest Missouri landscape afforded some protections and created a buffer zone against political, military, and missionary activities. The distance permitted many activities to go unobserved, even by the Indian Sub-Agent John Campbell who lived much of his time at Delaware Town. This is probably one of the reasons why there is so little known about Delaware religious and ritual activities in Southwest Missouri. It is certain that Xingwikàon, the church accommodating the Gamwing or Big House
Ceremony, was built and used at Delaware Town, yet nothing is written about it. It is possible that Sub-Agent John Campbell was aware of it and simply did not write about it. Alternatively, Delawares may have intentionally performed ritual and religious activities outside of Campbell's observation (and away from other outsiders who could have written about them). Regardless, the documentary and archaeological records of Delaware Town are silent on that subject.

The reclusiveness and privacy available at Delaware Town stands in such sharp contrast to the situation Delawares experienced in Kansas. In Missouri, there was very little oversight of Delaware activities, even by Sub-Agent John Campbell. Many families traveled away from the villages for months while hunting, often outside of the boundary of the state. In addition, Delaware villages were scattered up and down the river for miles, so many households never had to worry about being observed by outsiders unless Campbell (or others) intentionally traveled to visit (which did not appear to happen). Also, Delaware Town was far outside of most established river and overland routes and was more than 150 miles from the influence missionaries or military forts. Upon moving to Kansas lands, however, Delawares were placed directly next to several major river routes and overland trails, including the Missouri and Kansas Rivers, the Military Trail between Fort Leavenworth and Fort Gibson, the Santa Fe Trail, and the brand new city of Westport. Fort Leavenworth was located on newly-assigned Delaware lands in Kansas before they even agreed to emigrate. The presence of the Fort led to a complication during the assignment of Delaware lands that had to be accounted for by Isaac McCoy as he began his
survey. This location also placed Delawares directly in the path of Western migration once again and the associated missionaries, diseases, and other dangers.

The Delawares in Southwest Missouri were marked as outsiders partly because of their attitude of avoidance toward Christianity and their refusal of missionaries' requests to open mission schools on their lands. It is obvious from the annual reports from the Harmony Mission near the mouth of the Osage River that some Delawares chose to send their children to the school, but these families would have been in the minority. Also, when Reverend Nathaniel Dodge visited Delaware Town, he wrote that one Delaware woman owned a Bible and that he held a public worship service with up to 25 individuals. For the most part, however, Christianity was not openly and actively practiced by most natives at Delaware Town.

Another series of practices related to sexuality and marriage also marked Delawares as outsiders. Marriages between white traders and native women were not always taken seriously by the government. Further complicating the matter, traders might marry multiple native women in the course of a few years, even being married to two women at the same time, such as in the case with William Gillis. To some whites, rather than assigning any responsibility to the traders, this behavior connoted sexual promiscuity of Delaware women. In the Joseph Philibert deposition for the William Gillis probate case to determine if any of Gillis' descendents from marriages with native women would get a share of his massive estate, Philibert made disparaging remarks about Gillis' Delaware wives.
and Delaware women in general saying that they were, in general, not “honest” or “virtuous” (Missouri State Archives 1873). Philibert also noted that at least three Delaware men, Little Jack, one of Suwaunock's sons, and McCullock, who still practiced polygamous marriage (Missouri State Archives 1873). People like Joseph Philibert used these cultural features related to religion, sex, and marriage as indicators that Delawares were not the same as those of European descent. No matter how long natives had been accustomed to European material culture or even Christianity, they continued to be considered outsiders.

Contemplating the Delawares as outsiders and as Indians in this section led me to question why it seemed to be so difficult for archaeologists to recognize historic-era Delaware removal sites in Ohio, Indiana, and southeastern Missouri, particularly when there are several artifacts that “stand out” as Delaware at 23CN1. Despite the fact that Delaware Town was only occupied for six or eight years and that many households were abandoned for a few months out of the year, there are artifacts at this site that display “Indian-ness.” Upon re-reading the documentary record associated with the Apple Creek Delawares, I noted many peculiar phrases that indicated that the Delawares and Shawnees in southeastern Missouri lived their lives in ways that didn’t distinguish them very much from other non-native peoples in the area. It is reasonable to understand why Duncan Wilkie found a few homesteads, but nothing that could distinguish an ethnic identity as “Indian.” Of course, it is dangerous to use material “ethnic markers” to assign identity at archaeological sites, but this marked difference in Southwest Missouri is conspicuous.
I argue that these artifact emblems of Delaware identity and as emblems of being "Indians" are intentional and an integral part of the material actions being used to exert Delaware ethnic identity at Delaware Town. As Delaware ethnic identity was threatened, efforts redoubled to exert it. These efforts extend to the level of creating or recreating certain materializations that could be read as "ethnic markers." Many of these artifacts are part of the Bodily Attire artifact class, especially glass trade beads, silver ornaments, and copper/cuprous decorations and tinkling cones. As Delaware ethnic identity became part of the doxic universe, I argue that there was an active revitalization of apparent and visible artifacts and behaviors emblematic of Delaware ethnic identity. Thus, I attest that Delaware Town is able to be identified as "Delaware" over the much longer and more consistently occupied sites elsewhere because of identity revitalization in the 1820s. Distinctiveness of the ethnic borders and boundaries of Delaware identity took on a material form at Delaware Town.

Grandfathers at War

Lastly, an important aspect of Delaware ethnic identity was the ability to engage in warfare, in addition to acting as "grandfathers" for other eastern immigrant native groups. In the documentary record, warfare seems to be a constant part of the short occupation of Missouri, although the focus on warfare in letters is likely due to the bias of awareness of the Indian Agents. Within the primary sources, it is evident that there is a considerable amount of social exchange and alliance-building within Delaware social and political networks designed to confront issues with Osages. In particular, efforts made by the
Cherokees in Arkansas to garner support from Delawares and other eastern
groups were apparent as early as 1821. The documentary record suggests that
the Delawares mostly stayed out of the conflict but did maintain support for the
Cherokees. It is also possible that some Delawares and other eastern native
families traveled into Arkansas to help fight the Osages. In fact, Delaware
leadership focused on their traditional role as peacemakers and "grandfathers" in
existing native social relationships while in Missouri. In order to support their
"grandchildren" in addition to exerting their roles as "grandfathers," Delaware
leaders made sure to outline this metaphoric kinship status in the 1822 Treaty of
Peace and Friendship (Kansas Historical Society 1822).

Yet, when the Delawares "masculinized," they began more actively
engaging in hostilities with the Osages. Hostilities sparked in response to the
murder of Sesocum, the young son of Principal Chief William Anderson
(Kikthawenund). In several speeches, the Delaware leadership attempted to
make it clear to the government that they were engaging in warfare in order to
pursue justice. To the Delawares, the hostilities were justified. When the Indian
Agency questioned the veracity of the identity of Sesocum's killers and engaged
in numerous attempts to delay or quash the fighting, Delaware saw the
government resistance to their actions as acts of injustice. This sentiment was
especially illustrated in the efforts of Richard Graham, who believed he
convinced an influential Captain to stop the war only to have that Captain
become too drunk to act in order to avoid doing what Graham wanted. Also, in
speeches made by William Anderson and the war captain Killbuck, the level of
annoyance with the actions of the Indian Agency was overt. These leaders seemed incredulous that their justified actions to avenge the death of Sesocum (and other Delawares at that point) were being wantonly and unjustly restrained and threatened by the Indian Agency. To the Delawares, the government seemed to be protecting the murderers.

Beyond warfare, this dissertation ultimately argues that the most important "war" being fought while the Delawares occupied Southwest Missouri is a political assault on Delaware ethnic identity. As Delawares pushed for recognition of their preferred client status and as "grandfathers" of other immigrating eastern native groups, they actively exerted their identity in order to maintain this important social capital. The manifestations of their efforts are evident in treaty language, in speeches made to Indian Agency personnel and the government, in alliances made with their "grandchildren," and in overt and visible daily practices related to Dietary Habits, Bodily Attire, Production, and Exchange. The struggle for Delaware identity as "grandfathers" was the field of action by which multiple doxic categories were reconsidered, aligned, and practiced habitually as habitus.

The questions I posed for this research project were: What was the functional utility of a Delaware identity at Delaware Town, how was it constructed through daily practice, and what could it be used to accomplish? In short, Delaware ethnic identity was an essential part of social relations with other native groups, the government, and even with traders. It was a form of social capital that its members could use to get preferred clientage status from the
government, ask for liberal treatment and succor in times of need, and have a respected status position as “grandfather” in reciprocal relationships with other eastern native groups. I argue that Delaware ethnic identity should not be viewed as a monolithic cultural group, as it did have numerous internal divisions due to phratry and status. I also state that the 1820s was a time of active revitalization, and that active exercising of Delaware ethnic identity can be viewed in material terms within the archaeological record. At 23CN1, we see exchange items such as wampum beads and a stone pipe bowl used to maintain and enhance social relationships with other groups. Also, Delaware ethnic identity and status thrusts a lot of agricultural work onto local outsiders, who pay tribute in the form of food, so that Delaware families can utilize their labor in other ways, including lead mining, pursuing furs and skins for trade, and long distance traveling to hunt on the Plains or to visit other groups like the Cherokees in Arkansas. In short, wealth (even in the form of food) permitted a large number of Delaware families time to pursue cultural activities like the Gamwing, conspicuously consume expensive trade goods, and to build relationships with neighboring groups. Most importantly, after the starving times of the first year, Delawares had enough resources to engage in practices that re-asserted their personal and group identity as “Indians” and as Delawares. According to Bourdieu, doxa is the understanding that the field or “game” is worthwhile. Because Delaware ethnic identity, especially as “grandfathers” was so versatile and was the basis of a lot of social capital, reimagining and manifesting that identity in Missouri was its own battle. The doxic motivation demonstrating that Delaware ethnic identity was important
is expressed best whereupon Principal Chief William Anderson (Kikthawenund) moved to Kansas and immediately contacted the Indian Agent supervising the Pawnees in order to exchange wampum and build a relationship that could ultimately result in reproduction of the reciprocal relationship between "grandfathers" and "grandchildren."

Conclusions

The Delaware Town Project represents a synthesis of original documentary and archaeological research into the early-19th century Delaware occupation of Southwest Missouri that focuses on the manifestation of Delaware ethnic identity, using the data sets to interpret a poorly known period in history of Missouri and of Delaware peoples in general. Delaware Town was a thriving series of communities scattered up and down the James Fork of White River in Southwest Missouri that was part of a larger multi-tribal confederation including Delawares, Shawnees, Kickapoos, Piankeshaws, Peorias, Weas and Cherokees. Delaware Town represented the second largest population in the new State of Missouri and fueled an economic engine in the region due to the influx of thousands of dollars in annuity dollars per annum in addition to the trade of thousands of furs and skins to business conglomerations like the Missouri Fur Trade Company.

The region surrounding Delaware Town was remote and marginal due to being removed from the possibility of river travel into the region and the reality of traversing rugged, stony, mountainous terrain for days in wagons required to move back and forth between Delaware Town and St. Louis or Ste. Genevieve.
Yet, this isolation was desirable because it afforded the Delawares a respite from missionary activities and from military forts. The nearest missionaries were located at Reverend Nathaniel Dodge's Harmony Mission near the abandoned Fort Osage trading factory approximately 180 miles north. The nearest active military fort was Cantonment Gibson (established in 1824), approximately 180 miles southwest at the mouth of the Verdigris River in present-day Oklahoma.

Simultaneously, the independence afforded to Delawares living in a remote landscape like Southwest Missouri came with costs in terms of subsistence. The Delaware immigration to Missouri required ferrying across the Mississippi River, which led to an outbreak of horse thefts. With fewer horses, mostly unshod, the trek over the stony Ozarks Mountains was arduous for the Delawares, who were traveling to lands that were not yet assigned to them by the government. In the end, Delawares were instrumental in choosing their own residence in Southwest Missouri, finding land that was remote and undesirable for white settlers. Of course, these traits were also priorities for the Indian Agency. At both the Current and James Rivers, subsistence was repeatedly threatened by flooding, marginal agricultural lands, and a lack of wild game, which led to starvation and an extremely expensive provisioning strategy utilized by the Indian Agency.

After crossing the Mississippi River, however, the social capital of the Delawares' ethnic identity as "grandfathers" to other eastern native groups was initially undermined and devalued. As Delawares transitioned into a new Indian Agency, they came under the jurisdiction and stewardship of former military men
turned fur traders, who had well-established clientage relationships with Plains groups like the Osages, and who had very little (if any) familiarity with the eastern immigrant native groups immigrating into Missouri. This dissertation argues that the recognition of this devaluation, contestation, and (potential) loss of social capital prompted a strong reaction by the Delawares to re-establish their social position and political identity as “grandfathers” to the newly configured immigrant native groups in Missouri, the Osages, and the U.S. government in the 1822 Treaty of Peace and Friendship in September 1822. After that treaty, this research argues that the maintenance and expression of Delaware ethnic identity continued in the doxic universe, was refined and displayed intentionally, and was re-embedded into the subconscious, structural doxa.

Both the pre-consciously structured and the intentionally practiced aspect of emblematic Delaware identity is visible in the archaeological and documentary records in terms of artifacts and ecofacts related to dietary habits, bodily attire, production, and exchange. The Delawares pursued perceptible habitual and special behaviors that helped to reinforce their ethnic identity, including foisting a portion of agricultural labor onto outsiders in order to pursue other activities like hunting for the trade in furs and skins. Some Delawares also found prehistoric stone projectile points in the landscape and brought them back to the household to retouch, recycle, and perhaps utilize in lieu of trade goods. Also, there are several obvious symbolic artifacts related to reciprocal exchanges made with other native groups, such as wampum beads and a stone pipe bowl.
This dissertation organized and analyzed the documentary and archaeological information collected into key chapters. Chapter 1 provided an overview of the Delaware Town Project’s data sets, questions, and concerns. Chapter 2 detailed the social theoretical frameworks used to illuminate and interpret the data sets. I argue that this research was informed by, and would contribute to, three different concepts in the literature: 1) the instrumentalist/interactionist approach to collective identities, 2) practice theory, and 3) Stephen Silliman’s (2001) model of practical politics that relies heavily on the theories of Pierre Bourdieu and Anthony Giddens. In Chapter 3, I outlined highlights from Delaware histories prior to 1818 and a more penetrating presentation and analysis of primary document research pertaining to the 1820s and early 1830s that focus on four themes related to Delaware identity: 1) the triumvirate of the three phratries, Turtle, Turkey, and Wolf, in addition to the kinship metaphor as “grandfathers,” 2) the role of religion, 3) the importance of warfare, and 4) the strategic ways in which Delawares used their identity and position to attempt to leverage the most favorable results in their dealings with other native groups, fur traders, and government authority figures. In Chapter 4, I presented a detailed synopsis of the Delaware Town Archaeological Project, including discussion of the geophysical features, previous archaeological investigations, remote sensing, artifact conservation, and the findings of the 2003-2005 archaeological field schools. I emphasized three features, Feature 2 (a trash pit), Feature 3 (a dug-out log cabin floor), and four artifact classes deemed important for studying archaeology using a practical politics model.
Lastly, this chapter provided a discussion of Delaware ethnic identity using multiple lines of argument and supported by original research obtained in the documentary and archaeological record.

This dissertation illuminates two lacunae. First, this research contributes to the historical record by identifying and transcribing manuscripts pertaining to Delaware Town in numerous local, state, and national archives. Of course, it is important to understand that the majority of the documents presented were authored by non-Delaware outsiders as part of correspondence between Indian Agency officials and others. I located only a few documents attributed to Delaware authors and the majority of those were processed by a translator into English. Second, the archaeological component of this study reflects the only excavated site of Delaware patrimony outside of Lenapehoking. Therefore, much of the knowledge of Contact Period Delawares comes from historical documents written by missionaries or government officials, and the archaeological presence is restricted to (primarily) Munsee sites prior to Delaware removals into Western Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana. As such, the archaeology of the Delaware Town assemblage provides insights and interpretations into material culture that can be compared to and contrasted with the documentary record to more effectively understand the material and instrumental concerns of daily life in a Delaware household. Moreover, this research is useful and informative in terms of identifying the structure and practice of Delaware ethnic identities as well as what such an identity meant and what it could be (and was) used for.
While this dissertation focuses on issues pertaining to Delaware ethnic identity, I did not address certain issues in this study. First, this study did not address the issues of race and gender. I felt that race was an inappropriate avenue of inquiry at Delaware Town because race as an aspect of identity was an extrinsic definition from 19th century Europeans and Americans. Certainly, the "essentialist" blood quantum notion of race would be a more pertinent research question for Delawares in the 1860s and afterwards, when tribal membership questions grew more encased in European and American concepts of race. The documentary evidence reveals at least three enslaved people of African origin at Delaware Town in the household of trader William Gillis and five slaves in the household of trader William Marshall, who lived closer to Finley River. Virtually nothing is known of their lives. Any archaeological research that could illuminate their lives partly depends upon whether or not these trading complexes can be identified archaeologically.

I also did not address the issues related to gender at Delaware Town. One potential avenue for integrating gender identity into the assemblages at Delaware Town would be well informed by the recent work of Diana Loren on adornment and dress (2013). Occasionally, the documentary record reveals a glimpse into the lives of women, such as when Nathaniel Dodge describes the wife (or daughter/daughter-in-law) of Chief William Anderson (Klkthawenund) attaching silver brooches to Anderson's clothing. There is also considerable documentary evidence about the types of cloth made available by traders at Delaware Town. Alternatively, it is well known, anthropologically and in Delaware histories, that
there was a division of labor based on gender. In the documentary and archaeological data sets obtained for this study, I did not feel as though I could contribute meaningfully to what was already known about gender roles among the Delawares.

There is also a temporal near-sightedness requisite in studying such a briefly-occupied site. I attempted to ameliorate that focus by taking a long view of Delaware history up to the point of crossing the Mississippi River in order to identify themes related to Delaware identity that could be tracked into Delaware Town. Admittedly, this research ends shortly after Delaware removal to Kansas. My purposes for doing this were two-fold. First, I felt as though the significance of the archaeological findings at Delaware Town would be diminished or lose focus if I followed the group for too long into Kansas. Second, there are more well-known and published histories pertaining to the Delawares in Kansas, particularly after the 1840s when Delaware participation in military exploits and missionary activity produces more literature than is available in the 1820s. It was my intention to fill in the notable gap in the westward migrations of the Delawares with this research.

Alternatively, this research might have been interpreted using different theoretical frameworks that could shed light into aspects of this decade in ways that a focus on ethnic identity would not permit. In particular, archaeological theories that focus on landscape perspectives are a very informative alternative framework that would examine the spaces in Southwest Missouri not simply as a stage, but in terms of mobility, cultural perceptions, meaning, and memory. If
more archaeological research yields insight into additional Delaware settlements in southwestern Missouri, a landscape perspective would be a particularly fruitful framework to interpret this landscape.

The Delaware Town research presented in this dissertation contributes in three meaningful ways to existing scholarship: 1) illuminating early-19th century Delaware history using documentary and archaeological sources, 2) more fully describing the social and political changes that occurred during this period of extended Delaware revitalization as mechanisms to defend their social capital as “grandfathers,” and 3) as an important case study demonstrating the utility of Silliman’s model of practical politics as it applies to identity.

First, this study significantly enhances knowledge about Delaware peoples in the early-19th century. Not only does this research combine original archaeological materials with primary documentary sources (many previously unpublished) scattered in a myriad of archival repositories, but it interprets this period of Delaware revitalization in a new way. The standard Delaware histories tend to lose focus of Delaware westward expansion between 1795 until 1840. One reason behind this lacuna is the sparse historical record during this period resulting from a relative lack of oversight by missionaries and military groups. Second, much of the existing documentary resources are scattered in numerous archives throughout the country. For example, the main body of the Pierre Menard collection is divided into at least two repositories in Illinois and one in Missouri. Likewise, Indian Agency correspondence relevant to Delaware Town is split among numerous archives in New York, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, and the
National Archives. In addition, Delaware Town represents the first Delaware settlement excavated outside of Lenapehoking within the United States. As such, this work serves to shine light on the Southwest Missouri Delawares in a way that had not been done in the past.

A recent ethnographic study of Delawares described the period of the 1820s as part of the "revitalization" period of the Delawares (Obermeyer 2003). Unfortunately, the lack of information about this period meant that the structure, nature, and intent of this revitalization movement in Missouri were left uncharacterized. Ferguson (1972) and Schutt (1995) hypothesized that revitalization consisted of the efforts of Chief William Anderson to gather all of the scattered bands of Delawares in one place. I strongly disagree with this position and demonstrate it is unsupported by a close reading of the documentary sources. Alternatively, this thesis describes the reasoning behind the dramatic revitalization in the expression of identity occurring in the early-19th century. I situated the renegotiations occurring in doxa and habitus concerning ethnic identity in historical context and embedded them into a rational explanatory framework utilizing practice theory. In short, I argued that one of the reasons that the archaeological of Delaware Town is unmistakably "Delaware" as opposed to being virtually unrecognizable from other non-Indian settlements in southeastern Missouri is that the Delaware identity revitalization was produced by and reproduced in certain material conditions that emphasized ethnic boundaries. The reasoning behind this re-assertion of identity was as a response to a perceived loss (or fear of loss) of their long-held status as "grandfathers" and
preferred clients. The cost to losing this social capital was viewed as too great to lose without a fight.

Lastly, this dissertation is an exercise in the application of Silliman's model of practical politics in a situation where multiple lines of evidence can be applied to the framework. In Silliman's original formulation and utilization of his practical politics method, it was used to interpret the continuity of lithic practices at Rancho Petaluma (2001). He explained, while using numerous alternative explanations, that native peoples continued to practice more traditional forms of lithic tool manufacturing as an *orthodoxic* reaction of social and political changes to the *doxa*. At Delaware Town, this model is applied more broadly to household artifacts organized into four categories suggested from Silliman's research (2001). This dissertation tracked and explained continuity or change in artifact classes related to Dietary Habits, Bodily Attire, Production, and Exchange. I found Silliman's model of practical politics a very useful and informative bridge in creating a dialog between what I was finding in the archaeological record with what I was reading about in the primary source documents. It did not matter if the two data sets coincided or conflicted; I could ask questions about the practical politics of identity and take my hypothesis about the configurations of Delaware identity revitalization to the household level using his blend of practice theory.

This research represents only a preliminary study of the archaeological resources that may still exist in Southwest Missouri. Surely, future research activities can excavate the remainder of Feature 3 and attempt to locate more cabin features that were not obliterated by plow activity or bioturbation. I caution
researchers to carefully consider the depth of the plow zone in the region when choosing sites to survey. Even the south and east side of Feature 3 were almost completely scalped by agricultural activity. I believe the only reason that Feature 3 was identified at all was due to the builder's decision to dig out the cabin floor basin. Any cabin floors closer to the historic ground surface have most likely been destroyed by this time. Deeper sub-surface features like the trash pit called Feature 2 could very well be most of what is left intact in the James River Valley. Although the archaeological record is relatively scant and highly disturbed, when used in combination with the documentary record, this data set is extremely revealing into the practical politics of Delaware ethnic identity in the poorly-understood early-19th century.
APPENDIX A. List of Known Delawares Residing at Delaware Town, as Reconstructed by Primary and Secondary Sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Western Name</th>
<th>Phonetic Name and alternative spellings</th>
<th>Phraytry</th>
<th>Treaty Signer?</th>
<th>Birth &amp; Death</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Connor</td>
<td>Ahlaha-chick</td>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>b. 1817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George White-eyes</td>
<td>Alimee, Apacahund</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>d. 1826</td>
<td>Pondoxy (father)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andalle-com</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apitonalen, Apitoualen</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspelonga</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atowa</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wikawanqued (relationship not certain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacub</td>
<td>Auaqeniman</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apitonalen (brother)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Ketchum</td>
<td>Aukeelen-qua</td>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>b. 1786</td>
<td>Ahkechlunguna-qua (mother) Twehullalla (father) Mekingees (sister) Lapanihilie (brother) Kockkatowah (brother)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. 1825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aupaneek</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ketchum, Big Man</td>
<td>Kockkato-wha, Queshtato-wah</td>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Twehullanla (father) Ahkechlunguna-qua (mother) Kikthawenund (adopted father) Lapanihilie (brother) Tawhelalen (brother) Aukeelenqua (sister) Mekingees (half-sister)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bear, Baube</td>
<td>Lapanihilie, Lapaniachia, Lapaniihee, Lapihinili-hes, Lapanehilas</td>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Twehullanla (father) Ahkechlunguna-qua (mother) Kikthawenund (adopted father)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

493
|                         | Leearva  |       | Kockkatowha 
(brother)  | Aukeelenqua 
(sister)  | Tawhelalen 
(brother)  | Mekingees 
(half-sister) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Nanticoke, Menanticoke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemottenuckques, Lenawakepy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhanai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mekingees, Muchenchase, Mekinges</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Twehullalla 
(father)  |          |       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Ahkechlunguna-quaque 
(mother)  |          |       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Kikthawenund 
(adopted father)  |          |       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Lapanihilie 
(brother)  |          |       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Kockkatowah 
(brother)  |          |       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Tawhelalen 
(brother)  |          |       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| William Conner 
(spouse)  |          |       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| John Conner 
(son)  |          |       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Ahlahachick 
(son)  |          |       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Captain Patterson, Patterson |          | Yes   |                          |                          |                          | Ahkechlunguna-quaque 
(sister)  |
| Meshaquowha, Mushaco- |          |       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| wha, Mehshayquowah, Mesheko- |          |       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| whay |          |       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Wolf |          |       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| d.1835 |          |       |                          |                          |                          |                          |
| Moses | Nahkapash, Nahkahpash | Yes | | | | |
| Naquitihata | | No | | | | |
| Natakpa- | | No | | | | |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cap-</th>
<th>man</th>
<th>Wolf</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>d. 1848</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tain</td>
<td>Natcomin, Nathcom-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ming, Nakomin,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natcoming, Nahkomin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nauoche-caupauc</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party leader</td>
<td>Netahopuna,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Napanita, Neta-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hinoden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neetemethreen</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonondoquomon, Nanomida-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gum, Noninda-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gum, Nononda-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>goman, Nonnumdag-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>um, Naunote-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tauxien, Nonondaq-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qomon, Nonondo-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quomon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nungailautone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gray, John Grays</td>
<td>Onloohothnah</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Paudose</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petamonomosse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petamwose</td>
<td>Petchenanalas, Potchinowanlass, Peachanochlas, Pechenanahalous</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cat, Panther</td>
<td>Pooshies, Pousse, Poushies, Poushe, Pushis</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>b. 1780s d. October 1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poquas</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Bullet</td>
<td>Pondoxy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>d. 1826</td>
<td>Alimee (son)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Beaver</td>
<td>Punchhuck Turkey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beaver's son (father)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quatatas</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Relative</td>
<td>Relation</td>
<td>Birth/Death</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saquieholaíne</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Highest</td>
<td>Sarcoxie, Saccacsa, Sacacocksy, Sacoxia, Saxcoxi</td>
<td>Yes, but not at Delaware Town</td>
<td>b. 1784 d. 1876 William Anderson Kikthawenund (father) Ahkechlunguna-qua (mother) Sesocum (brother) Suwaunock (half-brother) Pooshies (half-brother) Quatatas (sister or half-sister)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long House, James</td>
<td>Secondine, Sahcondiah-hing, Secondyan, Sackendeathon, Jackenduthen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>b. ca. 1780s William Anderson Kikthawenund (father) Suwaunock (brother) Pooshies (brother) Quatatas (sister or half-sister) Sarcoxie (half-brother) Sesocum (half-brother)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesocum, Sosecum</td>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>d. September 1825 William Anderson Kikthawenund (father) Ahkechlunguna-qua (mother) Sarcoxie (brother)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>White Man</td>
<td>Suwaunock, Showonee, Suwaunock, Shewanack, Showanock, Ashamamuk, Stahawamuk</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>Tahunqueecoppi</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatamanis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Ketchum</td>
<td>Tawhelalen, Tahwheelalen, Tahwhetalenen, Tenwhaleland</td>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>Not at D-Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toletahsey, Tolatony, Toklacaussy</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wright</td>
<td>Troit, Yrop, Yrort</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Ketchum</td>
<td>Twehullahlah,</td>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Catch-em, Kutchman, Catchum | Twehulala, Tweehullah | Lapanihilie (son)  
Kockkatowah (son)  
Aukeelenqua (daughter)  
Mekingees (daughter)  
Tawhelalen (son)  
Unnamed daughter married to Gillis |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waichocatais</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waicholaitamint</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandaquowiwen</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wapaweta</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weashasch[illeg.]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whahelapiscare</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahepelathy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wikawanqued</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Atowa (relationship uncertain)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Elizabeth Marshall, Betsy, Priscilla Marshall | Wilaquenahoe | No | b. 1797  
d. 1875 | William Marshall (spouse)  
John Marshall (son)  
Lucinda Marshall (daughter)  
Rosanna Marshall (daughter) |
<p>| James Armstrong             | Zeshauau             | No                                                         |
| Ben Beaver                  | No                   |                                                           |
| Captain Beaver's            | No                   | Punchhuck (father)                                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Turtle</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Mekingees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Beaver, Beaver Gorge</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Little Beaver (brother)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohon, Cohun</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Conner</td>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>Yes, but not at Delaware Town</td>
<td>b. 1802 d. 1872 Mekingees (mother) William Conner (father) James Conner Ahlahachick (brother) Harry Conner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relation</td>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Conner</td>
<td>(sister)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Marshall Conner</td>
<td>(brother)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Elliot</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Gillis</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Gillis</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Girty, Guirty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gray</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Harrison</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain James, Jim Killbuck, KillBuck</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ros-</td>
<td>b. 1830</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>Exonerated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCullock</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Journeycake</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain, Joon Queake, John Queake, Johnny Cake, John Quake, John Quick, John A. Quick, Jonsey Quick, Johnny Quick, Jonny Quick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Sham, William</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Tunis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain George Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Wilson girl&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Family Members:**
- Anna Marshall: d. 1916
- Wilaquenaho (mother)
- John Marshall (brother)
- Lucinda Marshall (sister)

**Other Names:**
- Captain Journeycake,
- Joon Queake,
- John Queake,
- Johnny Cake,
- John Quake,
- John Quick,
- John A. Quick,
- Jonsey Quick,
- Johnny Quick,
- Jonny Quick

**Others:**
- Bill Sham, William
- Sam Street
- George Williams
- Williams
- "Wilson girl"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Squaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>William Gillis (spouse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>George Beaver (brother)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Beaver</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>William Gillis (spouse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Girl</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mary Gillis (daughter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Jack</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metleys</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Sally</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Patterson</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roasting Ear</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pooshies (father)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son of Pooshies</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Squirrel</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tote</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX B-1. Hopkins to Graham. 6 August 1825.

Source: Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

Point Pleasant, New Madrid County, Missouri, 6th August 1825

My dear Sir,

Much excitement has been produced in this vicinity for the last two or three months past in consequence of a prevalent rumour that the small settlements of Indians on the borders of the River St. Francis were to be forcibly broken up and their inhabitants removed beyond the White River.

Having latterly [sic] from a disposition to... subserve [sic] what I conceive to be the interest of this portion of the state. I have determined to address you, as their agent, on the subject of their situation prospects; confidently believing from the intimate interchange of good feeling and friendship which happily existed between us, while associated in the army, that my representations will neither be unwelcome or disregarded.

A correct knowledge of the topography of that part of the country would at once satisfy you that the time is very distant when it will be put in requisition for settlement. The east branch of the St. Francis which runs parallel with the Mississippi for upwards of one hundred and fifty miles on a direct line, and at no place is more than twenty miles from it, is from one extent to the other sunk by the earthquakes and filled with timbers which have died and fallen into the water, rendering it unnavigable for every species of boats except canoes; the west (or lead) fork as it is termed enters from the high country which divides Black and
White river from the tributaries of the St. Francis; and from fifty miles from its confluence with the east fork, has suffered equally, and is similarly circumstanced as it respects navigation. An [sic] hundred miles above the junction of these two, a bay or bayon [sic] (as it is here termed) connects them together. Within the island thus formed; and at a very small elevation above the level of the water, of the two rivers, spread over an immense surface as it is, by the sinking of the country, live those Indians, in three villages. They consist of Shawanees [sic], Delawares, and Muscogees [sic] (Creeks). It seems as if providence in commiseration of their misfortunes had directed them hither, where white men will not live; and where there is just enough of fish, fowl, and game to minister to their subsistence, without encroaching upon the rights of others.

In their character I am happy to bear witness, from two years residence in this neighborhood, that they are inoffensive, useful, and in some degree industrious. They raise good stocks of Horses, cattle, and hogs; and make a sufficiency of bread-stuffs for home consumption. No charge of dishonesty has ever been, even colourably, sustained against them, and the little trade they furnish in furs, peltries, Bears, oils is extremely acceptable to our small community from its vicinity, and the facilities afforded in obtaining it[...]

In an interested point of view, as a citizen here, I should dislike the removal of these Indians, 1st because it would deprive us of their little trade, which operates as a great convenience; and 2ndly because their occupancy of that isolated country keeps off worse neighbors. Will you be so good as to give me your own and the views of the government on this subject as early as
convenient.

In the sentiments I have expressed I know the whole community here heartily accord; and if necessary will unite in a petition to the government. It is probable my friend Capt. Lessieur (the oldest inhabitant of this part of the state and a respectable citizen in any country) will also make some statements on the subject. You may especially rely on his information and knowledge of the county.

Y[ou]r. friend sincerely

S. G. Hopkins
Department of War 8 Augt. 1821

Sir,

Your letter of the 7 June, enclosing an estimate for the quarter ending 30th Sept. next, has been received.

Funds for the 1st & 2nd Mos [sic] have long since been remitted to you, this Gov. Clark, which I presume you have received before this time. A remittance was also made directly to you on the 23 May last of $3341.66 on account of the expenses of the emigration of the Delaware, of which you were informed by letter of that date, and which I hoped would be sufficient to cover all the expenses of the Delaware emigration, as it was the entire balance remaining of the appropriation for that object. But as it appears from your estimate for the quarter ending the 30th Sept. next, that it will not be sufficient. I have deemed it advisable to authorize you to draw on Gov. Thos. A. Smith [Brigadier General Thomas A. Smith], the receiver at Franklin, Missouri, for $6021/ the amt. of your estimate, which I confidently expect will, with the sum before remitted, be amply sufficient to cover all expenses attending the emigration of the Delawares, and also of the Kickapoos, for the present year.

The expenses of the Delawares, where they are at present located, are very heavy, and it is probable, in consequence of the scarcity of game, will continue to be so while they remain there; - it is therefore desirable that they
should be removed, as soon as possible, to a country where game is more abundant, and where their situation in other respects will be rendered more agreeable; and I have enclosed an extract of your letter to Mr. Graham, their agent, and called his attention particularly to this subject.

Theeeeee Ac. To. [sic]

(signed) J.C. Calhoun
APPENDIX B-3. Graham to [Calhoun]. [1821].

Source: Box 2, Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

Sir[,

On my return from the Delaware [sic] I found your letter of the 30th May & feel gratified that my views are approved of by the War Dept. The $1000 was a reasonable supply, without it I would have been unable to carry into effect my policy.

I met with some difficulty in braving [sic] the Delaware [sic] & Shawnee Indians to agree to become friendly with the Osages. They had [sic] received several talks from the Cherokees, which had much enflamed [sic] them. They at length came into my measures & will meet the Osages on the 10th at this place. I shall start an express tomorrow to the Cherokees informing them of the arrangements [sic] I have made & enviting [sic] them to attend & likewise request their agent to aid me by inducing them to come on. The Kickapoos whom I have also seen are pleased with the idea of a peace on the plan I propose & will readily give their influence to carry it into effect. I apprehend no difficulty except with the Cherokees & if they do not attend I shall endeavour to place the other nations on a friendly understanding with each other & feel well convinced that when that is once effected the Cherokees will now come into the Miami [sic].

A small war party of Cherokees have been out & killed a man by the name of Riveiers [Revoir], a Frenchman formerly a respectable inhabitant of the Cote-514
sans-dessein, on the Missouri & threaten to kill all those who trade with the Osages. A large war party of Cherokees of 600 will leave their village about the last of this month. They will not meet with the Osages, who are on their Buffaloe [sic] Hunt, but I fear will destroy [sic] their corn fields [sic]. Tho[ugh] I am in hopes of arming them before they reach the Osage village, as my boat starts this day.

I wish to be instructed on my power of granting licenses, many applications have been made. I have informed the applicants that until [sic] I hear from you on the Subject I shall grant them licenses to trade with those Indians over whom I am placed an agent. With the Kickapoos, Shawnees, & Delawar[e]s, no difficulty can occur but with the Osages much is to be apprehended. Apart [sic] of that band lives within the Arkansaw [sic] Territory & the Choteaus [Chouteaus] who are traders with the Osages under a beleif [sic] that the license obtained from Genl. Clark was sufficient to protect them in their trade with Nation, have had their goods seized & taken to Fort Smith for not having a license from Gov. [James] Miller. If it is necessary to have a license from Gov. [James] Miller to trade with Osage within the Arkansaw [sic] Territory, it would subject the trader of this country to the inconvenience of traveling 600 miles to obtain a license.

I was much pleased with the Delawar[e], they appear to be industrious & are very anxious to become farmers & they have about 100 acres corn & praries [sic]. They have fixed themselves for the present on the West Fork of the Currents [sic][,] a branch of Black River, which empties into White River. The bottom on which they have settled is stoney [sic] though rich. The country around
is mountainous & one mass of stone & destitute of game. They have to go 30 or 60 miles to kill deer & complain much, that their Horses become so lame in one day[,]s journey that it is difficult to get them back. Indeed it astonished me to see that unshod horses could get over the country.

I have furnished them with Iron to show their horses as without it they could not exist. They complain likewise that the Salt which was promised them has not been paid. This salt annuity arises under the Treaty of [William Henry] Harrison made at Fort Wayne in June 1803. They say that [John] Johns[ton] promised them $100 per ann[um] in lieu of the ab[ove] & that am[oun]t is due for the years 1816, 17, 18, 19 & 20. Col. [Pierre] Menard having paid them for 1821.

On my arrival among them I found that in consequence of their distressed situation last fall, Col. Menard had advanced them in su[n][d][rie]s tha am[oun]t of their annuity & expenses the am[oun]t promised two of the cheifs [sic] an annuity for hope in procuring the assent of the rest of the nation to the treat[ie]s amounting to $500 & also 100 Doll[ar]s for the Salt annuity for 1821 & expressed much dissatisfaction [sic] when they understood that one half of the annuity was sent to that part of the Nation not yet removed. They paid over the part I took to them, to Col. Menard & requested of me to ask you to have forwarded to him the bal[an]ce that is 2750, [illegible] the one half of the annuity $500 the annuity promised [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] & Lapahala [Lapanihille], $100 as promised by Johns[ton] in lieu of the Salt, making all together the sum of $3350. They say the goods furnished by Menard were better & double the quantity which was del[i]vered by [William] Conner their former interpreter. They likewise wish
to have their lands allotted to them as soon as possible & to have the boundaries of it well marked. They expect a tract of land not less than that which they sold. I am this [sic] particular in stating to you their wants without troubling you with a very long speech which they made & requested it to be forwarded complaining of the sickness & difficulties which they encountered on their journey from Indiana to the Currents [sic] because [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] their old cheifs [sic] who was very ill when I was with the nation, is extremely anxious that they may be settled on their own lands before he dies & that they may know from you what they are to get. They are afraid more has been promised [end of writing]
St. Louis, Nov. 12, 1821

Sir[,]  

On my return from the Osages your several letters of the 9th, 18[,] & 23 Augt [sic] were lying in the Post office that of the 11 October has since been received yours of date of the 12 July reached me on my way to the Osages. On my return home I was attacked with a violent Billious [sic] firm [flu] which continued on me and kept me confined for six weeks the greater part of which time I was dangerously ill in consequence of which I have not been able to write before this time.

Majr. Bradh was to[o] good as to address a note to you for me giving the information that Genl. [Thomas A.] Smith could not pay the Bill of exchange which I was authorised to draw, enclosed you have his letter on the Subject. Mr. Lev'[s] statement of my a/c [account] and the diffirence [sic] of my Own accses [accounts] from the Circumstance of his deducting my pay of 2nd agent when runing [sic] the Indn. [sic] boundary line and likewise charging me with a Boat which I had turned over to the Q[uarter]. Masters Dept. Genl. [Henry] Atkinson wanted a Boat of that description and I had no use for One.

The Introduction of Whiskey among the Inds. [sic] so much complained of by all those who have anything to do with them is an evil which should be
remedyed [sic], my agency unfortunately is so situated that it is imposseble [sic] to do anything in it without Legislative aid which I shall apply for & from the views of the members I have convised [conversed] with I have no doubt they will pass some Act which will put a complete stop to it a great part of the Indians within my agency line on Lands of the UStates [sic] the Laws regulating the Intercourse with Indians can reach neither the trader [nor] vender of Whiskey & they may with impunity at present set down in the neighbourhood of the Indians and sell under a state license whatever they please.

The absence of Gov. Clark for a length of time has prevented me from Consulting him with regard to a proper person as sub agent to be fixed at Peoria if you have not appointed any One I would recommend Mr. Lawson Dobyns as a person every way qualified to fill the Office. The views of the Dept respecting the depredations commited [sic] by the Indians have been communicated to some of those who have been most mutually injured by them, this has been done in consequence of the numerous letters addressed to me beging [sic] immediate relief. With respect to the Sub Agents Mr. [George Champlin] Sibley & Mr. [Paul Liguest] Choteau employed among the Osages previous to my appointment as agent I have only to say that both are not necessary & as Mr. Sibley’s situation is such that he would not reside among the Indians[,] the selution [sic] necessarily falls on Mr. Choteau who will I believe acting under Instructions make a very good Sub Agent he has been so much among the Indians and raised as it seen [sic] with them that he possesses too much attachment to their habits and Customs and partakes a good deal of their supustutions [sic] these are errors.
that can be corrected. He is active[,] industrious[,] and does everything he is
ordered with the most purfect [sic] willingness.

I have not been able to attend to the order of your letter of the 9th Augt
[sic]. The Delewares [sic] on the Current had all gone on the Wintry [sic] hunt
before I had risen from my sick bed & will not be in before Spring[.] [T]he Issue of
provisions to those Indians shall be stopped [sic] that I see no alternative [sic] but
furnishing those now Emigrating with corn this winter & next summer & some
meat[.] [T]he necessity for furnishing them with Corn arises out of the failure of
the Crops of Corn of those Delewares [sic] who had preceded them the frost
having distroyed [sic] a great part of the Corn. I shall turn my attention to them &
shall have them removed with all possible convinience [sic] to the Lands which
will be best suited for them I shall select a tract which will be on the Osage
boundary line so as to include the whole or part of the Big bend of White River
which they are very anxious to settle on first prerrusing [sic] there is a valuable
lead mine within the lines proposed and many white famileys [sic] settled on it. I
would suggest the propriety of a decision from the War Dept. previous to their
being permanently settled and likewise for authority to have the Lands Surveyed
and Marked. I am doubtful whether a sufficiency of Lands adjoining on the Osage
boundary line North of the Kickapoos who have a much more extensive and finer
tract of Country than I had any idea of there is a small nook of Country lying
between the Pichard [Pomme de Terre] a branch of the Osage (the N West
Boundary of the Kickapoo lands) the Osage River and the Osage Boundary line
Containing about 280 square miles which would answer for the Shawnees in
exchange for their lands on apple Creek but of this body of land as situated within a few miles of the Osages will build their Village it is doubtfull [sic] whether the Shawnees will accept of it.

When I last had the honor of writing to you I was fully persuaded with a belief that I should affect without difficulty a good understanding between the delewares[sic][,] Shawanees [sic][,] Kickapoos[,] and Osages. I now have to inform you that after every exertion on my part & after having brought the principle chiefs of the Osage Nation to St. Louis I have been disappointed in the Delewares [sic] immediately on my return from the Osages I received a speech from their chief [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] telling me he had retained his principle Council War chief at the Village the others having gone on their hunt to meet me at St. Louis whenever they should be notified to attend. An express was dispatched to Col. [Pierre] Menard to have them brought in without delay and they answered by saying that two nations Could not make a peace that his chiefs had all gone on their Winter Hunt & he Could not come in & that his son had just arrived from the Cherokees who were very angry that they (the Delewares [sic]) would not take up the Tomahawk with them against the Osages and said they would go to War themselves & actually sta[r]ted with between 5 & 600 warriors whilst his son was there[;] during this time a Selection [of] principle chiefs of the Osage Nation with there [sic] head man was here as deputies to Conclude such a treaty as I should approve a deputation from the Kickapoos likewise attended during their stay.

They bow with the greatest patience and fortitude the affliction[,] which it
pleased the almighty to inflict on them. The firm [flu] which had Carried off so many of our Citizens swept off in a few days thru [sic] of [sic] their principle chiefs & so reduced and debilitated the others that they really become [sic] the objects of pity and charity.

The loss of their chiefs together with the disappointment of making a Treaty of peace so ardently desired by all the Osages except Cla[r]mores [Gramon] Village was an event so unexpected & dishissing [distressing] that they will not for years get over it they beged [sic] of me not to bring them to this place again to make peace that no faith is to be placed in the Cherokees & they would neither commence the War with them. I have sent a speech to the Delewares [sic] in which I have stated to them that if any Delware [sic] takes up the Tomahawk and goes to War against the Osages, I will stop their annuities & withdraw their traders from them. [T]hey have reataled [sic] their promise & faith to me. This ends all my prospects to procure peace among those tribes. The only way to effect a permanent peace now will be to force one Thousand Cherokee Warriors into the Plains and let the Osages be notified of it & let them have a fair treat of their Skill and Valor. I will say that this mode of affecting a peace will produce the happiest consequences and cool all the Indians of their ardour for War & will put a stop to those predatory war partied of both Nations who Commit depredations on the frontier Inhabitants & will now effectually answer and keep peace bothe [sic] with the Whites and Indians themselves became the result of a battle by which a force will be peace & a willingness on both sides adhere to it. Indian Warfare never results in a general Battle it is Carried on by small parties.
who steal on [sic] their enemy[,] kill or take one or two prisoners, distroy [sic] what property they can & carry off the Horses[,] [S]carcely an instance occurs of equal forces meeting & having a well contested Battle if a general battle takes place.

Soon after the Death of White Hair (Cheveaublanc) [Pahuska] the principle chief of the Osages a Scism [sic] took place within [the] Nation[,] Cla[r]more [Gramon] an intrepid & obstinant [sic] chieftain second in the nation led off about _ of them and setled [sic] on the Verdigrease [Verdigris][,] a watir [sic] of the Arkansaw [sic][,] E]very means was made use of to get them back but all their efforts ever unavailing. Mr. [Thomas] Jefferson sent them a speech urging a reunion & that Cla[r]more [Gramon] should return to their old Village and pointed out to them the serious injury the nation would sustain by the Scism [sic]. Cla[r]more [Gramon] still remained obstinate he was followed by other chiefs with their followers & in a short time had half the nation at his Village called the (Chines) from its being situated in an Oak grove[,] [O]ther descretions [sic] & jealousies arose & one half of the Balance of the old Village removed under aliason [sic] To the But[t]e situated about 70 miles higher up the Verdigrease [Verdigris] and about one half of the Distance between the old Village and the (chine)[,] T]hese Villages are in advance Just as far as they are removed from the Old Village to the hunting ground & the chiefs of the old Village complain that by the time they get on their hunting ground the Chines have driven the Buffaloe [sic] off & they have to advance farther among their enemies the Pawneas [sic] to kill buffetoe [sic] & Beg that Cla[r]more [Gramon] may be
made to return back with his Village the But[t]e Village & the little Osages residing on the [illegible] [Six] Bulls [Bull Shoals] talk of removing to the Osage River & making a Village near where the [illegible] & Factory [Fort Osage] is established[.] I had made out from the best information I could collect and my own observations a map of the Country but which has been mislaid by a freind [sic] who was examining it. I shall enclose a small sketch of the situation of the Villages from memory.

All the Osages sure to have a perfect willingness to do what is told them for their Own good, except Cla[r]more['s] [Gramon] Band who are looked on as Outlaws by other nations & possessing no one [of] good quality [in] the balance of the nation[.] [A]s they express themselves to me [they] have no objection to their receiving a good whiping [sic] from the Cherokees believing that would drive them back to their Old Village. This disjunction & division among them has been increased by the manner in which the sub agent has heretofore delivered their annuity he has divided them agreeably to their numbers of the Villages and the proportion to each Village & invited them by Villages to attend at the Factory [Fort Osage] to receive their annuity[.] [T]his has led them to believe that Government approves of this Division of the Nation & treats with them accordingly. The consequence has been that Cla[r]more['s] [Gramon] Village has not received annuities for five years past tho[ugh] requested by Mr. [George] Sibley every year, they will not go to Fort Osage and with great reluctance come as far as White Hair['s] [Pahuska] Village, saying they do not belong to the Osage, that their great Father is chief of the Arkansaw [sic]. I expressed to them that I was
now their agent & in [the] future their Annuities should be delivered to the chiefs Collectively without any reference to their Village rights and if they did not meet me Collectively as the Osage Nation they would not receive their annuities.

A part of this year's annuity having been delivered by Mr. [George] Sibley without my knowledge and not hearing of it but by accident when at their Village by serving his letter to one of the chiefs[,] I have paid over to the nation all the chiefs being present but two, the annuity intended for this year for the payment of the next year's annuity at their particular request[,] [T]hey were poor & had made a bad-Winter hunt in consequence of the difficulties between them and the Cherokees. I disliked doing of it but my situation was a peculiar one & no bad effects as discontints [sic] among them can Occur.

I regret extremely to find so much dissintion [sic] among this Nation and feel anxious to aid them in gaining that power and importance they fermorly [sic] held among other Nations. Their numbers are about 10,000 with only about 1,000 warriors. They have lost assets many within a few years past & the Small Pox some years ago Swept off larger numbers of them.

I have not been able to forward my accounts[,] which were created for the expenses of those Indians with purpose of making a peace who attended for the want of freinds [sic]. So soon as I can take up all the credits they shall be forwarded. If it is understood that all the a/cs [account] vouchers expenditures for the quarter are to be forwarded within 10 days after its expiration[,] I have to state that it will be impracticable to do which it would be necessary to call all the persons employed at one point at the expiration of every quarter or for the agent.
to ride a distance not less than 1000 miles to collect the vouchers - wich [sic] a/cs [accounts] as vouchers are obtained for can be forwarded at the first day of every quarter - with a view to embrace all the expenditures of the quarter in one a/c [account] has heretofore prevented me from forwarding my a/c [account] within 10 days.

With respect to the submission of my pay as agent during the time I was running the Indians boundary line, which has been laid over for some months to afford me an opportunity of giving explanations upon it. I have nothing farther to urge on it than the presedent [sic] for the charge & my understanding it would be allowed.
APPENDIX B-5. Graham to Clark. [1825].

Source: Records of the United States Superintendency of Indian Affairs, St. Louis, Vol. 2 1813-1825, Microfilm, William Clark Papers, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, KS.

The following is a List of the horses & their value which were stolen by Whites from the Delaware, that emigrated from the White River Indiana to the West side of the Mississippi from sometime in June to the 15th Nov 1820.

From Chief Anderson [Kikthawenund] 2 mares that had cost $130.00
Chief Paudose 1 dark bay horse 70.00
Chief Kutchman [Twehullahlah] 2 bay horses 140.00

One of these has been recvd [recovered]

Jack Harrison 1 dark bay horse 50.00
This one has also been recvd [recovered]

Weashasch[-illeg.] 1 horse & 1 mare 70.00
Wandaquowens (a woman) 1 mare 70.00
Quatatas, Anderson’s daughter 1 horse 80.00
Wolf 3 horses 80.00
Capt Tunis large bay mare 50.00
Poushies [Pooshies] black horse 30.00
Katcous black horse 40.00

Stolen below St[e]. Genevieve

Chief Lapanilhe [Lapanihilie] 3 horses 220.00
of those valued of $50.00 has been retaken from the robber

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Beaver</td>
<td>2 horses</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Sham</td>
<td>2 horses</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspelonga</td>
<td>1 mare</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Sally</td>
<td>1 mare</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>2 mares</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrorp [James Wright, Troit]</td>
<td>1 horse</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katemus</td>
<td>1 horse</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1400 is correct total] 1450.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nathcoming [Natcomin]</td>
<td>3 horses</td>
<td>320.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

one of them stolen in Missouri

N.B. The greater part of these horses were stolen from the Indians immediately after they left White River & in the Neighborhood of Vincennes, with the exception of 4, one of which was stolen in this state & thou [sic] at their camp below St[e]. Genevieve when they had crossed the Mississippi. Most the above had just been given by the Government [John Johnston] to the Indians.

The Following horses were stolen by the Whites in the Neighborhood of the little Wabash, from the Delawares moving with Killbuck in 1822.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Captain Pipe [Tahunqueecoppi]</td>
<td>one bay gelding that cost</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam [possibly Sam Street]</td>
<td>1 black stud</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natackpaman</td>
<td>1 roan horse</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B-6. Graham to Calhoun. 4 March 1822.

Source: Box 2, Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

St. Louis, 4 March 1822

Sir[ ,]

In my letter of Voc [Nov] 12, 1821 in answer to yours of 9 Aug Regarding that the expenses of the Delaware should be lessened means should be taken to prevent the continuance of the heavy expences [sic] attending the Delaware Indians, by removing them without delay to where game is more plenty or make such arrangements as will render them less dependant [sic] on Government. I had the honor to state that the issues to the Delaware shall be stopped but that those now emigrating would have to be furnished with corn & more this winter, Summer, the necessity of which grew out of the failure of their crops of corn of those Delaware who had proceeded [sic] them, the frost having destroyed [sic] a great part of their corn.

It is only recently that I have learned that by thorough [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] their chief [sic] that their crops of corn is exhausted & that they are all now in a starving situation & unless assisted by Government many must perish, whose who have remained at the Village Consisting of most all the women, children & old men have been on half allowance of corn, he says this is not what Mr. [John] Johns[t]on promised that their Great Father would supply them untill [sic] they could raise for themselves.

529
Believing [sic] their distress to be real I have required of Col. [Pierre] Menard to resume his issues of corn to them untill [sic] I hear from you on the [illegible] the lowest possible and of issues per quarter for those on the Currant [Current River] cannot be less than $825

(1350 bushels of) corn at 50 cts [$675

6000 flour at 2 _ 150

exclusive of Powder, lead, flints, Tobacco & salt this you will see is but a small calculation for the supply of 1200 souls for three months added to this will be the expenses of those now emigrating which will make $1650. Enclose[d] is an estimate of what I think should be allowed the Delawar[e] Indians untill [sic] they make corn enough & which will satisfy them of the Justness & liberality of Government to wards [sic] to them.

It is with diffidence I ask that appropriation for them because I fear under the curtailing system of Congress, that [illegible] cannot be allowed out of the general appropriations further Indn. Dept. but I feel it my duty to state to you their situation & of the necessity their being supplied with corn at all events.

If the Government wishes the Indians now in Ohio & Indiana to remove to this Country, it certainly would be sound policy to treat the Delawar[e]s with liberality. Humanity requires they should be kept from Starving and as I can do nothing more, I shall only allow them corn untill [sic] I hear from you on the subject.

In my estimate for the present quarter I have enclosed [sic] the whole of the Delawar[e] annuity, whereas $1200 should have been deducted for the amt.
paid by Mr. Johns[t]on.

I must again observe that if the Delawar[e]s are moved on the lands designed for them by Govt this Spring in time to make a crop of corn I fear war between them & the Osages will be enevitable [sic]. The proximity of the lands designed for them to the Osage will Before a treaty of amity is entered into between them will necessarily produce a war, which now threatens very strongly to break out which I most anxiously wish to put down. I therefore recem [sic] shall not attempt to move the Delawar[e]s untill [sic] fall. The reason of their not moving this Spring lies entirely with the Delawar[e]s as the Osages were ready & willing to make a treaty of Amity with them, last fall, which the Delawar[e]s refused [strikeouts in original].
APPENDIX B-7. Calhoun to Clark. 12 December 1820.

Source: Aug. 3, 1820-Oct. 5, 1823, Letters Sent by the Secretary of War
Relating to Indian Affairs, 1800-1824, Microfilm 15, Roll 5, Record Group 75
Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

War Department 12th December 1820

Gen. William Clark Sup. Indian Aff[air]s. St. Louis, Miss.

Sir,

Your letter of the 3d and 10th late have been received. The inclosed [sic] copy of a letter to Col. [Pierre] Menard will inform you of the present views of the Department, in relation to an exchange of land with the Shawnees and Delawares at Cape Girardeu [Girardeau].

It is the desire of the Department that the treaty with the Delawares should be strictly complied with, but of referring to the treaty, you will find that it is stipulations or [sic] not such as they state them to be. By the 1st and 2nd articles of the treaty the Delawares cede to the United States in general terms all their claim to lands in the State of Indiana in consideration of which the U.States agree [sic] to provide them with a country to reside on the west of the Mississippi, and the guarantee to them the peaceable possession of the same, but nothing is said about the extent of the country in either case, or of the surveying and marking of its [sic] and by the 3d Article, the U.States agree [sic] to furnish them, among other things, with provisions proportioned to their numbers and the extent of their journey, and not, as they demand, for the year after they had settled on the lands
assigned them. The Department, however, is disposed to act liberally towards the Delewares [sic] and authorizes you to correspond with Gov. [Lewis] Cass, who is acquainted with the Country and its extent, which they have ceded to the U.States, and with him to determine from a view of all the circumstances, what ought to be the extent of that provided for them on the West of the Mississippi. When this point is determined, you will report your decision, with the facts upon which it was made, to this Department for further decision.

And, after the arrival of the Delewares [sic] at their new residence, if their necessities should be such as to require a further supply of provisions from the Government, the Department also authorizes you to furnish it is such quantity only as will be absolutely necessarily for their subsistence, until they can raise a supply for themselves, or for a period not exceeding one year.

The request of the Delewares [sic] to be furnished with the articles a list of which you enclosed in your last letter, appears to be moderate and may be complied with. The expense which shall be incurred on account of these articles and supply of provisions above mentioned, cannot be paid until the appropriation is made for the next year (that for the present being exhausted) and you will, therefore, include the sum which may be necessary for the purpose in your estimate for that year. The expense of a blacksmith will also be included.

I have etc.

J.C.C. [Calhoun]
St. Louis, 3 January 1822

Sir[,]

I had the honor of receiving your letter of the 3[rd] enclosing extracts of a letter from Mr. [John] Johns[t]on Indn. [sic] Agent at Piqua [Ohio] & also an extract of your answer to Mr. Johns[t]on[']s letter, which shall be attended to.

In your letter of the 18th August 1821 you say "at such a distance, we can possess here only a general knowledge of the Country & as I have no doubt, you are well acquainted with its localities, it must be left to your discretion to fix the residence of the Delawar[e]s, at some more elejable [sic] point". Gov. [William] Clark informed me, in making the purchase from the Osages he had an eye to the Country on White River as best calculated for the Indians, that might be removed to this country from Ohio and if that was too mountainous, they could make choice of the prairie [sic], of which a large portion of the purchase consisted; by reference to the map herewith forwarded, which is very accurate, you will see that the Country ceeded [sic] to the Kickapoos take all the prairies south of the Osage River, and as I have not construed the power given to me in the above extract, as intended to extend to the North of the Osage River. I have to ask of you, if the Delawar[e]s should be dissatisfied with that portion of the land laid off for them, on the map, inconsequence [sic] of its not being sufficiently
extensive & not entrancing [sic] prairie enough. Am I authorized to select any of the lands North of the Osage River if they prefer it[?] The map will give you a very good idea of the situation of the Osages & their hunting ground.

I have selected a place for the agency, which is marked on the map, it appears to be as convenient as any other point, & more so to the Osages particularly if they carry their promise into effect in remooving [sic] their villages in the neighbourhood of the missionaries.

I have this day forwarded my a/c [account] & vouchers up to the 1 Jan[uar]y. Mr. Boiloin [Nicolas Boilvin] & Mr. Talliaferro [Lawrence Taliaferro] Agents up the Mississippi had their Treasury atts [accounts], which were forwarded to them by the treasurer protected at Bank for want of funds & which left them entirely without money. The former forwarded his certificate of deposit to the War Dept. & to relieve him for the present, I advanced him his pay for the last quarter & forwarded his receipts. The latter I have advanced the money for, to his agent on the certificate of deposit, which I hope will meet your approbation.

I have had a conversation with Genl. [Duff] Green on the subject of your letter, requiring a Blacksmith to be established at Chariton, for rather the employment of one, to do the work of the loways. The only objection to its being in Chariton, is that it will induce the Indians to go there frequently, under the pretence [sic] of getting work done, but in reality to get something to eat & Whiskey. It has been my policy to prevent as much as possible the Indians from coming into the settlements & no inducements should be held out to them. These Indians that is [sic] a part of the Ioway Indians live about 70 miles from Chariton
on the head of Chariton Creek & would probably resort to that place if no ship was employed to do their work. The balance of the Natives live on the River des Moines & go to Fort Edwards to get their work done. If Genl. [Duff] Green will be answerable for the good conduct if there Indians in their vents to the Settlement, it will be more than the Citizens I beleive [sic] will be willing to accept they have generally been a very bad & disaffected tribe of Indians. The Genl. [Duff Green] wishes a sub agency & it would be well to make him one, if those Indians are to be attended to. He seems to take a deep interest in them & I have told him I should employ the Blacksmith agreeably to your orders.

It is probable the agency for the Osage & Delawar[e]s will be established by law this session of Congress. If so, may I ask of you to propose a salary adequate to its duties which are complex & difficult, it extent & number of Indians embraced within it, make it as the [illegible] importance to Government & should be placed on equal footing with the most extensive agencies.

I am very respectfully y[ou]r. ob[edien]t. ser[van]t,

R. Graham, Ind. Agent

Source: Aug. 3, 1820-Oct. 5, 1823, Letters Sent by the Secretary of War
Relating to Indian Affairs, 1800-1824, Microfilm 15, Roll 5, Record Group 75
Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

You will exercise your discretion in furnishing provisions to the new
Delaware emigrants, for a reasonable time, but it is my opinion that the
Government is not bound to furnish anything more than a due proportion of corn
for their support until they can raise it for themselves. It is also left to your sound
discretion to select a suitable tract of Country for the residence of the Delewares
[sic]. It is advisable, however in making the selection, to locate them as far west
and as near the Osage boundary as possible, as they would by that means be
removed to such a distance from the white settlements; that they would not
interfere with each other for many years. The country to which you refer would
perhaps be the best that can be selected. In that case the lead mine which you
state is within the limits proposed to be assigned to the Delawares must be
reserved for the use of the U.S. [letter ends mid-sentence]
APPENDIX B-10. Graham to Clark. 3 October 1822.

Source: Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

St. Louis, Oct. 3, 1822

Sir,]

Here with you have thirty-three vouchers for expenditures from 1 July to [30] Sept in my Agency[:]

marked A-- a genl [general] abstract of Disbursements from same time[.]

_ Marked B _ My genl [general] a/c [account] current[.]

Marked C[,] A Genl [general] abstract of Disbursements from 1 July to 1 Sept 182[illegible][.]

Marked D. Abstract of Rations Marked E. Abstract of Presents[.]

Marked F -- for same time. Estimate of the expences [sic] attending the Indian Agency under my Superintendense [sic] from 1 Sept 1822 to 1 July 1823[.]

Marked G. My a/c [account] with the JC S. [Fort Osage or Marais des Cygnes Factory] Factory for the osages [sic]. Invoice of mdz [merchandise] received from the Factory, treaty with the osage [sic] Indians including recpt [receipt] for same[.]

Marked H. Abstract of Licenses granted commencing 1 July[.]

Marked I. And a Treaty with the Great & Little Osages[.]

Marked K. There I believe Contains all the statements & vouchers agreeable to -- Indians relative to my accounts for my Agency which I hope you will find all correct.
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The Delaware & Shawnee will commence their movement this fall for their Lands, which I have selected agreeable to instructions from the Hon[ora]ble the Sec[re]t[ar]y of War [John C. Calhoun] they are situated in S.W. corner of the State Bounded by the Osage Boundary line on the W, the Kickapoo Boundary on the NE & running from those lines to include such quantity of land as may be deemed advisable to grant to them, to include the Great Bend of White River at James Fork with a reservation of the lead mines (the Indians expect 70 miles square).

The Cheifs [sic] of the Delaware are extremely anxious to have the extent of their lines finced [fenced], their boundaries run out at marked, & the White people who are now settled on there removed as speedily as possible. I will have by leave to request the policy of ordering off as soon as practicable [sic] all the squatters on those lands designed for the Indians. Numbers of families have settled themselves on those lands neither this year past & many are moving from the Boonslick [Boone’s Lick] Country to settle on them. The Lead mines on White River are worked by White people under an old unconfirmed Spanish grant, it is said, of this grant I know nothing tho[ugh], am informed it is for 5 leagues square, if so & it proved to be, a good claim, it will interfere with the lands to be granted to the Delawares.

The Kickapoos have settled on the Veangee [Niangua] a Tributary stream of the Osage & about 25 miles East from the boundary of their own land. They are unwilling to move on their own lands. Refused to receive from me their annuities for the present year. Their reasons will be best shown by giving you an
extract from their speech to me on the 11th August last.

Extract: 7 other "What you have paid is not what [Paul Liguest] Chouteau & [Benjamin] Stephenson told us, he shewed [showed] us a large mark for our land, you have shewn [shown] a small one, you have placed us in a small hole.

Father, we thought Chouteau & Stephenson told us the truth[;] they told us to come on this side of the Mississippi & wherever we have made our fire, there we should have our lands, you tell us different, they did not tell us the truth.

Father, we told Chouteau & Stephenson at the time we saw them that we would not take gold nor silver for our lands, we hold that talk yet. After you came here we held a council & our braves & cheifs [sic] still hold the same talk & said we would not receive your silver.

Father, when you came here with your money, we thought God had not make it for us, we don't know the use of it as white people.

Father, we did not hear that from to [sic] Chouteau & Stephenson that we were to have $2000 a year for swapping our lands. We understood from them we were to pick our lands." [I will merely observe that last year there [sic] same cheifs [sic] received the annuity due for the years 1820 & 1821 from me, made no objections to it, nor said anything about their not understanding they were to receive $2000 pr. an. [per annum]].

It is highly important to the tranquility of the Whites settled near the Veangee [Niangua] & for the better regulating the carrying into effect the laws of Congress that the Kickapoos should be made to move in there [sic] own land. On this subject & likewise that of this payment of their annuity, (which I have
deposited at Col. Hrothers the receiver of public money) – I wish your [illegible]. I believe their [sic] is no doubt of their receiving it in Mdz [merchandise] – the transportation of which, if sanctioned by you, will cost a much larger sum than paying in Specie.

I found some difficulty in getting the Osage to agree to give up their Factory on Manic deCigne [Marais des Cygnes River] but when they found there was no treaty obligation to continue that Factory, they readily consented to [illegible] that 2nd article of the Treaty of Fort Clark which binds the United States to keep up the Factory at that point. The Treaty is enclosed among the papers herewith sent. I hope the Amt. [amount] given for the abrogation of the 2nd article will not be thought to be too high. When it is considered it does not amount to more than for the annual expenses if supporting that Factory.

The Osages wish their annuity to be paid in Mdz [merchandise] as they greatly prefer it to Specie, stating to me that the Amt [amount] they get from the traders fort is not more than what it will buy in their Silver.

They also require that no permissions should be granted to persons to pass thro[ugh] their lands, stating that they were promised at the treaty that no white person should be permitted to hunt or pass through their lands & if the practise [sic] is centd. [continued] of white men going on their lands they cannot be answerable for the mischief they commit, & I hope that means will be taken by their Great Father to put a stop to it.

I am happy to inform you that a treaty of peace has been entered into between the Osages, Delawares & Shawnees & perfectly [sic] tranquility is
restored to all the Indians within my agency.

Respectfully, Yr. Ob. Sevt [Your obedient servant]

[William] Anderson[']s [Kikthawenund] village, October 1st 1825

Sir[,] 

Since my letter of the 28th was stored [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] has informd [sic] me of a man by the name of Sollomon Yokam [Solomon Yoachum] hoo [sic] is just settled inside of the Delliware [sic] line and has erected a distillery on the other side of the line and has made a quantity of peach brandy and has been selling it for some time in quantities to the indians [sic]. There is a number of those outlaw characters settled all below him hoo [sic] are alsoe [sic] silling [sic] whisky constantly to the indians [sic], if there cannot be some plan divised [sic] to remove them from that place, the dellewares [sic] and Wias [sic] and all those lower indians [sic] will be a lost people before two years. [Illegible] can point out any way that this Yokam [Yoachum] who lives on the indian [sic] land can be removed i [sic] wish you to doe [sic] soe [sic] if i [sic] had any assistance i [sic] would soon remove him but i [sic] am now left alone without a white man in the nation four or five old indians [sic] are left here with the chiefs to take charge of the Villages. I am apprehensive i [sic] shall have some difficulties with one or two others that are living on the land before i [sic] get them off i [sic] am told that they will not pay there [sic] rents to the indians [sic] if soe [sic] what steps is [sic] to be taken to compell [sic] them. I have just started [Interpreters] troit [Troit] and [John or James] Conner again to notify them all that
they must remove.

Your friend

John Campbell, Sub Indian Agent
APPENDIX B-12. Campbell to Graham. 19 May 1825.

Source: Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

[William] Anderson's [Kikthawenund] Village, James Foark [sic], May 19th 1825

Sir[,] I have this day pointed out a situation for building opposite to [William] Anderson's [Kikthawenund] dwelling, where there is a fine spring and good timber for building. I would advise that the buildings to be built be on the plan of [James] Wilson's buildings. I am unable to ascertain what they will cost, but it will be considerably above one hundred dollars. I have had a talk with [William] Anderson today on the subject of the man hoo [sic] is selling Whisky to the Indians he is much dissatisfied that he is not removed. I should of started down on Sunday but on examining the laws I am not satisfied that my powers extend into another state or territory, on this subject I wish to be advised and instructed, write me fully on this subject and I will attend to it immediately. I think it would be well to write to the proper authority in Arkansaw [sic] and no [know] wheather [sic] those persons have account to squatt [sic] without permission on the publick [sic] lands, if there can be no way to break this set of horse stelers [sic] and whisky sellers up, we shall have no peace in this nation.

The Kickapoos have called again today asking me to visit them, I shall goe [sic] and see them soe [sic] soon as [William] Anderson leaves. This Anderson wishes me to write you to mention to Genl. Clark something about the horse that was taken from his son by the man that [William] Anderson took the whisky from
as he cannot get his horse. Please send me some tea by [James] Wilson and don’t forget my hat.

Be sure to make the arrangement with Col. [Pierre] Menard to bring my trunk and Mattres [sic] and the articles in my memorandom [sic], send me paper and quils [sic], Ink powder for [James] Wilson.

Track wishes me to say to you the number of persons belonging to there [sic] family there is twenty souls in all here including Bob hoo [sic] are entitled to there [sic] share.

Inclosed [sic] you have the list of horses lost by the Dellawares [sic] and the evidence persisely [sic] as they gave it in. It is more lengthy than was nesesary [sic] but they would have every particular set down, you will pleased have it coppied [sic] and corrected. I should of [sic] done it myself, but had no paper and my pen has given out. I wish you would urge the nessesity [sic] of having our buildings put up, for it is very disagreeable to have to board with those people. I wish you to write me fully on the subject of those horse thiaves [sic] and whisky sellers. I wish to no [know] wheather [sic] I shall be Justifiable in taking some of the Indians with one and forcing those fellows to give up the property belonging to the Indians. Write me all the news and don’t forget my letters.

Yours respectfully[.]

John Campbell
APPENDIX B-13. Anderson et al. to Clark. 29 February 1824.

Source: Fort Leavenworth Agency, 1824-1836, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 300, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Father, Open your Ears and listen onst [sic] more to your red Children we speak to you Just as if we had you by the hand. We thank the great Spirit that thire [sic] is away made the can speach [sic] to you although a Great ways apart.

Father, We gone see that this Summer we are going [to] suffer for the want of Corn as we Did that last summer. We know that a Number of our people Died Just for the want of something to live on and it[']s well known by our friends the Whites who live amongst us.

Father, We know you have fulfilld [sic] your promise to us of furnishing provisions untill [sic] we got to our land. We have got in a Country where we do not find as was stated to us when we was asked to swap lands with you and we and we [sic] do not get as much as was promised to us at the Treaty of St. Marys neither.

Father, We did not think that big man would tell us things that was not True. We have found a poor hilly stony country and the worst of all no Game to be found on it to live on.

Father, Last summer our corn looked verry [sic] well untill [sic] a heavy rain came on for 3 or 4 Days and raised the waters so high that we could just see the tops of our Corn in some of our fields and it destroyd [sic] the gratest [sic]
part of our corn[,] punkins [sic] and beans and a great many more of my people
camind [sic] on we had to Divide our little Stock with them.

    Father, Last summer there was a few Deer here and we had some hogs
but we was obliged to kill all of them and some that not our own but this summer
there are no game nor hogs and my Old People and Children must suffer.

    Father, You know it[']s hard to be hungry, if you do not know it we poor
Indian know it.

    Father, If we go a Great Ways off hunt we may find some Deer but if we
do that we cannot make any Corn and we must still suffer.

    Father, We are obliged to call on you onst [sic] more for assistance in the
Home of God you know that one God made us all and us know it.

    Father, We expect a Great many more of our people here this Spring to
make Corn, all of my people who lived long ago in this Country. We wish to
gether [sic] all of my onst [sic] more to gether [sic] (as i [sic] know i [sic] can[']t
Live always).

    Father, If you will give us any help you will Let us know as soon as
possible by writing to our friend Pierre Menard if you do not we cannot make
much corn this summer.

James Fork of White River February 29th 1824

James Wilson U.S. Interpreter

Wm. Anderson [Kikthawenund] Head Chief Delawars [sic]

Lapaniachla [Lapanihilie]

Capt. Ketcham [Twehullahlah]
Capt. Neithcomon [Natcomin]

Capt. Beaver [Punchhuck]

Pusheese or Cat [Pooshies]

General [William] Clark written to on this subject
APPENDIX B-14. Excerpt of Hendricks to Calhoun. 5 February 1822.

Source: Box 2, Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

5 Febry [sic] 1822


I was also entrusted with a speech form [from] my chief and Warriors intended for the Delaware tribe of Indians [from White River Indiana] and who had lately removed beyond the Mississippi river which we earnestly desire you to have the goodness to transmit to those Indians and though the agent of the tribe accompanied with such remarks from you as will induce the Delewars [sic] to consent to let our nation have such part of the annuity stipulated to be paid to them; as we are justly entitled to. And Moreover are desirous; you would advise the agent to deliver ten strings of White Wampum of one yard in length each with the speech, as Indians in general are more apt to pay attention to any speech from other tribes if the same is accompanied by Wampum.
APPENDIX B-15. Graham to Anderson et al. 6 November 1822.

Source: Box 2, Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

Nov. 6, 1822


I herewith send you a talk with wampum from the cheifs [sic] & warriors of the Muh-he-con-nuk [Stockbridge-Munsee] Nation of Indians residing in the State of New York. It was forwarded by your Father the Secty [sic] of War.

I do not know any thing [sic] about the covenant of friendship in general council held between the cheifs [sic] of your nation & those of the Muh-he-con-nuk [Stockbridge-Munsee] at Wau-pe-kom-me-kuk [Wappocommehroke], by which the Stockbridge Indians lay claim to a part of the lands sold by your nation to the United States, for which they now ask you for a part of the money you are to receive for it. With the justness of this demand, you are the best judges and therefore cannot take it upon myself to advise you to give, or withhold, from them any part if the monies obtained by this sale. But I am satisfied that if ever a promise was made by your nation to receive the Muk-he-con-nuk [Stockbridge-Munsee] Indians as joint proprietors [sic] with yourselves in the lands alluded to in their talk that you will now in good faith, fullfill [sic] every stipulation that have [sic] been made by your Fathers at the council of Waupe-kom-me-kuk
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[Wappocommehroke]. Your answer to their talk you will send to me as early as possible accompanied with such observations as you may think proper make to me, that I may also give My Brothers my views upon it.

I would have visited you myself this fall, but I have been very sick since my return from visiting you & the Osages. I was anxious to do so that I might shew [sic] you the place where I wished you to build your Town. I understood, after I left you, that many families of White people had gone on the lands that were intended for you. You will tell such as you see that they must prepare to move off next Spring as the lands are yours. The Secty [sic] of War advised that White people have moved on the lands intended for you & I have no doubt but instructions will be received, to force them off if they do not go quietly. In the mean time [sic], do not let any of your young men disturb any of their property & if any White people should injure any of your people or their property you must let me know. I am anxious to hear if you like the lands you are going to & how you get on & at the same time to assure you that all that is within my power shall be done for your comfort & happiness.

Gov. [James] Miller of the Arkansas Territory has sent me a copy of the Treaty made between the Osages & Cherokees. By that Treaty the Cherokees are to deliver up all the Osage prisoners within 40 days from the date of the treaty 14 Augt [sic] are permitted to hunt on the South Side of the Pawnee & Arkansas River & in passing to the Osage villages to have the priveleged [sic]. You now see that I was right in telling you that a Treaty would be made by the Cherokee with the Osages without consulting you. This will be a lesson to
you hereafter, allways [sic] to act for yourselves & never to place too much confidence in the professions of other nations. I say this to you because the profession of the Cherokees were very near producing a war between your & the Osages. I rejoice that you have at length made peace with them and I hope it may be a lasting one. I wish that the Great Spirit may take you by the hands & make you a happy & prosperous people is the wish of your friend,

R. Graham

April 9, 1825

Sir,

I received a few days since a letter from Mr. N.W. Watkins informing me he was requested by several of the Inhabitants of New Madrid [County] to write to me requesting that I would forward to you a license to trade with the Indians within my agency.

The law requires that bond & security should be given before a license is granted. To save you the trouble of coming to this place to obtain a license I enclose to you a blank bond[,] which you can sign, filling the blank with half the amount of the Invoices. You will also forward an Invoice of goods with the amount, the names of the persons you with to take with you & denote whether they are citizens or foreigners. If foreigners[,] bonds in the ammount [sic] of $500 for each individual will have to be taken. You will have the certificate of the clerk of the courts, that the person signing with you is sufficient for the amount of one half of your invoice, which is the sum required to be named in the bond. $5000 is the highest security required & that only where the Amount of Invoice is very large.

I send you a form to be attached to the invoice requiring [a] permit for your necessary lands. Places are designated for traders to be fixed at[;] you will
therefore say whether you wish license to trade with the Delawar[e]s, Shawnees, Peorias, Piankishaws [sic], Weas, or Kickapoos[;] if for the whole of them, you will have to be established at [William] Anderson[']s Town.

Whiskey is expressly forbidden & if taken into the Indian Country subjects the goods to seizure.

R. Graham

Mr. Adam Rittenhouse

An Invoice of goods intended for trade with the Indians at White River, State of Missouri[:]

For Blankets at $ p[e]r pair $ 

For B. Strouding at

I certify that the above is a correct invoice of Mdz [merchandise] intended for the Indian trade in which I desire a license to trade the same & a permit to take with me A.B. Interpreter. C.D. Clerk & E.F.G. #. For engages [sic] all citizens of the United States[.]
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Dec. 8th 1826

Mr. James Campbell[,]  

For I understand William Gillis has sent his pack horses loaded with goods to the woods to trade with the Indians which I consider a Grand imposition on me for a man with out [sic] a lycence [sic] to Go and trade in that manner contrary to law to deprive me of my Just Credits for which reason I Request you to have him stoped [sic] As Quick as possible you may be well assumed he has no lysence [sic] to trade in that Quarter I am inhopes [sic] for you will not fail to have him desicded [desisted] in his pursuit.

Wm. Marshall

Mr. James Campbell, Esqr.

James Fork, Anderson Town
Delaware Village[, December 9th 1826

Major R. Graham

Sir[,] I write you a short note, giving you my opinion of matters things here, I am satisfied there is too many persons here acting as agents and advisors hoo [sic] are all working for there [sic] own intrust [sic], some it appears from indian [sic] reports don’t want the Dellewares [sic] to exchange there [sic] land without the goverment [sic] consent to pay there [sic] debts I suppose to the traders, others want reserves of land made for them; others want pay for there [sic] buildings, some of the persons say if the agents will help them that they will assist the agents in affecting what they wish for the goverment [sic], all those things combined together has more or less influence upon the mind of the indians [sic], permit me to further state to you that I think it bad pollicy [sic] to permit the traders to cultivate so much of the indian [sic] soil and to keep such large stocks of horses and cattle in the neighborhood of the villages, and pay the indians [sic] no rent and sell them corn at an extravant [sic] price to them the indians [sic] have no encouragement to raise corn or stock, some of the traders are now clearing more land, those hoo [sic] have indian [sic] families of children I think ought to be allowed to cultivate soil sufficient to support there [sic] children but nothing more, I hope there will be a stop put to this grand imposition as soon as possible, you will very readily perceive from the above remarks from what
source they come Indians are not very apt to make those remarks of themselves, 
I wish you to send me some washington [sic] papers by Mr Mitty [Jacques Mette] 
and letters if any, since I enclosed you my report, Mr[.] William Marshall has 
lodged a written report against Mr. Wm Gillis for having sent a number of pack 
horses to the woods with goods to trade with the Indians without license which is 
the fact, the goods are sent to the three forks of white river [sic], for soon as Gillis 
arrived from St Genavive [sic] I informed him of Marshall[']s Report, and that I 
should hold him accountable for the forthcoming of the goods and [illegible] untiill 
[sic] I should hear from you on the subject, I hope you will not delay giving me 
some instructions how to proceed, I wish you to answer my letter fully on the 
subjects above stated, you have inclosed [sic] Marshall letter, I have sent Col[.] 
[Pierre] Menard a copy [sic] of Marshall[']s letter as he is much interested in this 
affair, Anderson has called on me and expresses a wish that Mr[.] Gillis may 
have license to trade on the three forks of white river [sic], this you will be the 
best judge of yourself, I have permitted [sic] Mr[.] Gillis to remain at the three forks 
of white river [sic] untiill [sic] I should hear from you as it was the particular wish of 
[William] Anderson [Kikthawenund], but he is not to trade any of the goods[.] 
You have no idea of the high ground this gentlemen takes here he is more than 
agent, I could say much more to you on this subject but let this suffice for the 
present, or untiill [sic] I see or hear from you, which I hope will be so soon as you 
can send me the answer, Did not intend saying so much in this note as I have 
[illegible] but this affair of Gillises [sic] has compelled me to do so, this letet [sic] 
is only intended for you and myself
I am Sir with Due Respect your

John Campbell
APPENDIX B-19. Campbell to [Graham]. [1825].

Source: Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

Charges against James Wilson, U.S. Interpreter for the Delaware Nation of Indians, exhibited by John Campbell, U.S. Sub Agent[:]

Charge 1st: Want of knowledge of the Delaware Tongue[.]

Charge 2nd: Not interpreting according to the true meaning any talk from the Agent to the Indians & from the Indians to the Agent.

Charge 3rd: For giving advice to the Indians contrary from that which the Agent had given.

Charge 4th: For contempt of the Government.

Specification 1st: Inasmuch as the said Wilson did curse the Govt. of the U.S. when being told that he did not interpret according to the true intent & meaning of the orders of the Government.

Charge 5th: For cheating the Indians.

Specification 1st: The said Wilson did keep and make use of Iron, belonging to the Indians and intended for their use.

John Campbell, Sub Indian Agt. [sic]
The defendants read in to evidence the depositions of Joseph Philibert, which is in words and figures: to-wit Joseph Philibert of lawful age being produced, sworn and in the part of the said defendant, depoeth [sic] and saith [sic],

Q: State your name, age, residence and occupation.
A. My name is Joseph Philibert. My age is sixty eight years. My residence is at the mouth of James River in Stone County, My occupation a farmer.

Q: Are you aquainted [sic] with Plaintiffs and Defendants in this case.
A. I am not but I have heard of them.

Q. Were you aquainted [sic] with William Gilliss [sic], the Tester mentioned in this case If yea, state when and where you first became aquainted [sic] with him.
A. I was aquainted [sic] with him. I became aquanted [sic] with him in Ste. Genevieve. The dates trouble me. It must have been in 1819 or 1820.

Q. What business were you engaged in from the Spring of 1822 to the spring of 1831 and at what place.
A. In Sept. 1822, when I first came to James Fork Trading Post. I went to work at the Gun Smith[']s business. I worked at that business for a few weeks, when I was employed by Gilliss [sic] as a clerk and there I was mostly I was engaged to sell goods as a clerk at the Delaware Trading House on the James
Fork of White River.

Q. In whose employ and under whose direction and control were you during that time.

A. Was in the employ [sic] and under the control of William Gilliss [sic], during that time till 1830.

Q. Who besides youself [sic] was employed as cleck [sic] in the Indian trading business under Gilliss [sic] at the James Fork Trading Post.

A. No one but a young man by the name of William Myers from June 1827 to the mouth of Swan Creek which is now Raney [Taney] County, Mo. Where the town of Forsyth is now located.

Q. State as near as you can the month and year you first came to the James Fork Trading House to remain in business.

A. I came to James Fork Trading Post between the 1st and 18th of September 1822[.]

Q. State the name of the county and state in which said James Fork Trading House was located and how near was it to your present place of residence.

A. Where James Fork Trading Post was located is now in Christian County and State of Missouri and about forty miles from my present place of residence and about fourteen miles southwest of Springfield, Mo.

Q. What tribe of Indians did Gilliss [sic] supply from said Post. Please state the name of each tribe and the distance each tribe was located from said trading post.

A. He was the trader if the Delawares, but when the Shawnees, Peoria,
Weas, and Piankeshaws came we traded with them.

Q. State if Gilliss [sic] had a house at or near the mouth of Swan River. If yea state during what time and what tribe of Indians were supplied from that Post.

A. He did have from the 1827 [2 illegible words] part of the year 1829. The Weas, Peorias, and Piankeshaws were supplied from that house. [...]  

Q. What part of the business at said trading post did you specially attend to while in business there under Gilliss [sic].

A. I laid in the goods and sold the goods for furs and peltry.

Q. When did William Myers come to the trading house in the employ of Gilliss [sic].

A. To the best of my recollection Wm. Myers came there in the employ of Gilliss [sic] the latter part of the summer of 1827.

Q. What part of the business did Myers specially attend to.

A. He traded with the Piankeshaws, Weas and Peorias at the mouth of Swan part of the time. The remainder of the time he was under me at the James Fork Trading House. There was no necessity of Myers remaining at the Mouth of Swan all the time as we had a man named Basila Boyers [Basil Boyer] stationed there in charge of that branch house in Myers absence to take care of the property as a hired hand. He was not able to work. The house was shut during Myers['] absence.

Q. What kind of a house did Gilliss [sic] live in while he was carrying on said business and where was his dwelling home located. Please describe the house fully and give a diagram of same from memory.
A. It was one story hewed log house known as a double house with an open entry between. The south room was a kitchen-the north room was Gilliss [sic] room. A door from each room opened into the open entry and one door on the west side of the kitchen opening to the outside. One window in the east side of Gillis'[ sic] room and a chimney at each end of the house. This was located at the James Fork Trading Post- a diagram of said house which I have made from memory marked exhibit A is hereto attached and which is a description of said house.

Q. Who was Gillis[']s housekeeper and state who all occupied the house, stating the occupants of each room during Gillis'[ ]s residence at the James Fork Trading House.

A. Two Negro women - Gillis[']s slaves kept house for him. The North room was occupied by Gilliss [sic] and myself and when Myers came there he also occupied the same room. The Negro women and their children occupied the kitchen being the south room.

Q. What were the social and confidential relations existing between you and Gilliss [sic] while you were together at James Fork Trading House and were you acquainted with his private affairs and his relations towards the Indian women of the tribes he traded with.

A. From the very beginning we were intimate together. We were more like brothers than friends. I was acquainted with his private affairs if he told me the truth. I was acquainted with Gillis[']s relations with the Indian women of the tribes with whom he traded.
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Q. Were you acquainted with Poquas a Delaware Indian woman if yea, state when and where and how long you knew her.

A. I was acquainted with Poquas a Delaware Indian from September 1822 to 1833. I saw her first in Gillis' house at James Fork. She was there when I landed at the trading house. She remained in the vicinity of James Fork till the Fall of 1830 when she went to Kaw River where I knew her till 1833 when I left Kaw River.

Q. What were the relations between Gilliss [sic] and Poquas.

A. When I first met her they lived as man and wife. They so lived till [sic] sometime in October 1822 when Gilliss [sic] went to the Arkansas River in a trading expedition. Before he left he requested me to see to her. After that they did not live together as man and wife.

Q. Do you know of Gilliss [sic] having a child by Poquas. If yea state when and at what time the child was born, the sex, and name of the child.

A. I know that he had a girl child by Poquas. It was born the last of October or the first of November 1822. I went after the midwife when the child was born. We called the child Sophia. Gilliss [sic] named the child Sophia Gilliss [sic] after his return.

Q. Were you acquainted with a Natta Koque [Nanticoke] Indian woman belonging to the Delaware tribe commonly called Little Girl. If yea, state when and where and how long you knew her.

A. I was acquainted with her from 1822 to 1833 at James Fork Trading Post. While the Delaware lived there and afterwards at Kaw River while I lived there.
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Q. Do you know what the term Natta Koqueas [Nanticoke] applied to Indians means. If yea, then please explain the same fully.

A. I only knew that they were a band of the Delaware tribe calling themselves Natta Koqueas [Nanticoke]. The children born took their name from their mother not from their father. All the tribes with which I was acquainted did the same.

Little Girl['s] parents were half NattaKoque [Nanticoke] and half French.

Q. Do you know what were the relations between Wm. Gilliss [sic] and Little Girl. If yea, state the relations.

A. I do. He kept her as his wife. I think it was in the year 1824 when he first took her. It was at James fork Trading Post. In the fall Gilliss [sic] went to Black River Swamp on a trading expedition and took Little Girl with him about the same time I went to St[e]. Genevieve I meet Gilliss [sic] at Hicks [Hix] Ferry[,] Current River, Arkansas State. From there we went to Big Black River and remained there till [sic] late spring. When Gilliss [sic] went to St[e]. Genevieve and had pack horses and I brought Little Girl back for Wm. Gilliss [sic] to James Fork Trading House. She remained with Gilliss [sic] till [sic] about the 1st of May following when she went back to her father for good. Did not live together after that.

Q. Do you know of Gilliss [sic] having a child by Little Girl, if yea state the time and place and the sex and the name of the child.

A. I do. The Child was born about two months after she left Gilliss [sic] about July 1824 at her parents about one and ½ miles from the James Fork Trading House. It was a girl. He, Gilliss [sic] named her Mary Gilliss [sic].
Q. Who kept and provided for and raised Sophia Gilliss [sic] and Mary Gilliss [sic].
A. They remained with their mothers till they were old enough to go about then they were given to Mr. Gilliss [sic]. William Gilliss [sic] then kept them at his own house in the hands of his black women. During the absence of Gilliss [sic], I saw to them, that they were provided for.

Q. What was Mr. Gillis's conduct towards and treatment to the said children.
A. His treatment was that of an affectionate and good father.

Q. When and where did you last see Sophia and Mary Gilliss [sic].
A. At Gillis's House on Turkey Creek near Kaw River in Jackson County, Missouri in the year 1833.

Q. Were you acquainted with Leharsh a Piankeshaw Indian and his wife and children. If yea, state the time and place when and where you first became acquainted with them and how long you knew them.
A. Yes. I have seen him often, but never had any dealings with him. First met him to my recollection at Pinsauneau [Paschal Pensineau] Trading House on the Osage [River] about the year 1825, afterwards saw him and his family encamped near one trading post when he was moving with his family to the mouth of the Swan. To the best of my knowledge he had two sons and one daughter. After Leharsh and family moved to Swan River his wife and children lived in one of the houses owned by [Louis] Lorimier [Jr.] which was left in the possession of Gilliss [sic].

Q. Were you acquainted with the daughter of Leharsh. If yea, state the time
and place when and where you first became with her and about her age and how long and where you [illegible] to know her and her name if you remember.

A. I was. I saw her at different places while encamped at the James Fork Trading Post and also when they lived at the mouth of Swan in the Lorimier house. I saw her at different times, I believe from the year 1825 to 1829 until shortly before the removal of the Piankeshaws to Grand River. I don't remember her name now.

Q. Do you have any knowledge of any intimacy existing at any time between Gilliss'[s sic] and Leharsh'[s] Daughter during the time that Gilliss [sic] lived at James Fork Trading House. If yea, state all about it.

A. I have not, nor never knew of any intimacy existing between them.

Q. While you were under Gilliss [sic] at James Fork Trading Post subsequent to the time that Leharsh moved to the mouth of Swan, did Gilliss [sic] to your knowledge remain any of his time at the trading house at the mouth of Swan. If yea, state how he was there and how long he may have [illegible]

A. I recollect about you or three times that he was down there and stayed one night only that I know of. He might have been there fifty times when I was away from home.

Q. Do you know what year and the time of year the Piankeshaw Indians moved from the mouth of Swan to Grand River now in Cass County Missouri.

A. To the best of my recollection it was in the fall of 1829.

Q. Do you know who moved them.

A. Gilliss [sic] I suppose was the man that moved them. I recollect very well
when he returned from moving them.

Q. When were you at the removal of the Piankeshaw Indians to Grand River.
A. I must have been at home or near the trading post. I did not see them pass the trading post at James Fork when they moved, but Gilliss [sic] stayed one night at the James Fork Trading Post.

Q. Were you at home at the James Fork Trading Post when Gilliss [sic] returned from Grand River.
A. I was at home.

Q. About what time was it when Gilliss [sic] returned from Grand River.
A. It must have been the latter part of November or the first part of December 1829.

Q. Where did you remain during that winter of following spring after the removal of the Plankeshaws.
A. I remained during the winter at James Fork Trading Post and made a trip to Three Forks of White River.

Q. How long were you gone from home on that trip to Three Forks of White River[?]
A. It might have been two weeks - it might have been three weeks I know it was not long.

Q. What season of the year was it that you made the trip to Three Forks of the White River.
A. I think it was November.

Q. State if you saw any member of Leharch[']s family at Gillis[']s house at
James Fork Trading Post at any time in the winter and spring after the removal of
the Piankeshaws to Grand River.
A. I don't recollect of seeing any of them there.

Q. Do you have any knowledge of Gilliss [sic] and Baptiste Peoria after
Gillis' return from Grand River in the winter of 1829, fixing up pack horses and
going to Cow Skin [Creek].
A. No. I have no knowledge of any such thing - never heard of it. Gilliss [sic]
was not at Cow Skin [Creek] while I was with him.

Q. State whether Leharsh's daughter was at Gillis' house at James Fork
Trading Post at any time during the winter and spring following the removal of the
Piankeshaws to Grand River.
A. I do not recollect of seeing Leharsh daughter at Gillis' house at that
time or any other time.

Q. State where you roomed in the winter of 1829 and Spring of 1830 after the
removal of the Piankeshaws to Grand River - where you slept and eat and who
slept in the same room with you and who eat at the same table with you.
A. I roomed in the same room that Gilliss [sic] roomed in-his bed was in one
corner and mine was in the other. When I was at home and Gilliss [sic] was at
home, we eat at the same table in the same room that we slept. William Gilliss
[sic] and William Myers, when he was there, slept in the same room with me.

Q. Do you know who roomed and slept in the kitchen, the south room of
Gilliss [sic] said house during the same time you was at James Fork Trading
Post. If yea, state who.
A. Gillis[']s Negro women and children and the husband of one of them, one of them being married.

Q. Did any other person lodge or sleep in Gilliss['] said house during the time you was there, besides those already named by you as having slept and lodged there. If yea, who[?]

A. Yes, sometimes a white visitor would come and remain with us and sleep with us.

Q. Where [sic] there any other except white visitors.

A. I don[']t know of any.

Q. Where did Gilliss [sic] remain during the winter and spring following the removal of the Piankeshaws to Grand River.

A. He remain [sic] at James Fork Trading House.

Q. State whether Leharsh[']s daughter you have spoken of is the same spoken of and known as KahKatoqua.

A. From what I have heard she was the same. I never heard of his having but one daughter, her parents were old when I knew the family.

Q. Do you have any Knowledge of Leharsh[']s wife, daughter and son or either of them being at Gillis[']s house at James Fork Trading Post at any time during the winter and spring following the removal of the Piankeshaws to Grand River or thereafter up to the time of Gillis[']s removal from James Fork Trading Post. If yea, state all about it.

A. I have none sir.

Q. State whether Gilliss [sic] and Leharsh[']s daughter lived together at
James Fork Trading Post the winter and spring following the removal of the Piankeshaws to Grand river.

A. They did not live together then to my knowledge I knew where Gilliss [sic] was. He was at home on James Fork Trading Post during the winter till [sic] grass grew in the spring, when he went to St[e]. Genevieve.

Q. Do you have knowledge of Gilliss [sic] and Leharsh[']s daughter living together at James Fork Trading Post at any time before or after the removal of the Piankeshaws to the Grand River. If yea, state all about it.

A. I have no such knowledge.

Q. Do you have any knowledge of Gilliss [sic] having a child by Leharsh[']s daughter. If yea, state your whole knowledge.

A. I have no such knowledge of it.

Q. State whether any Indian woman or girl lodged in Gillis[']s house at any time during this winter and spring following the removal of the Piankeshaws to the Grand River. If yea, state when and where.

A. I don[']t recollect of any.

Q. Do you know whether any Indian woman or girl lodged in Gillis[']s room during that time. If yea, state who.

A. I do not know of any.

Q. Do you know when Gilliss [sic] closed and removed from James Fork Trading Post. If yea, state when and where did he remove to and locate if you know.

A. I knew, he closed the business in the spring of 1831. He moved away that
same spring of 1831. He moved to Kansas River and located in Turkey Creek near the mouth of Kansas River. I accompanied him to Turkey Creek and I remained there that summer.

Q. What then became of Gillis' Negro women and the two children Sophia and Mary Gilliss [sic][?]

A. They went with him to his new home in Turkey Creek.

Q. Do you have any knowledge of Leharsh's daughter being at Gillis' house at the James Fork Trading Post at any time after the removal of the Piankeshaws to Grand River. If yea, state time she was there and how long she remained at any one time.

A. I have no knowledge of her being there at all.

Q. Who assisted Gilliss [sic] in moving the Piankeshaws Indians from the mouth of Swan River to the Grand River.

A. William Myers and his teamsters.

Q. Who laid in the goods for Gilliss [sic] for his Indian trading business after you went into his employment.

A. I mostly did - at first he did sometimes, but at last I did.

Q. Who laid in the goods for the last several years that the business was carried on at James Fork Trading Post.

A. I did.

Q. After Gillis' removal from James Fork Trading Post, where and with whom did you then live and how long did you so live.

A. I lived with William Gilliss [sic] from the spring of 1831 to February 1833
on Turkey Creek, Jackson County.

Q. What was Gilliss [sic] engaged in and where did he stay or pass his time while you lived with him on Turkey Creek.

A. He was about home at Turkey Creek engaged in no particular business until the summer of 1832 when he went to St. Louis to an Indian treaty. He remained there till [sic] in the fall about November.

Q. Was Gilliss [sic] absent from home at any time after you removal to Turkey Creek near the mouth of Kaw [Kansas] River. If ye, Where and when he was when from home if you know.

A. I know of absent at the treaty at St. Louis in the summer of 1832. This was all his agency that I know of except a visit to Scotos [Chouteau] Trading Post with me when Col. [Pierre] Menard was there.

Q. Do you know where Gilliss [sic] was in the summer of 1830, If yea, state where he was and if away from James fork Trading Post, state the time he left, how long he was gone and the time he returned to the trading post and by what route he returned if you know.

A. I believe in the latter part of the summer of 1830 he was in [illegible] land. He must have left late in Spring of 1830. Don't know exactly the time he left. I think he was gone about three months and a half. He returned to the trading post late in the fall. He returned by the same old route we always traveled - what we called the old Piney Road - which route came and led from St[e]. Genevieve by Massey[']s Iron works across little [Piney] and big Piney [River] passing to the head waters of the James [River] by the house of Thomas Patterson and then
four miles south of Springfield and so through [3 illegible words] James Fork Trading Post.

Q. Who accompanied Mr. Gilliss [sic] in his return on that trip from St[e]. Genevieve.

A. Sylvester Sausier [Sylvester Saucier] who remained with us until I left Turkey Creek in 1833.

Q. Do you know where Sylvester Sausier [Sylvester Saucier] now lives or if he is yet living.

A. I don'[']t believe he is living though I am not certain. I have Frequently [illegible] after him and could hear nothing of him.

Q. How long did Gilliss [sic] then remain at home at James Fork Trading Post after his return in the fall of 1830 as you have stated.

A. He remained at home til [sic] 1831, when he removed the Delawares.

Q. Have you any knowledge of Mr. Gilliss [sic] ever visiting the Piankeshaw tribe or any portion of them in Indian Country after his return from Grand River to James Fork Trading Post. In fall of 1829 and between that time and the Spring of 1833. If yea state when and how often and how long he remained with them at any one time.

A. I have no knowledge of any such visits.

Q. Do you know any thing [sic] about the removal of the Delaware Indians from the James Fork of White River. If yea, state who moved them and when and where they were moved to and who all assisted and accompanied them in moving there[.]
A. Yes in the winter of 1830 on my return from Ste. Genevieve, Gilliss [sic] was gone moving the Delaware Indians. He returned three or four days after my return. Col. [Pierre] Menard and Valley [Louis Vallé], not knowing that Gilliss [sic] had moved any of the Delawares sent me horses for that purpose. In the spring Gilliss [sic] moved the remainder of the Delawares, mostly poor ones. And at that time we broke up all business at the James Fork Trading Post and all went to Turkey Creek, Kaw River.

Q. Do you have any knowledge of Mr. Gilliss [sic] being at the Cow Skin Creek at any time in the fall or winter of 1829 after the removal of the Piankeshaw Indians to Grand river. If yea, state the time of his visit there and his business there if you know.

A. I have no knowledge of his being there then or at any other time while I was in his employ.

Q. Do you know where the locality of the place then called Cow Skin Creek is. If yea, state where said place is.

A. Yes, it is a small river taking its origin in Missouri and empties into Grand River in the Seneca Indian Country.

Q. When did you remove from Turkey Creek near the mouth of the Kaw and where did you then move to and where have you lived ever since.

A. I left Turkey Creek February 1833 and came to White River, Stone County, Missouri and have been living there ever since.

Q. Were you acquainted with the Piankeshaw customs and usages as to the men and women selling and eating at the same table. If yea, state such customs
fully and particularly such customs and usages as to husband and wife.
A. Yes, they never eat at the same table when together even among
husband and wife. The man always eats first, the women afterwards.
Q. State whether this you have stated was general among all Indian tribes
you have been acquainted with.
A. It was general among all tribes with which I was acquainted.
Q. State whether any Indian woman eat with Gilliss [sic] at his table at the
James Fork Trading Post at any time while you was there from the year 1822 up
to the time of Gillis's removal to the Kaw River in 1831. If yea, state what Indian
women, their names and when.
A. No, I never knew one single Indian woman ever eat with Gilliss [sic] at all
not one single time, never seen one.
Q. How far is it from James Fork Trading Post of White River to the Cow Skin
[Creek] in the Seneca Indian County.
A. I believe it is eighty miles.
Q. Were you acquainted with the Piankeshaw Indian customs and usages in
reference to contracting marriage? If yea, state full such customs and manners
of consummating marriage.
A. If their customs were like the Delawares[,] I was and my understanding is
that they were the same. There were two sorts of people - one rich and the other
poor. The rich were called Big Folks. If you wanted one of their daughters - a
virgin you had to make a friend - generally a woman - for your friend. Tell you
wanted such [illegible] daughter. Then your friend would tell you it would take
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such and such articles and goods naming the articles it would take that she believed that you could get her for these articles. Then you made up the bundle of goods and gave it to your friend. The friend would tell you that tomorrow or day after tomorrow she would go and if she returned with the bundle of goods you could not get her without adding such and such articles. After adding the required articles and the bundle was taken back if they were accepted your friend returned and tells you, you can get her and she will be here such and such a night. She never comes alone, but when she comes about dark accompanied by her mother or aunt or elder sister if she has one. Then the one that brings her soon after leaves and goes home and then you invite the bride to come and show the blanket - this consummates the marriage. Some require more than others and sometimes a horse or gun or saddle are given.

Q. To which member of the family of the girl is the application made and the goods offered.

A. To the Mother. If she has no mother then to the aunt called little women.

Q. What, if anything, did the father of the Indian girl have to do with the application for and the marriage of the daughter.

A. I don't know that he has anything to do with the application but I am told that when the father and mother are alone together that they talk the matter over between themselves, but says nothing to the friend that offers the goods. The goods are offered to the mother or just put down.

Q. State whether the father is approached on the subject by the friend of the applicant.
A. No, he is never approached that I have ever heard.

Q. State whether the customs and usages of Indian marriages which you have described were general among all the Indian woman you were then acquainted with.

A. I believe they were general among the Indian tribes I knew.

Q. Were you acquainted with a Delaware Indian woman named Charlotte[?] If yea, state when and where.

A. I was. I was acquainted with her from 1822 to 1833 at the Delaware village and at the James Fork Trading Post and also at old mine[.] 

Q. Do you know what relation existed between Mr. Gilliss [sic] and Charlotte. If yea, state what such relations were and the time and place.

A. Yes, He brought her from Arkansas River to James fork Trading Post as a wife in the spring of 1823 and kept her a day or two. I suppose he brought her as his wife.

Q. Were you acquainted with a Delaware Indian woman, Black Squaw - if yea, state when and where.

A. Yes. I was. I was acquainted with her at Delaware Town and at Black River Swamp. I was acquainted with her from 1823 to 1824. I think.

Q. Do you know what relations existed between Gilliss [sic] and Black Squaw - if yea, state what these relations were, where and what place.

A. Yes, he had her for one of his wives. He had two at the same time. In the year 1823 Gilliss [sic] started for the Black river Swamp and encamped at Rich Wood [sic] and the mother of Black Squaw brought her to Mr. Gilliss [sic] there. I
am not certain about the date. It might have been in 1823 - 1824 or 1825. They went from Richwood to Black River. In the following winter before his return from Black River to James Fork Trading Post he drove her off and she went to her aunt. He never lived with her at home. He took this woman sometime after he had Little Girl and he had the two awhile at the same time.

Q. Do you know anything about Mr. Gilliss [sic] having a Delaware Indian woman, a daughter of Capt. Ketchum [Twehullahlah] at the trading post at James Fork of White River. If yea, state all you know about it and the time and the relations which existing between Gilliss [sic] and her.

A. Yes he had such a woman about his house. When she came there I was not at home. William Myers was there at the time. She remained from four to six weeks, He Gilliss [sic] told me he drove her off. I was either in 1827 or 1828 that she was there. I m not certain of which.

Q. Do you know of Gilliss [sic] having any other Indian women at the James Fork trading post with whom he lived any at all except those already named by you. I yea, state their names and time he had them there.

A. Yea I know of one. I knew her only by the name of Wilson. She was [James] Wilson[']s daughter. She was a Delaware half breed I think it was the summer of 1828 or 1829 that he had her there to the best of my recollection. How long he had her I cannot tell. She may have slept at Gillis[']s house two or three nights to my Knowledge and when she came there her mother generally came with her. She lived with her mother and brother. They lived at Capt. Ketchum[']s [Twehullahlah] Delaware Village below us. Gilliss [sic] frequently
went to their house in the evening and returned the next morning. He kept her to my recollection about two months and then quit her.

Q. Do you know of Gilliss [sic] keeping or living with any Indian woman at the James Fork trading post at any time after he quit Wilson[']s daughter, If yea, state who and when.

A. I do not to my knowledge know of his keeping or living with any after he quit living with Wilson[']s daughter.

Q. Were you acquainted with James Pool at James Fork trading post. If yea, state how long said Pool lived there, what was his employment and his wife s name if you recollect it.

A. I was acquainted with Pool before we came to this county. He was here when I came. He was the Delaware blacksmith - employed by the government at James Fork trading post. He lived there till the fall of 1830 when he moved to the Kaw River I was acquainted with Mrs. Pool. I think her name is Phe[o]be. Mrs. Pool left with Mr. Pool for Kaw River in the fall of 1830. She, Mrs. Pool is a white woman.

Q. Were you acquainted with Sarcoxie and the Connors [John and Henry/Harry] - men of note of the Delaware Indian Tribe at James Fork Trading Post during the time you were employed at said post.

A. Yes. I was acquainted with Sarcoxie who lived at the Delaware town and John and Henry [also known as Harry] Connor. They lived at Capt. Ketchum[']s [Twehullahlah] village.

Q. Do you remember the names of any other Delaware Indians who were
young persons about the year 1829 and 1830 and who were familiar about James Fork trading post. If yea, state their names.

A. I don't remember at this time, except it is John Marshall.

Q. Do you know under what authority Gilliss [sic] moved the Piankeshaws from the mouth of the Swan [Creek] to Grand River. If yea, state all about it and whether Gilliss [sic] had any contract with the U.S. Government for moving them.

A. I do not know except this - Col. [Pierre] Menard had orders from Superintendent of Indian Affairs [William Clark] at St. Louis to move the Piankeshaws where they wanted to move. Col. Menard didn't know that they wanted to move and how Gilliss [sic] knew it, I do not know. He either moved them on his own hook or volunteered to do it.

Q. Do you remember the complexion of Leharsh's daughter. If yea, state what was her complexion.

A. Yes she was a tolerable white Indian.

Q. Were you acquainted while in the Indian Country with one Baptiste Peoria. If yea, when and where did you first become acquainted with him and how long and where did you know him.

A. Yes I was acquainted with him. I became acquainted with him in St[e]. Genevieve before I came to this country. I knew him from about 1819 to 1832 at St[e]. Genevieve, James Fork Trading Post and Grand River and at the mouth of Swan River. He passed for a Peoria Indian.

Q. Were you acquainted with the wife of Baptiste Peoria. If yea, state to what tribe she belonged.
A. I was acquainted with her and she passed for the daughter of a Piankeshaw Chief.

Q. Had you any knowledge of Baptiste Peoria being in the employ of Mr. Gilliss [sic] about the time of the removal of the Piankeshaw Indians to Grand River. If yea, state what was his employment.

A. I have no knowledge of Baptiste Peoria being employed by Mr. Gilliss [sic] about the time of the removals of the Piankeshaw Indians, but he was employed before that time.

Q. What was his employment before that time under Gilliss [sic].

A. His employment before that time was to track horses and to interpret with the Piankeshaws, Peorias and Weas, the language we could not talk.

Q. State whether Baptiste Peoria to your knowledge acted in the capacity of clerk for Mr. Gilliss [sic] at any time while you were under Gilliss [sic]. If yea, state when and where.

A. I never knew Baptiste Peoria to act as clerk for Gilliss [sic].

Q. Do you know where Baptiste Peoria remained after the removal of the Piankeshaw Indians to Grand River.

A. It is my understanding he went with the Piankeshaws. I don't know where he remained and I saw nothing of him in this country afterwards.

Q. State whether Baptiste Peoria was at James Fork trading Post the winter and spring following the removal of the Piankeshaw Indians to Grand river. If yea, state of what time and how long he remained.

A. I did not see him nor hear of him.
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Q. Do you know where Baptiste Peoria eat [sic] and lodged when at or about the James Fork trading Post before he left there. If yea, state the place.
A. He slept with the hired hands in the house with the hired hands. I suppose he also eat [sic] with the hired hands.

Q. State whether Baptiste Peoria while about the James Fork Trading Post eat [sic] or lodged in Gillis[’]s dwelling house. If yea, at whose table did he eat and in which room did he sleep.
A. He never eat [sic] or lodged in Gillis[’]s house to my knowledge.

Q. State whether any flour was on hand at the James Fork trading post at and about and after the removal of the Piankeshaws Indians to Grand River.
A. I don[’]t think there was any on hand for Gilliss never bought any except sometimes a few pounds to use on the road from St[e]. Genevieve to James Fork Trading Post.

Q. Do you know what Indian language Mr. Gilliss [sic] was able to speak and understand while you were with him. If yea, state what language.
A. He understood and spoke the Delaware language.

Q. State whether Gilliss [sic] was able to speak and understand the Piankeshaw language.
A. He was not.

Q. Were you acquainted with Col. [Pierre] Menard of Menard and Valley [Vallé]. If yea, state when where you knew him.
A. Yes, I knew him from the time I was a child. I knew him at St. Louis, Ste. Genevieve And KasKasKie [Kaskaskia, Illinois][.]
Q. Are you acquainted with Peter Menard now of Fremont[,] Tazewell County[,] Illinois, a son of said Col. Menard. If yea, state when and where you first became acquainted with him and what were the social and business relations existing between you and said Peter Menard during the time you were under Gilliss [sic] at James Fork Trading Post.

A. Yes I was well acquainted with him. He was somewhat older than I. I was acquainted with him in St. Louis and Ste. Genevieve, Kaskaskia and James [River] trading Post. I was acquainted with him from the time I was a boy up to the year 1834. We were friendly together but not in business together. I was a clerk for Gilliss [sic] and he was employed by Menard and Valley [Vallé].

Q. State the year and the month as near as you can in which Peter Menard made his last visit to James Fork Trading Post while you were there under Gilliss [sic] of which you have any knowledge.

A. I believe in 1826 was the last visit he ever paid us at James Fork Trading Post. He usually came in the spring or the fall. Before 1826 he sometimes came twice a year.

Q. State if you have any knowledge of Peter Menard being at James Fork Trading Post after William Myers came there to be clerk in Gilliss [sic] business there. If yea, state where.

A. I don't believe he ever was here at James Fork Trading Post after William Myers came to the trading house. He went to Peoria[,] Illinois.

Q. State whether Delaware Trading House and James Fork Trading Post both of which you have mentioned are one and the same place.
A. They are one and the same place. We used to call it Delaware Trading House. It is usually called James Fork Trading Post.

Q. Where were you when Gilliss [sic] returned from Grand River after moving the Piankeshaws there in the fall or 1829.

A. I believe I was at the James Fork Trading Post.

Q. According to the Indian customs of marriage in your examination in chief, how many wives was a man permitted to have at the same time.

A. I never knew any law among the Delawares, debarring a man from having as many wives as he had a mind to have.

Q. Did you ever know of a case of a man having two wives at the same time among the Delaware Indians and if so how many.

A. Yes, I knew several. Little Jack a pure Delaware, he had a mother and a daughter for wives at the same time. The war chief- Shuwanack’s [Suwaunock] son had two-his own cousin and a strange woman. McCullock had Shuwanack’s [Suwaunock] niece and another woman. I have no doubt I could think of others by studying.

Q. Were the Delaware women honest and virtuous like the Piankeshaws.

A. They were not. There were a few exceptions-there were some honest ones.

Q. Were you present at the marriage of William Gilliss [sic] with any of the Delaware women mentioned in your direct examination. If so, state the ceremonies.

A. I was not.
Q. Do you know anything of your own knowledge of William Gillis[']s marriage with any of the Deleware [sic] women mentioned in your direct examination. If so state what you know and all about it.

A. All I know about it is seeing him going to bed with them and calling them his wife.

Q. How did man and wife separate according to the customs of the Indians.

A. I have always heard if the wife left she took her own property and left. And if the man left he did the same. I have often known them to drive their wives away. This is all the Law of Divorce I knew among the Indians.

Q. During your employment by Gilliss [sic] at the James Fork Trading Post from the year 1822 to 1830 were you necessarily compelled to be away from the post more or less every year, and if so, state what trips you made what distance you went and how long you were absent.

A. I was, I am not able to tell now. Sometimes I was absent two or three days. Sometimes two or three weeks, a month and once upwards of two months. St[e]. Genevieve was one place to go to we called it 250 miles.

Q. How often did you go to Ste. Genevieve and for what purpose.

A. I can[']t tell now. I went sometimes once a year, sometimes twice and once I went three times.

Q. How many trips did you make down the James Fork and White River with furs in boats during the time from 1822 to 1830.

A. One trip I made in 1827 with William Myers to Forsyth. One trip I made with William Gilliss [sic] from Delaware Town to Forsyth down the James [River].
One trip from Forsyth to New Orleans. This is all the trips I made with boats while in the employ of Gilliss [sic].

Q. During the time from 1822 to 1830 how many trips did you make to the three forks of White River.
A. I can't tell. I was there five Falls. It took me two days to go and two days to come back.

Q. What was your business there on these trips.
A. To go and get their peltry - The Indians' Peltry and collect our credits - what the Indians owed us, the Delawares

Q. Were you at Pincineceau [Paschal Pensineau] Trading House on the Osage [River] from the year 1822 to 1830 and if so, how many times and how far was said trading post from James Fork Trading House.
A. From 1826 I believe I was there from Delaware town some three or four. I cannot tell how far it was from James Fork Trading House. But it must have been 90 to 100 miles. I rode it in two days.

Q. What was your business there.
A. The first time I lost my way and got there- the second time I went to see Pincinneceau [Paschal Pensineau] the third time I went with Col. [Pierre] Menard[.]

Q. How often were you at Cow Skin [Creek] during those years.
A. I don't think I was there but once.

Q. How often were you at Black Swamp during those years.
A. I don't think I was there but once.
Q. During the years from 1822 to 1830 what other points [parts] did you visit to collect peltry and collect from the Indians?

A. I visited sugar creek and the Kickapoo in Arkansas.

Q. After the Piankeshaws moved from the mouth of the Swan to Grand River in the fall of 1829 did William Myers ever return to the James River Trading Post.

A. Yes. He returned late in the spring following.

Q. Where did he go after his return to Gillis's trading house on the James Fork of White River after his return from Grand River in the Spring of 1830.

A. Gilliss [sic] requested me to take Myers with me and go to Grand River to the Piankeshaw Chief and collect $1000.00 which they owed him. We went- we got there in the evening. We let him know our business by Baptiste Peoria interpreting for us. From there we went to the Kaw River from there we went to St. Louis- from there we went to Ste Genevieve.

Q. About what time in the Spring of 1820 did you and William Myers go from Gillis's trading house in the James Fork of White River to the Piankeshaw settlement on Grand River?

A. About the 20th of July we started from James Fork Trading Post to Grand River.

Q. In your direct examination have you given dates and circumstances from memory without the aid of books or memoranda.

A. I have given dates and circumstances from memory as well as I could.

Q. Between the year 1822 and 1829 did you know of William Gilliss [sic]
taking a fancy or becoming interested in KahKetoqua or Leharsh[']s daughter. If so state what you know about it.

A. I never saw them together.

Q. Could you speak the Piankeshaw language.

A. I could not speak their language, but I could understand enough to trade with them.

Q. Did you ever live at the mouth of Swan [Creek].

A. No. I never lived there I only stayed there two or three days at a time.

Q. Between the years 1822 and 1830 with what tribe of Indians did you principally live and what Indian language if any did you learn to speak.

A. I lived with the Delaware Indians - there was my home. I learned to speak the Delaware language.

Q. You stated in your cross examination that you were at Pincinneau [Paschal Pensineau] Trading Post three or four times. Please state whether you saw Leharsh[']s daughter at said trading house at either of these times. If yea, at whose house did you see her.

A. I saw her there once, I believe it was on my first visit there when I was lost in 1825. The house belonged to the American Fur Company and Pincinneau [Paschal Pensineau] was the trader.

Q. State if you at any time had knowledge or information what relations existed between Pincinneau [Paschal Pensineau] and LeHarsh[']s daughter previous to the year 1829.

A. To the best of my knowledge I know of no information that any relations
existed between Pincinneau [Paschal Pensineau] and LeHarsh['s] daughter previous to the year 1829.

Q. Have you ever traveled any time from home during the last three months. If yea, to what places, in what manner and state the [2 illegible words][.]

A. Yes I have- I went some sixty or seventy miles on a little trip to Christian Creek in Arkansas. I have also been to Springfield, about sixty miles. I was also to Galena yesterday. A week ago about twenty miles. I traveled all this on horse back [sic]. When I am forced to travel I travel but it nearly kills me.

Q. How did you travel from your home to Galena at this time and on what day and who accompanied you.

A. I traveled on horse back [sic]. It was Tuesday the 7th of June. Mr. Grover the plaintiff['s] counsel accompanied me.

Q. Who attends to your own private business which requires attending.

A. I do.

And further Deponent sayeth [sic] not Joseph Philibert[.]

Subscribed and sworn to before me on the day at the place and within the [2 illegible words] hours first aforesaid [illegible][.]

W. Estes, Justice [2 illegible words] within the county of Stone County[.]

Missouri[.]
KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, That we William Gilliss and Louis Valle are held and firmly bound into John Quincy Adams President of the United States, or his successor in office in the sum of one thousand dollars, money of the United States, to the payment of which, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, and each of us, our heirs, executors and administrators, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents: Sealed with our seals, and dated this first day of November one thousand eight hundred and twenty seven.

The condition of this obligation to such, That, whereas, R. Graham agent of Indian Affairs, at St. Louis has this day granted to the said William Gilliss a LICENSE to trade at the Three forks of the White River the place designated for carrying on trade with the Shawnee & the Delaware Nation, or Tribes of Indians.

NOW, if the said William Gilliss shall faithfully perform all the duties which arise from the laws and regulations which now are, or hereafter shall be made, for the government of Trade and Intercourse with the Indian Tribes; if he is not a citizen or subject of a foreign power; if he shall not carry among the Indians any uniform clothing, other than that of the United States; nor Medals, Flags, Armbands, or other ornaments of dress, bearing the figures, devices, or emblems of any foreign power; if he has given to the agent correct Invoice of the Merchandize which he takes with him; if he shall not sell to, nor exchange
spirituous liquors with the Indians; and if he shall Trade at the aforesaid trading
establishment, and at no other place, and shall in all respects act conformably
[sic] with the License granted him this day, then this obligation to be void, else to
remain in full force and virtue.

William Gilliss [sic]

L. Valle

Signed, Sealed and delivered in presence of Raphael Widen, Pierre Menard
St[e]. Genevieve[.] 9 Nov 1826
Sr Incl- un license pour William Marshall son Invaise de man manders Sy et le
vieux Anderson couseur que Mr. Marshall ayent Le mayor Cambell que tu aurat
present Le lieux est du mines Marshall Chez Anderson et La luis 7 metres a
bieure sa le vieuz na pain d'objectiore. Alors si Marshall bevis La license[.]

[Translation by author: Sir Included: A license for William Marshall his Invoice of
goods And the old Anderson wants for Mr. Marshall is assigned Major John
Campbell presents his license at Marshall's place at Anderson's Village and to
him 7 meters of beer for the old is not under objections then if Marshall has a
license.]
Superintendency of Indian Affairs

St. Louis[,] May 4th 1827

Sir[,]

The introduction of spirituous liquors among the Indian Tribes, is not only contrary to Law, but productive of much mischief, and which, while it thwart the beneficent policy of the Government with regard to the Indian Nations, and entails misery upon them, endangers the peace & safety of its own Citizens. It therefore becomes a duty to put a stop to this increasing evil and you are requested to take the most prompt and efficient steps, to prevent their introduction among the several Tribes of Indians, within your agency, either by the Licensed or other Traders, and to enforce the Law on this point against all offenders.

All Indian Licences [sic] will be withheld on proper information on oath, that the Trader has sold Liquor to the Indians.

The most rigid measures should be observed on this subject, and it is Just & proper, that they should be equally rigid in every portion of the Indian Country, that the Trade in one part may not have an unfair advantage over the Trade in another, but the sale of an article forbidden by Law, & which carried with it vices and calamity.
I am very Respectfully your Ob[edien]t Serv[an]t[,]  

Wm Clark
APPENDIX B-24. Menard to Piankashaws, Peorias, and Weas. 31 August 1825.

Source: Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

Delaware Town[], 31st August 1825[]

To my brothers the Piankeshaws [sic], Peoria and Wia [Wea] Indians,

   Sickness has prevented me from visiting you for the present time, but I hope that the master of life will be charitable to me and that I shall see you again.

   I have understood my Brothers that you were going far off a hunting this year with our friend [Peter A.] Lorimier, this I am very Glad of and I hope and wish that the great spirit will favour you with a good hunt, so as to pay you for your trouble.

   My Brothers, I know that some white men will do all they can to induce you to leave your friend [Peter] Lorimier. They will promise you a great deal, but in the end they will not give you anything, and when they will take your skins they will not look at you anymore.

   My Brothers be aware of those sweet Tongues they will employ people of your own colour and probably of your own nation, to induce you to go with them but you must not believe them. Keep yourselves always close to the one who is your friend, & who has been so for several years, who has kept his own people to follow you and who furnishes you with your wants.

   You know that I support him and if we can[,] he had not good enough to pay you for your hunts, that his papers on me are as good as the ready money.
But if he has not good enough, the others will have still less for he has more
goods than the others.

Your friend and brother[,] Pierre Menard

To the Chieff [sic] of the Piankeshaws [sic], Peoria, and Wia [Wea] at Port
Defiance[.]

Care of P[eter] A. Lorimer [sic]
APPENDIX B-25. Menard to Lorimier. 2 September 1825.

Source: Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

James Fork[.] 2nd September 1825[.]

Dr [Dear] Peter [Lorimier],

Inclosed [sic] you have the letters for your Indians, one of them you will read to those Indians in presence of Magt. [Major John] Campbell.

I have sent you by Wagon, 150 pairs of small ear bobs, it is all I had & you will credit me for them.

Your friend Mr. William Marshall was here Yesterday and was much displeased at some reports of some Indians. He was informed that you have told the Indians that you were the only one that could and would have goods, that him Marshall & [William] Gillis & [Basil] Boyer, credit was not good and that they could not have goods any longer, I told him that I was sure you never used such language and that it was false, Magt. [Major John] Campbell told him the same. Should we be so lucky as to make an advantageous contract for skins, you will be informed in time[.]

Yours[.]

Pierre Menard

Ps I believe that James [Wilson] is the one who has made that report to [William] Marshall[.]
APPENDIX B-26. Anderson et al. to Lorimier. 11 March 1825.

Source: Menard Papers, Correspondence 1804-1826, Microfilm, Reel 3, Frame 502, Pierre Menard Collection, Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library, Springfield, IL.

Mr. Lorimore [sic]

Sir[,] I think you ought [sic] to pay us some rent for last fall ass [sic] [William] Marshall[,] [James] Wilson[,] and [William] Gilliss the[y] have payd [sic] and we wish you would do so likewise. The above mentiond [sic] hence payd [sic] five bushells [sic] to the acre though Graham told me those that the land was cleared should pay Ten bushells [sic] to the acre. We only ask you for five bushells [sic] to the acre and so Doing will please us verry [sic] much.

Given at James Fork[].

March 11th 1825[].

Wm Anderson [Kikthawenund]

Laopanenchla [Lapanihilie]

Ketcham + [Tawhelalen]

Capt. Pipe [Tahunqueecoppi]

N.B. Sir you pay Laopaneuchla [Lapanihilie] the rest for last year and oblige[.]
APPENDIX B-27. Campbell to Graham. 25 July 1825.

Source: Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

James Fork White River, July 25th 1825[.]

Sir[.]

Inclosed [sic] you have some documents for your parusal [sic] on the subject of hog killing by the Dellawares [sic]. The dispute betw[ee]n Natcoman [Natcomin] and Mr. [William] Marshall is not yet settled. Marshall has gone to Cape Jerrardoe [Girardeau] for evidence. There is much feeling here amongst the Indians about the manner [in] which the annuities shall be distributed. The poor Indians complain to me constantly and state they get little or nothing that the big fish eat all the little ones up in the duration. There [sic] complaints are made by Killbuck's band and very justly too. I am creditably informed that he Killbuck and his great men have signed receipts to Gillis & Boys [Boyer] for Seventeen hund[red] dollars to be paid out of this annuity. This is for depts. [debts] contracted by Killbuck and a few of his band. By this means the poor of his band are to get nothing. This is unjust and ought not to be suffered. I hope you will inform Col. [Pierre] Menard of this and prevent his excepting [accepting] those orders of Killbuck[']s. [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] the chief Joins me. He is much disatisfied [sic] at the conduct of Killbuck and his party. That party a few of them are disatisfied [sic] with me in consequence of the corse [sic] I have persued [sic] to endeavor to stop them from bringing in such quantities of whisky. There has not been less than three hundred dollars of whisky brought in the
nation by the Indians since you left. This [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] and myself have called the chiefs and soldiers together several times and I have said everything that I could say to stop it but all to no purpose. [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] says we will stop but them [sic] goe [sic] on and see what will be there [sic] fate. You have no conception of the Difficulty I have undergone since I arrived here. I have not had three days rest since here I been. I believe I have erected every cabbon [sic] on the Dellaware [sic] land. I have just returned from a visit to the Peankashaws [sic] and Weas and Peorias, they join me in endeavaring [sic] to stop them from bringing in whisky below. The chief of the Plankashaws informed me that some of those white persons who were permitted to remain on the land by Anderson had brought in whisky and sold it to the Indians. I remained and watched them for two days but could not ketch [sic] them. On my return I called on [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] [and] told him that they must leave the land. He called the chiefs and they counsilled [sic] together, finally concluded that I should notify those men that of they did soe [sic] again they must leave the land immediately but that they must have it at all wints [winter] so soon as them crops were finished.

I have visited the Kickapoos frequently, I have made them give up some horses which they had belonging to the whites. I should be glad if there could be anint [another] interpretor [sic] for the Kickapoos. I have had that to doe [sic] myself which is not my duty. They wish one to visit them on the Osage river which I shall doe [sic] as the fires are done. Some Jurion [sic] has written to the Kickapoos that they would furnish them goods at a very reduced price for there 602
[sic] annuity. They had agreed to take there [sic] goods from Col. [Pierre] Menard as they told me themselves. I doe [sic] not expect that any body [sic] will furnish them lower than Menard.

I have now given you a full view of everything worth your attention. Except that I have notified Mr. [James] Wilson that I should not [call] on him again to interprat [sic] for me, he is by no means fit for that place, he cannot give the propper [sic] interpratation [sic] of anything, he will always put his own construction upon what I say to the Indians and what they Indians say to me. This I have caught him at frequently and giving different advise from myself. This [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] and a great many of them tells me now. They say they thought I would find it out myself. I have done soe [sic] to my satisfaction. You can doe [sic] as you please. I informed him on the 21st of this month that I should not call on him again. I have spoken to Troyet [Troit] to act for me for the present. Send me the outlines of the late treaty that I may no [know] the boundary lines. Give my best respects to Govener [sic] [William] Clark and family and to Col. Abinander [Matthew Arbuckle]. I am much oblige [sic] to you for the hat you sent me. Write me by Col. [Pierre] Menard.

Send on the newspapers.

Your friend,

John Campbell, Sub Indian Agt.

Source: Fort Leavenworth Agency, 1824-1836, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 300, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Shawnee & Delaware Agency [Kansas]. December 17th 1830.

Genl. William Clark[,] Supt of Ind. Affairs[,] Inclosed [sic] you a quarterly Estimate for the first quarter of the year 1831. When I wrote you last, I felt some uneasiness In consequence of the apparent dissatisfaction of the Delawares, there [sic] traders [William] Gillis & Martial [William Marshall], came on here with them; before they returned Martial [Marshall] wanted to have me one of his waggons [sic] to hall [sic] there [sic] Provisions, the evening before they started back The traders came to my house with a note from The Sub Agent, informing me that there was Some Complaints against the Delaware B[Jack] & G[un] Smith [James] Pool And that those Gentlemen [sic] woul[d] inform me of the Particulars, they had with them Capt. Ketchum [Tawhelalen] a Delaware, who comanenced [sic] first, and lodged in Several complaints, was followed by Gillis and Martial [Marshall], after they got through, Gillis wanted me If I removed Pool, to let him furnish a Smith A black man of his, which he offered for $150 less than Pool Received, which I thought explained The whole matter, after they went off, I started up To see the Delawares, met with Ketchum [Tawhelalen] at the Shawane [sic] Interpreters, he requested Anthony Shane [also spelled Chene] to say to me That what he had
said the evening before he was requested to say by his Traders, that the Chiefs had not sent him as he had stated to me, Chief [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] wished me to inform you that he did not wish Gillis for a trader any moore [sic], my impression is that they are both very unsuitable men To be amongst the Delewares [sic], as soon as they left Here the chiefs were easily reconciled and appear to be interely [sic] satisfied, they are very much pleased with there [sic] new home. The present year will soon you have not authorised [sic] me to draw on you for Any thing [sic] in the next year. The delewares [sic], that Are hear [sic], have very few hunters among them. There [sic] young men events [sic] into the woods in the Fall & will not be here untill [sic] Spring. Game is very scarce and hard to get, they are all ingaged [sic] putting up camps to winter in.

If Provisions are not furnished, them and That at the Kanzas [sic] River for they can't [sic]t will cross There horses for the ice, they will suffer very Much if some don't [sic]t Perish. I can't [sic]t let this Hapen [sic] while I have money on credit. I wish to receive instructions from you how to Procede [sic]. There have been some transgressions, hunters on the Shawanee's [sic] lands, the Kanzas [sic] Indians Made an attempt to rob our Company of the Whites who stood there [sic] Ground untill [sic] they Killed one of the Indians, after which they run and left there [sic] Property to the mercy of the Indians. I have not Been able to ascertain the names of the intruders. As soon as I do I will report them to you.

Respectfully, Your most Ob[edien]t Servant,

Richard W. Cummins
APPENDIX B-29. Miller to Monroe. 10 December 1820.

Source: Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

Fort Smith [Arkansas], Dec. 10, 1820[.]

To the President of the United States [Monroe],

Sir,

I am here now with a view of making another attempt to complete a settlement betwixt the Cherokee and Osage Indians. I had believed I could do so, but on my arrival at this place I was informed that the Osages had a few days before robbed a party of the Cherokees killed two and wounded one. I have sent for both nations to come be agreeable to their material agreement where with them last Spring. I have not yet heard from either but I expect to soon. I have but little hope now that I shall be able to effect [sic] my object, should I fail the property of the white people will be jeoperdised [sic] if not their lives. The Indians assions [actions] are now so intermingled with the White Settlements, what every war party going against the Osages must pass through them and it is expected will commit deprivations [sic] not only on the property, but on the persons of the white Inhabitants, therefore should the Indians go to war themselves, and should their expected depredations on the Whites unfortunately have [illegible] a war betwixt them and the white people, which I hope may not be the case in our present situation. The White Settlements ar [sic] so far detached from each other and intersected by Indians assions [actions] and settlements it would be extremely difficult for me to concentrate the fuo [fort] militia. I have to depend on
and the Commandant of this post could not with safety to his command help me to more than forty men in case of War –

A Gentleman direct from Tennessee last evening favoured me with a paper in which I discovered a treaty purporting to be a treaty of peace, Amity and Accommodation between the United States on the one part by their Commissioners signed Andrew Jackson & Thomas Heinds on the part of the United States and about Eighty Chiefs and head Men of the Chactaw [sic] Nation on the other. Such a treaty cannot be an accommodation to the United States much less to the unfortunate Inhabitants of this Territory. I cannot believe that those Gentleman Commissioners on the part of the United States could have had correct information of that part of this Territory by them ceded by said treaty. I therefore consider it my duty so far as I have been able to get information to make a just statement of facts to you as well as to the Honbl. Senate of the United States. The overflow of the Mississippi, White, and Arkansas Rivers renders the land generally untenable from the Mississippi near to the post the Quapas [sic] Indians claim by treaty the land South of the Arkansas River commencing at the post running thence South West to Red River, thence up Red River to the Saline Fork, thence up the Saline Fork to a pace here a North East point will strike the Little Rock thence down the Arkansas to the bound first mentioned the distance on a straight line from the post to Little Rock is seventy or seventy five miles in this there appears to be some mistake.

The treaty now in the hands of the Quapas [sic] says a due North East point from the Saline to the Little Rock and that approved by Government says
due North. From the Little Rock tu [sic] a due west west [sic] line it is forty four miles by Secnvey [sic] to the counterplanted [sic] Eastern boundary for the Chactaws [sic] on the South of the Arkansas River and the Cherokee live on the North, therefore a tract of land forty four miles wide is left between the Quapas [sic] & Chactaw [sic] lines and one hundred & ten miles long extending from the Arkansas to Red Rivers.

If said Treaty is confirmed as it now stands it will not only depopulate two counties entire now organized by the Legislature of this Territory viz. Crawford & Miller, but it destroys Hempstead in my opinion second to none in the Territory fur [sic] point of numbers and respectability. The Indian line will cut the County of Hempstead in two and have the best and thickest settled part of that county within the Indian Boundary and it will be necessary to drive all these White Citizens from their humble houses prepared by many years hard labor to give place to Savages.

Agreeable to the best information I have not less than one third of the whole white population of this Territory will be compelled to move and surrender their improvements and that is not all, when this takes place the Indians (If I am rightly informed) will have control of all the Salt Springs in this Territory which the white people now depend on for their Salt. The Chacktaws [sic] will have those South of the Arkansas River, the Cherokees and Osages north & west. And again I understand that a number of those people who will have to move or surrender their houses have erected Mills the expense of which is enormous here, but few spots can be found here where the advantage of water can be had
and I undertake to say that at this day nine tenths of the bread corn made use of in this Territory is either pounded or ground on land Mills.

The tract of country taken in by this assion [action] is very extensive and if we are rightly informed here runs West beyond any bound any [sic] ever claimed by the United States and takes in the hunting ground of Pawnee and lataw [sic] Indians, it also bounds the Chacktaws [sic] north on the Osages with whom they have always been at war.

Although this assion [action] appears to be made to an indifferent number of Chacktaws [sic] without reserve even of the military post here or the navigations of the river. I presume should the whole nation give up all the land they now possess and come here and instead of having their Eastern line near a hundred miles East of this it should be placed two hundred West of this and then hold the Balance West of that as now bounded they would have there tru [sic] acres of good land for every one given up and as desirably situated perhaps as the land given by them in exchange it is much better for the Indians because it is the best hunting ground in this Territory and I have no doubt as good soil. Many of the Settlers, who have so long been resident in Clark and Hempstead Counties, have no doubt of their right to preemption agreeable to law and common usage others have Spanish Claims and grants which they have been in possession of for many years. I have only to say that I hope & trust that the Government, whom I have been proud to look to for many years for Justice & protection, will not now be found less mindful of the rights & privileges of their Territorial Subjects than those of the States.
With perfect respect[,]  

Your very ob[edien]t. Serv[an]t.

James Mille[r]
APPENDIX B-30. Graham to Calhoun. 7 February 1822.

Source: Box 2, Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

St. Louis, Feb[ruar]y 7th[,] 1822[.]

Sir[,] When I startied [sic][James] Wilson the Interpreter to the Delliwars [sic] in [illegible] for that part of the tribe left in Ohio & Indiana. I was fully impressed, a belief that he would reach their freinds [sic] at the Currants [Current River] before Winter set in, enable[d] me to make arraingements [sic] futheir [for their] comforts that would be both pleasing to them & satisfactory to Govt. But the sickness which was so general throughout the U States last Fall has prevented their advancing farther than the Ambarras [Embarras River, Illinois] a small stream that empties into the Wabash a few miles below Vincints [Vincennes]. I enclose you the report of the Interpreter by which you will be able to judge of the distressd [sic] situation.

Added to this difficulty of thrown in my way of having if not all, at least a real part of them located at the Lands designed by Gov[ernment] for them in the Spring - is, that of the Delawar[e]s now at the Currants [Current River] determination of going to War with the Osages.

However anxious the old man [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] & a few of the old cheifs [sic] are to preserve peace[;] I fear their authority will not be suffecient [sic] to restrain their young men. With the affair of the Cherokees &
Osages they seem like bloodhounds in the bark. I have told them if they go to war I will retain their annuity[,] withdraw their traders from them & withhold any further supplies & they will be considered as without the protection of the Government [sic]. If this will not restrain them which I much fear it will not from their present spirit, I would ask the aid of the Military to stop it, or provide each party with the means & let them fight it out.

Each day experience confuses me more & more, that without the protection of Government the Osages will be destroyed [sic]. This Wintry [sic] hunt have [sic] given the emigrating Indians an idea of the vast riches of the Osage Country & they openly avow their intentions of taking possession of it. Hunting parties of Delaware[s] are equipped [sic] for war ready to strike if they fall in with any Osages. If they go to war[,] the Kickapoos will join them, tho[ugh] they have a fine country, none superior, yet they are anxious to exterminate or drive the Osages off.

One half of the Kickapoos are still in Illinois & are unwilling to remove but say they will come in the Spring[,] they have between two & three hundred warriors on the Osage River. The following will be something like the number of warriors that can be brought against the Osages from the east - Cherokees 600, Delaware[s] 600, Kickapoo 400, Shawnees[,] Peorias[,] Weas[,] Michipamians [sic], Piankishaws 500, making a total of 2100; from the west about 2000 Pawnees & others. To meet this force the Osages can bring into the friler [field] 1000 warriors & the Kansas 250, making a total of 1250.
Their [sic] is a treaty offensive & defensive between the Sacs & Foxes & the Osages as it respects the Pawnees, but the Sacs & Foxes will not take up the tomahawks against the Delawar[e]s, who have an extensive control over all these Indians now residing West of the Mississippi.

A party of Pawnees have taken three lodges of Little Osages and another party of the same nature consisting of 11 warriors, were all killed by the Kansas. This latter party had gone out for the purpose of stealing Horses.

I have enclosed to you an estimate of the expenditures [sic] that will occur within my agency for the 19th of the present year in which I have embraced the contingent expenses[,] which will occur in the delivery of annuities. Not being able [draft ends midsentence]

Source: Records of the United States Superintendency of Indian Affairs, St. Louis, Vol. 2 1813-1825, Microfilm, William Clark Papers, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, KS.

A Treaty of Peace and Friendship made and concluded by and between the Delaware nation of Indians acting for themselves and all their Grand Children whose chiefs were present of the one part and White Hair [Cheveux Blancs or Pahuska], Big Soldier [MonShonAkiDa Tonka], and Wanonpashe [Wanougpacha or He Who Fears Not], all of White Hair[']s Town of the Osage Nation acting for and representing all the Osage Tribes. The parties being desirous of establishing peace and friendship between them have agreed to the following articles.

Article 1st Every injury or Act of hostility done by either of the contracting parties against the other shall be mutually forgiven & forgotten.

Article 2d Their [sic] shall be perpetual peace and friendship between the contracting parties.

Article 3rd It is mutually agreed that if any difficulty should occur [sic] between the Osages and any of the Delawares['] Grand Children in the adjustment of it is to be left to the Delaware nation who are to decide without any deficmcly [sic] or partiality. But any difference between the Osages an[d] the Delawar[e]s themselves, is to be left to the desision [sic] of the Superintendent of Indian Affairs residing in the Country.
Article 4 The Delawares have setup claim against the Osages of one Thousand dollars for damages sustained. The Osages offer to pay five hundred dollars in goods at a fair price this is refused by the Delawares but they would be very willing to receive land from the Osages adjoining their own. This Article is left to the decision of Wm. Clark, Supt of Ind. Affrs [sic] if the Osages after consulting their Nation agree to give the land they will give notice to the Delawares against the first day of June next.

Article 5 The undersigned Chiefs & warriors for themselves and The Tribes they represent promise to support the foregoing Articles of stipulation of the Treaty this day concluded between them.

In witness whereof they have subscribed their names and affixed their seals this 21st day of Sept. in the year of our Lord 1822. Delaware Towns[.] State of Missouri[.]

Delaware Chiefs & Warriors. Signed in presence of Kethdewhnan [Kikthawenund] or William Anderson

Pierre Menard, Sub Ind Agt Wm. Anderson [Kikthawenund]
Paul Louise [Loise], “ “ Lapanihile or Big Bead [Bear] [Lapanihile]
Peter A[.] Lorimeir [sic] Pousse [Pooshies]
Sam B. Marshall Potchinowalass [Petchenanalas]
Wm. Gilliss [sic] Nanomidagum [Nonondoquomon]
Silvester [sic] Saucier
John Quick [Journeycake]
Petamonosse [Petamonosse]
Captn Nathcoming [Natcomin]
Capt Beaver [Punchhuck]
Capt Catchem [Twehullahlah]
Capt Killbuck
Capt Whitemen [Suwaunock]

Fort Smith, Arkansas Territory, December 5th, 1823.

Dear Sir,

On the 17th Ultimo[,] a party of Osage Indians attacked a camp of American Citizens, and some half breed Quapaw Indians on Deleau [de l'eau] Blue, a branch of the Red River [Blue River, Oklahoma], and killed five Americans and a Negro. It is now understood that the Osages are proceeding towards the White River ostensibly [sic] for the purpose of hunting, their principle motive however it is believed is to have a conference with the White River Indians, and to invite them to join them in the event of a Rupture with the United States.

I have therefore to solicit a correspondence with you and shall expect to here [sic] from you soon and that you frequently advise me of the disposition [sic] and views of the Indians residing on and near the White River.

I am, Sir very respectfully Your obe[diant] Servant,

A. Arbuckle, Colo[nel]. Commdy [sic]
APPENDIX B-33. St. Louis Council House. 6 January 1825.

Source: St. Louis Superintendency, 1824-1826, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 747, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Council House St. Louis[.] Jan[uar]y 6th 1825[.]

In Council with Genl Clark[,] Sup[erintenden]t of Ind[ian] Affairs

The deputation of Cherokees exhibited a number of Stouds [sic] &
Bunches of Wampum with several white wampum belts which that nation had
received at different times from the various Tribes of Indians residing East of the
Mississippi which had been delivered to them with talks in relation to their
removal to the West and occupying a Country convenient to each other for the
purpose of union – and support of regulations calculated to govern the whole and
promote the culture of the earth and a tendency to civilization.

No 1. received by them was a long white belt from the Six Nations.

No 2. received by them a white belt of Wampum from the Canawagos
[Caughnawaga].

No 3. a long white belt of Wampum and several strands from the
Showonees [sic] of Ohio.

4 a bunch of Wampum from the Chicksaws [sic].

5 a bunch of Wampum from the Chacktaws [sic] and a bunch of Blue
Wampum from the Chacktaw [sic] warriors.

6 a bunch of White and Blue Wampum from the Creeks.
7  3 bunches of White Wampum from the Nottoways.
8  2 bunches of White Wampum from the Showonees [sic].
9  1 bunch of White Wampum from the Wayandotts [sic].
10 1 bunch of White Wampum from the So-wa-ke-la Tribe.
11 1 bunch of White Wampum from the Miamies [sic] Nation in Ohio.
13 1 Bunch of White Wampum from the Ottowas.
14 1 Bunch of White Wampum from the Chipaways [sic].
15 1 Bunch of White Wampum from the Socks [sic].
16 1 Bunch of White Wampum from the Foxes.
17 1 Bunch of White Wampum from the Kickapoos.
18 1 Bunch of White Wampum from the Wayandotts [sic] of New York.
19 1 Bunch of White Wampum from the Delewares [sic].

One belt of White Wampum and a large bunch containing strings of white and Blue wampum received from the several Tribes aforesaid renewing their former talks which had been received.

A string of white beads encurled [sic] & curiously connected, attached to a peice [sic] of Tobacco received by the Cherokees from 18 villages of the Tribes residing between Arkansas Territory and New Mexico acknowledging the talks of the above tribes which had been communicated by the Cherokees and through them enviting [sic] those Tribes to come and be their neighbors.

In Presence of W. B. Alexander[,] Sub Indian Agent
APPENDIX B-34. Patterson to Clark. 27 January 1825.

Source: Records of the United States Superintendency of Indian Affairs, St. Louis, Vol. 2 1813-1825, Microfilm, William Clark Papers, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, KS.

Delaware Talk[.] January 27th[.] 1825

Patterson [Meshaquowha]

   My Brother. About three years ago the Osages came to see me with Maj. [Richard] Graham who told them to listen. I want you to be friends with the Osages. I still remember that I told them I wanted to be friends. It is not much use to say much about it as you know what they think. I tell you my brother that after we made friends, the Agents said whoever did wrong should suffer for it. I will not see who it is did [sic] wrong. My brother as I considered these people my friends, I thought I would try them and came here hunting. I thought I would go & see how they would treat me. The Osages said come – the road is clear – come & go at leisure. Last fall as I came along I met the Osages Near this river, going to hunt on White River. I thought we were mutual friends changing hunting grounds, continued on to Choteau[']s [Auguste Pierre Chouteau] where I heard a letter had been received saying all was at peace. Chouteau [sic] told me there was a great many hunting towards red river & that I had better g[illegible] Arkansas. I went & incamped [sic] over next-time I camped I met Osages they asked us for powder & I gave it. [G]ive them everything I could spare they stole a great many little things about camp. I did not care about them. I thought them friends & looked
over it. My Brother, I then went on to where I commenced my return home, returning I saw four Osages who said they come from War with the Pawnees.

They heard some gunfire & I told them they were all Delawares they asked me to give some powder & I gave it. I was behind coming on & when I got to Camp I saw the Osages had caught one of my horses & was driving the rest they quit driving the horses and we came on & camped together. I thought there was one of White Hair's [Pahuska] warriors while I was encamped I saw seventeen more Osages four of them White Hair's men in the morning they shot one of my young men and stole all his property amounting to one hundreds [sic] forty three dollar[s] & a half. There is a gun in my Camp which I believe belongs to the Osages who shot him which the Osage left-behind when he ran they first asked for powder & loaded with some of it & shot at him the gun when [illegible] and had been uncharged & several buffaloe [sic] skins were found near him after he was shot-at. [H]e ran off to where his wife and child was & got one of the horses & came at night to [William] Gillis's Camp.

My Brother I shall by very glad when I see what was taken from my young man... There were eleven or twelve hundred deer skins, ninety five beaver, eight otter skins & some racoon [sic]. [H]ow many I don't know. Twenty or twenty one I believe, two Bear skins. There was also left some camp equipage our trader knows how much of it. Not long after we left the men, they were attacked by the Osages and were obliged to run off. It was nobody but Osages. My Brother they alone done it out of & left there, one American & Frenchman got to us safe. I don't know what has become of the other two. [T]he two who came to us got in
with great trouble in seven days after leaving pirogue [sic]. My Brother, after they shot our young man, I did not want to do anything wrong untill [sic] I could see the agent. You know the Delawares do not tell lies, when I receive what I have lost I will be satisfied but not till [sic] then, this is all I have to say.

Questions, by the Governor: who were in council of the Osages, giving you leave to hunt on Osages Lands.

Answer: Whair [White Hair or Pahuska] & his Principal Braves.

Paul [Loise] & Simon were interpreters.

Ques. by G[overnor]: Where did they shoot at your man?

A: on the big Bend of Arkansas or a little above it.

Q by Gov: Who owned the peltries the Osage took?

A: all of us owned them [illegible] Delawares who are behind owned some.
A Treaty of Peace and Friendship made and concluded at St. Louis in the State of Missouri the 7th day of June 1825 by and between the Great and little Osage & Delaware nations of Indians. Whereas, a Treaty of Peace & Friendship was concluded by and between the Delawares & Osages on the 21st of June 1822 at the Delaware Towns on the Currents [Current River] in which it was mutually stipulated and agreed, that certain claims [sic] referred by the Delawares against the Osages should be left to the arbitrament [sic] and award of William Clark of St. Louis & that all differences that might ther[e]after arise between the Osages & Delaware nations should be left to the conclusions of the Treaty aforesaid, difference has unhappily arisen between the said Delawares & Osage nations all of which have been mutually submitted & made known to the said William Clark in[illegible] council by the said Chiefs headmen & Warriors of the said nations; now therefore in satisfaction [sic] of the claim referred [sic] by the Delawares against the Osages at the execution [sic] of the Treaty aforesaid [sic] said, as also, for & [illegible] in, satisfaction for all differences that have since arisen between said nations. It has been awarded by the said William Clark that the Osages shall pay the Delawares the sum of Eleven hundred & fifty dollars, the payment of which has been assumed by the United States for the sake of 623
preserving peace and restoring friendship between said nations, and of which sum of eleven hundred & fifty dollars, the Delawares now here acknowledge the receipt.

Article 1st In consideration of the promise & to the and that there may be perpetual peace and Friendship between said forgiven & forgot & that the provisian [sic] of the Treaty aforesaid concluded by & between said nations are hereby renewed & shall forever remain in full force & effect.

In Witness whereof we the undersigned Chief[s], headmen & Warriors of the Delaware nations & we the Chief[s], headmen & Warriors of the great & Little Osage Nations, in presence of Genl William Clark do hereant [sic] set our hands & seals this by the 7th day of June 1825.

Witness[es] Present[:]

Wm Clark
R Graham US Ind agt
A. Menao [McNair] US Indian agt of Osages
P.L Chouteau US agt
J.H.A. Sandford
Paul & Lirse [Loise] Intep Osage
Yrort [Troit] Interp. Delaware
Delawares[:]
Wm. Anderson [Kikthawenund]
Lapihinilihes [Lapaniliilie]
Tatamanis
Capt Patterson [Meshaquowha]
Capt Nathcoming [Natcomin]
Capt. Showonee [Suwaunock]
Capt. Killbuck
Capt Tunis
Panther [Pooshies]
Jonsey Quick [Journeycake]
Little Osage[s:]
Lapluiquemache
Lawangahouis
Mangaisci
Sansakan
petit Solelat [Soldat]
Yiassdeus [Tiessinjais]
Sans Orielle [No Ears]
Missouri Chief [Kahegewashinpisheh or Cahegawashimpeeshe]
Osages[s:]
Clarmont [Gramon]
Chevuse Blanc [Pawhuska]
Sansnuf
Petit Chief
APPENDIX B-36. Campbell to Graham. 20 September 1825.

Source: Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

Anderson's Village, September 20th 1825[

Dear Sir[.]

Your letter [sic] of the 8th Instant by Antwine [Antoine] came safe to hand, with the papers inclosed [sic] relative to the hogs stolen by the deliwiars [sic], and alsoe [sic] an abstract of claims against the Kickapues [sic][.]

Immediately on the receipt of your letter [sic], I called on [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] hoo [sic] called all the chiefs together [sic] and held a council. I [sic] read [sic] your letter [sic] to them. I [sic] told the chiefs that complaint had been mad[e] to me by Oncat that the deliwiars [sic] had stolen some of his hogs, and soe [sic] soon as satisfactory know [sic] of [knowledge] was given me that the deliwiars [sic] had stolen the hogs. I should then call on them for payment as that was the instructions of there [sic] great father, they are willing when cov [sic] satisfactory proof is given me to pay for them, I am sorry that you had not decided on Natcomins['] [Natcomin] claim when [William] Marshall laid the papers before you at your house, I am myself desidedly [sic] of the opinion that the horse party at capejerredoe [Cape Girardeau] is Natcoman[']s [Natcomin]. I have written to Col. [Pierre] Menard by request of the parties to get the horse at capejerridoe [Cape Girardaeu] if he should be of the opinion that it is Natcoman[']s [Natcomin] horse he has the description of him, as to the orders of Kil[l]buck in favor of [William] Gillis & [Basila] Boys [Boyer][.] Col. [Pierre] Menard
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paid very reluctantly knowing the injustice of it, he said a great deal to them on that subject but all to no effect on Killbuck and his councilors had popetively [sic] directed the payment to be made to them, I had said soe [sic] much to them on that subject untill [sic] my patience was worn out, besides geting [sic] much illwill [sic] from eredicting [sic] them on the faith of being paid out of the annuity except [William] Anderson's [Kikthawenund] signature [sic] is to the order and that only for some thing [sic] to bury the ded [sic] on for the apestance [sic] of the sick, as to the white that were permited [sic] to remain on the indian [sic] lands after the breach committed by [Johnathan] Denton & Yokam [Soloman Yoachum] in bringing in whisky I took the liberty to order them off soe [sic] soon as they had finished there [sic] crop and paid there [sic] rent to the indians [sic], but agreeable to your wishes i [sic] shall order them again, I mentioned this subject to the chiefs in the council they are satisfied but express a wish for Mr. [John] Mooney hoo [sic] lives on James [River] should remain as he has always conducted himself well and friendly to the indians [sic] as to puting [sic] a stop to there [sic] bringing in whisky is moreally [sic] & Physikally [sic] impossible as [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] and myself have tried it sufficiently, as to antwine [Antoine] if he had been here and taken part of the trouble of my hands with the kickapus [sic] it would of [sic] helpt [sic] him I assume[d] you a doe [sic] not like much to be a kickapus [sic] interprator [sic] for nothing.

The kickapues [sic] had left there [sic] villages for red river fifteen days previous to Antwine's [sic] arrival to make their winter hunt. the peankashaws [sic]
left there [sic] village about the same time, and consequently i [sic] could not present the claims against them but soe [sic] soon as the Kickapues [sic] return I will present the claim, the peankashaws [sic] will not return to there [sic] village on white river, as i [sic] could not prevail on them to return i [sic] advised them to return on the east side of the arkansaw [sic] and there remain until [sic] they got further advising [sic] in fact they would all be glad to leave there [sic] present sittuation [sic], as to [James] Wilson you say if i [sic] cannot agree with him he must be dismissed [sic], you must be well apprised of his incabability [sic] to interpret for no other reason have i [sic] dismissed [sic] him, I have employd [sic] trait [Troit] for the present, I was in hopes i [sic] should of [sic] been permitted [sic] to of visited St. Louis this winter i [sic] have given out all hopes, the chiefs remain and wish me to remain with them not knowing what the result of the war may be beteen [sic] the Cherrokeas [sic] and Pawneas [sic].

I have agreeable to your request called upon the chiefs and laid before them the proposition made to them by the Miamies [sic] relative to the damages done the delliwares [sic] possitively [sic] object to the proposition made by the Miamies [sic] to them and state in answer that they will not agree to receive less than five hundred dollars for each one they have requested me to enclose there [sic] speach [sic] which they wish to be laid before them which i [sic] inclose [sic] you, they are much dissatisfied that there [sic] blood had not been coverd [sic] before this time. The delliware [sic] are a little dissatisfied at not having receed [received] there [sic] iron as usual, they called on me to interceed [sic] with Mr. F[elix]. Valley [Vallé] to let them have what iron there [sic] was there amounting
to three hundred pounds, that if the govmnt [sic] did not pay for it that is [sic]
should be paid out of their nint [sic] year[']s annuity, upon those terms they got
the iron, The news has reached [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] that the
Cherokeeas [sic] are preparing [sic] to goe [sic] to war against the Pawneas [sic],
soe [sic] soon as they finish there [sic] fall hunt, this has given the old man
great [illegible] he sent for me and all his chiefs and comutted [sic] what was best
to be done, I advised as they claimed him for there [sic] grandfather to write to
them which I have done for him and enclosed the peace wampum which is sent
by express I hope it will have a good affect [sic]. I believe i [sic] have given a full
detail of all the transacton [sic] in the nation I will write you again by [James] Pool
hoo [sic] will goe [sic] in next month give my best respects to Govener [sic]
I am Sin[erely]. with respect, yours obt [obedient] sr [servant][,]
John Campbell, Sub Indian Ag[en]t
APPENDIX B-37. Campbell to Graham. 27 September 1825.

Source: Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

Anderson's Village, James Fork White River, September 27, 1825.

Sir[

Inclosed [sic] you have [William] Anderson's [Kikthawenund] speach [sic] delivered on 27th intant [sic] on the late murder of his Son [Sesocum] supposed to be killed by the Osages on his return from the head water of red river in company with ten other Delliwares [sic] hoo [sic] have been absent from this village since last fall, the company states that they had saw some indians previous to there [sic] horses having been stold [sic] but did not [k]no[w] what indians they were as they were a distance off from them, they remaind [sic] and [illegible] some day, for those horses but could not from there then they proposed moving them [sic] camp, Anderson [sic] son [Sesocum] said he was not satisfied but would remain with another man and make another search, which he did accordingly he left the man to take charge of the camp and started in search, the man remained at the camp two or three days weighting [sic] his return, he got alarmd [sic] and followed his company who were a weighting [sic] for them, several of them there returned to search for him found his camps as they left it and his property, then they made a general search for him but coul[d] not find him nor the horses, they then concluded that the indian they saw a few days before had killed him, they then moved on slo[w]ly wiatingh [sic] two or three days at each encampment for him, untill [sic] they arrived at Chotoe[']s [Auguste
Pierre Chouteau's establishment when they weighted [sic] eight days longer to see if he would arrive, finding he did not, they then proceeded [sic] on to this Village, the company states that they had saw [sic] an Osage hoo [sic] stated that they has saw the company some distance back, they questioned the Osage but could get nothing more out of him, that made there [sic] suspitions [sic] still stronger.

I've done given you there [sic] statement as nearly as I [sic] could collect it from them, [William] Anderson request[s] particularly that Govener [sic] [William] Clark should visit him immediately, there is considerable fuling [sic] [illegible] this at [illegible] mention this subject, the greater part of the nation have started to make there [sic] winter [illegible]. I have [illegible] [William] Anderson to notify them to doe [sic] [illegible] until [illegible] hear from you & Govener [sic] Clark.

James Conner [Ahlahachick] returned with this party, I had him to assist troit [Troit] in this council, i [sic] find with a little practice he will make a first rate interprator [sic], he speaks the english [sic] language very well and has become to speak the delleware [sic] language well soe [sic] says the indians [sic], he is now with me reading and writing, I think that him and troit [Troit] to gether [sic] would answer all our purposes well as to the interpreting, let the pay be divided between the two, if this should meet your approbation please write me by the first oppertunity [sic]. I have agreed to give troit [Troit] twenty dollars pr [sic] month from the first of September if this meets your approbation answer me alsoe [sic], I wish you to answer my letter [sic] sent by Antwine [Antoine], you will please send
me by the first oppertunity [sic] two grrires [sic] writing paper don[']t forget the ink powder, i [sic] would of [sic] sent an express with the dispatches by request of an[d] could not get one, I have been compethed [sic] to the way of St[e].

Gennevive [Genevieve].

I am Sin. Resp [sic]

John Campbell, Sub Indian

P.S. you will be soe [sic] good as to have coppied [sic] and send me the copy as i [sic] lack paper[.]
APPENDIX B-38. Campbell to Graham. 16 March 1826.

Source: Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

Delaware Village[,] March 16th[,] 1826.[]

Sir[,]  

On my arrival at this place I find but few Of the indians have arrived but they are daily expected, One of the Dellewares [sic] arrived two days ago, and brings the accounts of the Dellewars [sic] and Kickapoos having killed five Osages on the waters of red river [Oklahoma]. There were ten Dellewars [sic] and ten Kickapoos who were hunting together at one camp, the Osages came to them and told them they had been to war against the Pawneas [sic]. They invited them to camp with them they did soe [sic], in the night the Kickapoos proposed to the Dellewars [sic] to kill them[;] the Dellewares [sic] replied saying that there [sic] chief and there agint [sic] had told them that they must not doe [sic] any mischief while on there [sic] hunt. [B]ut before daylight they all concluded to join and tomhawk [sic] them, which they did accordingly. They justify this act because the horse belonging to [William] Anderson[']s son [Sesocum] hoo [sic] was killed was seen amongst the Osages, another reason they [illegible] that the Cherrokea [sic] chief told them that the Osages had killed eleven of his people last fall and one Shawny [sic] and one Delleware [sic] boy. The Cherrokea [sic] chief is now collecting all his warriors [sic] and intends striking the blow in about fore [sic] weaks [sic], there was when this young man left Marshall[']s [possibly William Marshall's brother] trading town on red river about eight hundred [furs] collected
from the different tribes, about 6 weeks [sic] since the Osages have killed five Dellewares [sic] among them was George White[eyes or Alimee] his father [George Bullet or Pondoxy][,] one woman[,] and two boys, so soon as this news reached Natcoman [Natcomin] on red river he started with five men determined to have scalps, the indians have all left red river on there [sic] way home soe [sic] soon as they arrive I shall be able to get all the particulars, and will communicate them to you, there is at present soe [sic] many reports that I don't think it necessary to notice them, I called what indians there [that] were here soe [sic] soon as I arrived and delivered your speach [sic] to them alsoe [sic] Goviner [sic] [William] Clark[']s letter, they appeard [sic] to be well satisfied with there [sic] contents, I am endeavoring to suppress the war as much as possible untill [sic] we shall hear from you what Col. McNears [Alexander McNair] has done with the osages.

Lawfanialy [Lapiniihilie] The second chief died about one [illegible] since I laid before the chiefs the map sent by me they are well pleased with the country, and soe [sic] soon as the Shawneas [sic] chiefs and Kickapoos chiefs arrive they will then visit that country on the Kansan [sic] river, I will send an express as soon as the indians all arrive I should be glad to have a Kickapoo interpreter [sic] when they arrive, I wish you to get all my letters out of the post office and send them, and some of the newspapers since the siting [sic] of the last congress, send Col. Mcnares [McNair's] Letter as soon as possible, tell Goviner [sic] Clark [William] Anderson will answer his letter by the next oppertinity [sic] give my best respects to Goviner [sic] Clark and family[.]
and remain Sir yours

with Respect[,]  

John Campbell
March 1826[

My Brother,

Your talk to Genl. [William] Clark was received by me in his absence from this place at the City of Washington.

It distresses me to hear by it that you still seem to be determined on war with the Osages. My Brother, I will tell you the news that has been sent to your great Father at Washington [President John Quincy Adams] respecting the present difficulty with your nation & the Osages. He has been informed that your son [Sesocum] is missing and that you believed the Osages had killed him.

He has been informed by the Osage agent [Colonel Alexander McNair] (who has since died) that the Osages deny it & know nothing of it. That if it can be established by any evidence[,] they will do what is required of them. He was also informed by the Osage agent that a party of Osages fell in with a party of Delawar[e]s & Cherokees I believe & informed them that a day or two before they fell in with a party of Comanches with whom they had a fight & killed several of them & took from them some scalps that they believed to be Delawar[e], [and] That they gave up the scalps which were thought to be Shawnees & Kickapoos.

My Brother your grand Father has also been informed of the wanton attack on the Osages by the Kickapoos & Delawar[e]s in which five Osages were
killed. Clamore [Claremore or Gramon] has also sent a talk to him stating there
[sic] circumstances & that his head is now hanging low & will not raise it untill
[sic] he hears from him, [and] that he will not strike hopeing [sic] that his great
Father would see that Justice was done to him.

Your great Father has also been informed by Col. [Alexander] McNair the
late Osage agent, that arraingements [sic] were made for the Osages &
Cherokees to meet at the Fort on the Arkansas [Fort Smith] on the 1 May & that
he intended to try & get a dispatch taken of Delawar[e]s to go with him. His death
has put a stop to this intention of his.

My Brother this is the news that has been received here & sent on to your
great Father. Whether true or false the great Spirit will judge & know.

My Brother, If what I have stated is true your nation has done wrong in
killing the 5 Osages. You ought to have waited untill [sic] there was some
certainty of your sons [Sesocum] being killed by the Osages before you
retaliated. Besides the solemn oblication [sic] of a treaty held Sacred by all nation
in all quarters of the world & that too made under the sanction. I guarantee of
your great Father, should have restrained you untill [sic] you had his consent to
go to war. But I fear now the steps you have taken will bring you into difficulties
as well as the displeasure of your great Father.

My Brother, my voice has not been heard among you. My heart beats
warm for you[,] my blood runs as strong in my veins to redress your greivances
[sic] & compell [sic] the Osages to do you justice, as the most violent of your
warriors, but with this difference. I wanted you to be at the right side, to do justice
& then make others do justice. It should have been done[,] I would have seen
that it was done & for that purpose gave the Osage Agent [Alexander McNair]
untill [sic] 1 June to shew [sic] that the Osages did not kill your son, but the
impatience of your warriors has put a stop to all this.

My Brother, your last communication relative to some of your peoples
being killed by a party of thirty Osages [on the Roubidoux Fork of the Gasconade
River, Missouri], fills me with astonishment. I can scarcely beleive [sic] it. I never
would suppose they had courage enough to pass all your settlements & attack a
party of your Indians. I think there must be some mistake in it. You say the
Horses were not taken; this is a circumstance that never occurs with the Osages.
If they had either killed or taken prisoners, it was most probable they would also
take the Horses, particularly where they were tied up.

My Brother, you were right to send a war party after them. I hope they
have been overtaken & punished. I do not want you to stand still & let them strike
you. No. When such attacks as the last you mentioned is made upon you, I
would like to see the whole energy of your nation aroused & carry the retaliation
to their own villages, but before you do it, be sure what nation it is that has been
to[o] daring. My Brother, I would have been with you before now, but the great
Spirit has sent among the white people & I fear it will get among the red skins
too, a disease, with which all have been afflicted & many died. I was confined for
two or three weeks & am now too weak to ride or would immediately visit you.

My Brother, Defend yourself from all nations who strike at you, but I mark
before you would strike back in return you would wait untill [sic] I can go to see
you.

My Brother, Have patience, it is twice enough. Whenever the Delaware &
their grand children raise their arm against the Osage, its fall will make them
strike [sic] & they will no more be heard among the nations of the earth.

My Brother, I feel the loss your nation has sustained in the death of
Lapihinilie [Lapanihilie]. It is a veritalive [sic] of the great Spirit which we all have
to yield to.

For your prosperity & success, you have the prayers of your friend & agent,

[Graham]
APPENDIX B-40. Anderson to Clark. 18 March 1826.

Source: Box 3, Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

My Brother [William] Clark[.]

I take you and [Richard] Graham[,] [Pierre] Menard[,] and [John] Campbell by the hand or [as] if you were present, my brother[,] I heard what you said to me yesterday to take time[.]

My Brother Clark it is true what you have said not to Jump up wright [sic] away.

[M]y Brother, you no [sic] that all my grandchildren are all around me I will let them all no [sic] what the Osages has [sic] done to me[.]

My Brother, I am not a [sic] going to say much to my grandchildren at present I will wright [sic].

My Brother Clark I have heard from the Cherokees [sic] they are arragoing [sic] to raise the tomahock [sic][;] it will not benefit them to be in such a hurry.

My Brother, it will not be long till [sic] I send a man with the tomahock [sic] to the Cherokees [sic] and let them send it on.

My Brother, this is what I say to you that I shall say to the Cherokees [sic] that you must not jump soe [sic] soon you must wright [sic] look around at all our relations first.

My Brother Clark you say allways [sic] when I want any thing to call on you now my brother I want something to load my guns with.
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My Brother I cannot tell you how much of powder I want I will see it when it comes and will divide it amongst four nations.

My Brother Clark they have killed my son [Sesocum] last fall the Osages they killed him with the bowe [sic] and arrows, I don'[/]

My Brother, there is a good many of your people among these Osages I wish you take the French [traders] and all away from them.

My Brother what I mention to you for the article to load my guns if I get it will please all the hearts of your red children.

My Brother Clark you no [sic] it is not wright [sic] for your people to be amongst the Osages when your children looks at them.

My Brother don'[/]t give no more powder to the Osages this will please all the hearts of your red children.

My Brother Clark this is all you will hear from [me] and my council men and warriors at present. I shall call for the Kickapews [sic] tomorrow and tell them what the Osages had done to me.

My Brother, my people are all scattered all through the woods, everywhere, if you see any of them your [sic] I want you to send them all this way.

This speach [sic] was deliver[e]d since the packet was closed I have not time to coppy [sic] it. I only have an oppertunity [sic] to send it to Mr. Baldreidge[']s [Baldridge] mill [in present-day Texas County, Missouri][.] I have directed him to forward it by the earliest oppertunity [sic] the spirrit [sic] of war is rising rapidly.
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John Campbell, U.S. Sub Indian agent
APPENDIX B-41. Anderson to Graham. 29 March 1826.

Source: Box 3, Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

March 29th[,] 1826.

My Brothers [William] Clark[,] [Richard] Graham[,] [Pierre] Menard[,] & [John] Campbell[,] I now speak to you again. I speak to you as if I had you all by the hands. I want you to no [sic] what the Osages has [sic] done to me again. Only two days ago one of my young men [Joe Elliot] was found killed and scalped and eight more of his camp are missing. I don'[/]t no [sic] wheather [sic] they are killed or taken, or made there [sic] creape [escape], one of the men belonging to the same camp, and hoo [sic] brings us this nuse [sic] last night. He says that him [sic] and two others went out a bar [bear] hunting. The man hoo [sic] brings us the nuse [sic] says that he returned to the camp in the evening[.]

He found all of there [sic] horses tied up, and no person to be seen[;] he then looked about the camp and found a great deal of blood and soon after found the man killed. He immediately made his escape.

My Brothers[.] Seven days agoe [sic] one of my men came in and said that he had seen thirty Osages near this same place[,] I thought he mought [sic] be mistaken, but now we believe it.

My Brothers Clark and Graham about sixteen days agoe [sic] our friend Campbell sent an express to you to tell you what the Osages has [sic] done to me on the waters of red river. They killed five of my people there.
My brother, we are afraid that the express is killed, as his track was seen near where the Osages were seen. It appeared as if he was making his escape from the different courses he took.

My Brothers when I left my country away, [illegible] my fathers told me that they would set me down on where [White] river when there [sic] arms would allways [sic] be around me, and if any nation struck him that they would be struck alsoe [sic]. I think now my friend they are struck.

My Brothers[,] all of you no [sic] what the Osages has [sic] done to me, you no [sic] that they killed my son [Sesocum] last fall.

My Brothers you see what they are doing to me and my Grandchildren every day.

My Brothers you cannot after this say that we struck the first blow.

My Brothers you will now[,] I hope[,] let me and my Grand children alone. We are all your children[;] can you bear to see your children cut to peaces [sic] soe [sic][;]

My Brothers[,] all of you think in your hearts of me and my grandchildren and see how the Osages uses [sic] us.

William Anderson [Kikthawenund], Cheif [sic] of the Dellewares [sic]
Kaskaskia, April 17th 1826[.]  

Major R. Graham, U.S. Indian Agent  

Dear Sir,  

James Pool has just come in from the James Fork, which place he left on 31st March last, and came away for safety[']s sake. Now the following is his report. He says that four days previous his departure, Captain Beaver[']s [Punchhuck] son had discovered a party of fifty or sixty Indians who announced themselves Shawnees, but were Osages. These Indians he saw at the old village of the Piankeshaws about thirty miles distant from the Baldridge[']s Mill in Texas County, Missouri] and seventy from the Delaware town. He escaped from this party unhurt and ran to [William] Anderson’s village to give the alarm. That on the following day a Delaware had arrived who stated that he had found in the same neighbourhood the Body of Joe Elliot (a Delaware) shockingly mangled & scalped, and besides that[,] two women and two children were missing. That on the succeeding [sic] day came in the son of the Panther [Pooshies] who had been wounded in the hand at the Battle were [sic] Elliot had been killed. Upon receiving these informations [sic] [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] sent a party of Twenty six Delawares and Twenty five Kicapoos [sic] from Yanga’s village and who were them there to intercept the Osages. These had not
proceeded further than three miles, when they heard behind them a discharge of about Twenty Guns. Supposing the Town to be attacked[,] they wheel about, and on their arrival found another party of Kicapoos [sic], who on their way had fired on five Deer. Mrs. [Phoebe] Pool being alarmed by all this would not stay a moment longer, but insisted to be brought to the white river settlements. They therefore start on the spot at 1 o’clock on the 31st of March, and procede [sic] to [William] Marshall’s place where they arrive about sunset. Mrs. [Betsy] Marshall’s [Wilaquenaho] family had already moved away, and only Morris and Ned were found there, taking care of the property. All the Delawares then in, amounting to 60 or 70 men, were then either at [William] Anderson’s or Nanumdagum’s [Nonondoquomon] Town and there were only three old men at Rostingear’s [Roasting Ear] town about 300 y[ar]ds from [William] Marshall’s on Finley [River in Stone County, Missouri]. These had their horses saddled by them and ready for a fleight [sic] about nine o’clock at night. [James] Pool heard the report of four Guns from that part of the river, which made him fly on the spot and not wait for the result, until he had proceeded [sic] about six miles, when he perceived a string of fire of about 200 yards long at or near the place he had left, but saw no Body. A few minutes after he heard some Indians speak, this makes him again after his course, and at the distance of nine miles he sees the House of Lapanihilie [Lapanihili] in flames. He pursues his route, arrives at Lorimier’s [possibly Peter Lorimier] and from thence to Ste. Genevieve from the foregoing you see the news are [sic] alarming, but I hardly beleive [sic] the tenth part of it. It may be true that Joe Elliot has been killed[....]
Having been informed that the Shawnees have not gone to examine the land promised to them in consequence of the existing difficulties between the Osages and Delawares apprehending to fall in with some of the war faring parties while out, and besides not being myself in a state of good Health, I delayed my Journey for some time. But having since been informed of what passed on red River, and that the Osages killed in February last George Bullet [Pondoxy], George Whiteeyes [Alimee], and some other Delawares, I apprehended some disturbances might ensue, especially as the greatest part of the Delawares were absent from their Town, and those that were there had no ammunition. I therefore send a cart out with 6 Kegs powder[,] 300 Lead[,] & 500 gun flints, with instructions to let the Delawares have them in case of urgent necessity. The Delawares that wintered in the [Southeast Missouri] swamps will reach their Town in 2 or 3 days from this. [William] Gilliss has passed here and started with my son [Peter Menard], and will get to white River about the 22 instant, and if there is anything extraordinary, they will send in an Express. I have advised [James] Pool to start immediately, in order to repair the arms of the Delawares, for if his information should be true, they will stand in need of his presence. He starts tomorrow, and says he will get there in 6 Days, but leaves his wife [Phoebe] behind.

I should have forwarded you the report of [James] Pool at the date of the present, but at the moment I was sending it, I learned from Mr. [Francois] Lessieur of Portage des Sioux that you had went to white River. Since I have been informed by Mr. [Jean] Pierre Chouteau jr. through Mr. G. Kennerly [George
Hancock Kennerly], that you were at home. I therefore concluded to send it to you, and take the liberty to remark again, that I do not believe the tenth part of [James] Pool[']s story. For if anything extraordinary had been taken [sic] place, my son [Peter Menard] would have sent me an Express, and if any arrives hereafter you shall immediately be informed of what will have transpired.

I am very respectfully your Ob[edien]t Serv[an]t,

Pierre Menard
APPENDIX B-43. Graham to Clark. 29 April 1826.

Source: St. Louis Superintendency, 1824-1836, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 747, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Sir[,]  

Since the Treaty made between the Osages & Delawares in July last in which they agreed to a settlement of all differences up to that date serious misunderstandings have taken place between these Tribes.

The Delawares complain of the following violations of the Treaty; that in November the Osages killed a son of the principal chief (Anderson) [Kikthawenund] on the Waters of Red River who in hunting for his horse had separated from his party; that after this they killed five of the Delawares and Kickapoos & on the 27th March last they killed & scalped a Delaware man near their village, and that 8 Delawares of the same party have been missing, supposed to be killed or taken prisoner, and that they have stolen several horses. The Delawares admit that a party of Kickapoos & Delawares killed on the Red River five Osages, but state it was after the murder of Anderson's son [Sesocum] & that the Osages had his horse in their possession.

The Osages on their part say that a War party of their Tribe fell in with a party of Camanches [sic], killed them and found in their possessions some scalps, which they believed were Cherokees; that in meeting with a party of Delawares, they related the Circumstances & showed them the Scalps, which
proved to be those of the Delawares & Kickapoos; they deny that any of their Young men, or any of their nation killed Anderson's Son [Sesocum], that if he was killed they know nothing of it.

The above facts I hasten to communicate to you, more particularly as it seems the Osages have made an attack on the Delawares near their village which seems to indicate a determination on their part to prosecute a vigorous & sanguinary War. The Delawares have sent out two war parties, one to endeavor to intercept the Osage War Party & the other to follow on its Trail.

The Chief and Warriors of the Delaware Tribe ask me first to call in all the Whites that are amongst the Osages & not to permit them to be furnished with lead or powder, and ask for powder and lead themselves - they say that their Great Father told them when they were placed on White River that his arms would always [be] around them, that if any nation struck them, they should be struck at too. That they have heretofore been prevented from raising the Tomahawk by their Agent, they now they hope their Great Father will let them alone.

Under these circumstances, I feel at a loss how to act to fulfil [sic] the views of the Government in keeping those Tribes at peace – admonitions & remonstrances [sic] has [sic] no longer any effect, an[d] you are aware that I have no physical force by which I could put a Stop to the War. I therefore refer to you for instructions on this point.

The Object of the Government to locate all the Indians, who feel disposed to emigrate beyond the present state and Territories [into Kansas] is no less
desirable than humane. It will give them a home from which they will not be removed, where civilized habits may be now effectually inculcated & the situation of the Indians greatly ameliorated. The predatory Warfare carried on by small War parties ever since the Delawares commenced moving West of the Mississippi & will, I fear, produce a reluctance to remove amongst those who have not yet emigrated [from Missouri].

The most serious difficulty in my mind to this location of the Indians is the prevention of war & murders among themselves, some means must be adopted to effect this object & until [sic] some effectual scheme is adopted, it is the risult [sic] of my experience & the opinion of the most intelligent Indians themselves, that they should be left alone to settle their own differences, and it is my advise [sic] that this course should be adopted on the present occasion. You are well aware that all attempts of the Government to force a peace between hostile Tribes and Where hatred to each other has been deep rooted & amongst whom revenge is ranked among the first virtues, has Resulted in merely smothering for a time these hostile feelings. By permitting them to wage war a more speedy and lasting termination will be put to their hostilities, and a more permanent peace & Friendship effected by it, besides I am certain that in the end it will be more humane.

It is not in the nature of Indian warfare to loose [sic] many men in a pitched battle, one party or the Other will some give way, and when their strength is fairly tested, the Weaker will readily yield to the terms dictated by the Stronger & will be forced to keep that peace & Friendship, which never can exist so long as they
try their strength only in small predatory warfare.

I am of opinion that it would require a cordon of military posts from the Missouri to the Arkansas to keep those Indians in check from waging War on each other. The deep interest that Government takes in maintaining a friendly feeling among Tribes of Indians located on the Western Boundary of Missouri & the Arkansas induces me in consequence of the death of Agent for the Osages [Alexander McNair], which has thrown many difficulties in the way of restoring harmony & which still exist[s], to offer to you my services in attempting to restore these Tribes to a state of peace and likewise to effect a friendly understanding between the Osage and Cherokees in conjunction with the Cherokee Agent [Major Edward W. DuVal] tho [sic] I confess I have no sanguine hopes of effecting so desirably an Object.

I cannot close this communication without observing to you that the same reasons to force & maintain a peace between the Osages & Delawares, which existed Two years ago no longer exists. Then it would have the Object of the Delawares to have exterminated the Osages, to get possession of their lands, now, their lands being defined, and their right & possession of it guaranteed by the United States, the Delawares would have no object in driving off or exterminating the Osages; their object would extend only to force them to be quiet & peaceable, a circumstance to be much desired, as these Indians not only commit depredations on the surrounding Tribes, but scarcely a caravan passes between Santa Fe [and] Missouri, that does not feel the effects of their thieving & hostile disposition, as is witnessed by the large demands made upon the
Government by individuals, for losses sustained by the Osages.

With great Respect I am Dear Sir Your Most Obedient Servant

APPENDIX B-44. Campbell to Arbuckle. 24 May 1826.

Source: Fort Leavenworth Agency 1824-1836, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 300, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Anderson's Village[,] May 24, 1826[.]

Sir[,]  

Your letter of the 14th last per express came safe to hand. It could not have arrived at a time when it could have been more useful than at present, as all the White River Indians were called here by [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund], the Chief for the purpose of making their arrangements to carry on the War against the Osages.

Immediately on the receipt of your communication, I laid it before the Council, explained to them your wishes, as well as the result of the meeting of the Cherokees and Osages at the Cantonment. They were much pleased at the receipt of your communication, as they all consider you their good friend. I hope it will have a good effect; it will, at least, retard their movement until the express which bears your dispatches to Saint Louis can return, when I shall be able to hear from General [William] Clark who I know will use all possible means to have justice done to all the injured parties.

I have had considerable difficulties prevailing on the Delawares to remain quiet until the arrival of General Clark from Washington City [Washington, D.C.]. There is considerable excitement amongst the Delawares at present, you have
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doubtless heard of the murder committed by the Osages, fifty in number, on the Delawares who were on their return from their hunting ground not far distant from the village, on the waters of the Gasconade, five Delawares were killed and one hurt: this took place about six weeks ago. Since that there was an Osage killed by the Delawares on the waters of the Illinois [Fork of Arkansas River].

I have detained the express one day for the purpose of hearing what might be decided upon in the day’s council: [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund], the chief, has given up the business to his warriors [sic] who, it appears, have determined to carry on the War. I hope I have prevailed on them to remain quiet until I shall hear from General Clark.

I have the honor to be Sir, your Obedient Ser[van]t.

John Campbell, Sub Indian Agent.
APPENDIX B-45. Anderson and Killbuck to Graham. 29 May 1826.

Source: Box 3, Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

29 May 1826[.]

Anderson[: ] My Brother, when I was at St. Louis, I took the Osages a little by the hands. I had not been seated down at home 2 months before the Osages killed my son [Sesocum]. You do not beleive [sic] the Osages killed my son.

This Spring I heard again what the Osages had done. Then I [illegible] to them of what a big damage they had done. Then I begin to think that never could be settled between us & the Osages.

When he heard this, there is my Brother [John Campbell] who set it down & sent it to you, I suppose you got it thru [sic] two days you asked me again. It says you don["]t beleive [sic] me.

Then I speak to you my friend. I then told you what the damages they had done, my brother [John Campbell] wrote to you & you still want me to treat with them.

My Brother then I sent you word not to give the Osages any more powder. That is the time they killed me [sic] Only one boy & they killed him with bow & arrows.

My Brother, that twice I sent word to you. I ask you not to stop my me[n] & my Grand Children no more. They had done enough & I don["]t want you to tell a thing more.
My Brother, that time I spoke to you to speak to all those [white] men among the Osages to persuade them to go away.

My Brother, at that time I asked you to let me have powder & lead to against [sic] the Osages. He told Majr. [John] Campbell to wrote [sic] to me all the damages done that way. Then after that one of my men come [sic] another course & told me what the Osages had done again (this killed the Saw Mills) [murders at the Roubidoux branch of the Gasconade River].

He sent the word again that the Osages had killed my men to Congress land this side of the Sawmills, there are the people you have told me to treat with.

My Brother, where we set their [sic] (Current River) not disturbed [sic] us[:];] you told us to punish with nothing disturbed [sic] us there, all come home safe.

My Brother, that [sic] twice you sent us down. [Three illegible words] your arms would be around us if any one struck us, they would strike you. I expect now they have hit you. My Brother, this is all I have to say.

Something has been [illegible] you to say you never heard of the [illegible] being killed before now. All my men know that he was killed.

Now my Brother all that which [was] done strikes me & makes my heart very heavy. I cannot think more of good on his heart. You have heard me now I have [illegible] ont [sic] I can do more.

My Brother, you told me to keep my warriors tight not to let them to war. I have done that. I have helped you. I hope you will please to know that I cannot do no more.
My Brother, it is not many days since I let my warriors loose, at that time they called all their grand Children here.

My Brother, my Grand Children came. I told them that I could do no more, that I had given out that I could not help you in the good work & I know you could not put a stop to it.

My Brother. you must not think that I have thrown all good from my heart. I still will allways [sic] talk with my Grand Children when I hear my G[reat]. Father talk good I will talk good too.

My Brother, If the Osage chief [illegible] shows anything into my camp it will not go in for I see they can'[+]t do nothing [sic]. That is all[,] my Brother[,] you will hear from me now. The other day you heard all from me[,] now you will hear from warriors.

Killbuck, a Captain: My B[rother], I want you to listen to his grandchildren[,] the Warriors. When his head man told him all this & his headmen told him all this then he called his grandchildren.

My. B[rother], as the war cheif [sic], I know how to kill this [illegible]. I know how to kill any one that does bad.

My Brother, my Grand Children are all this way (East) & my grandchildren are all this way (West) & I will send a man to each. They will all come & look to that man [Osages, Claremore (Gramon)], his heart is not good.

My Brother, all my grand Children are this way [East] & all my Grand[children] are that way [West]. They strike me. They strike them. The tomahawk is in their heads & it is your head too.
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My Brother. you told me you wanted me to [illegible] the Garrison. I can &
as into [sic] you must not think I have a heart to make peace with the Osages
after what they have done.

My Brother, I want the Osages to consider this. I don’t want it settled at all.

My Brother, I see my cheif [sic] he could do nothing with us & you my
Brother all you could do can’t change us.

My Brother this man I won’t be quick. I shall keep slow at it untill [sic] I
get killed.

My Brother, this is what the war chief says. He sees his chief [William
Anderson (Kikthawenund)] who has tried to stop us & his counsellers [sic]
around him & you too. My brother you have done all you could to stop us but our
warriors won’t be stopped, they will break loose & you must not think hard of it.
APPENDIX B-46. Graham to Clark. 29 May 1826.

Source: St. Louis Superintendency, 1824-1836, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 747, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Delaware Agency[.] 29th May 1826[.]

Genl Clark[.]

D[ea]r. Sir,[.]

I arrived here on the 25th and found nearly all of the principal chiefs drunk. On the 26th I sent for [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund], & had him in my tent for some time and explained to him as fully & forcibly as I was capable of, the views the Government had towards the Indians for their General welfare that they must not go to war – that I had understood their War Chiefs had determined upon it. That their Great Father [President of the United States] had their good so much at heart, that I would not hear of their going to war, and that if they did, the Military would be instructed to put a stop to it by force, if persuasion was found ineffectual.

That as a chief so celebrated for the goodness of his heart, for the welfare of his people over whom he had so much control, he ought to exercise all his influence to turn the minds of his War Captains & young men from War. That his Great Father looked to him for aid in restoring peace. And nothing would please him more than to see him exerting himself for the good of his people in this desirable Object. [T]hat by listening to what I said & attending to it, his nation
would find much good growing out of it, but if they shut their ears on what I had to say, he might rest assured his G[reat]. Father would be seriously offended & would send his Soldiers to put a stop to any further bloodshed. He answered me by Stating the different murders committed (a List is herewith sent) that they had been so frequently Repeated that his War Captains & young men had become so clamorous that he could no longer Restrains them. That he had now put out his fire – that the War Chiefs stood before – That he could say nothing to me on the Subject and thought any talk on that subject would be useless, which I might have to make them, as their Ears would be shut to any terms of accomodation [sic], but to please me he would talk to his Captains.

The next Evening I went into Council & made a speech to them all the Evils that would grow out of a War, that it would have a Serious effect upon those of their Grand Children, who were East of the Mississippi and that they would never think of Removing so long as War was waged between the Delawares & Osages. Stated to them the kindness with which their Great father had always regarded them, that his hands were ever open to them. That there was a prospect of a meeting between the Osages & Cherokees [at Cantonment Gibson] in August and advised them most strongly to postpone their intentions of War until they should see what the Osages said of what they would do, or what their Great Father would do with them in case they would not render Justice to the Delawares. Recommended to them to think of what I said & council on my words and give me an answer in the morning. The Following morning 28th I sent for Shawonac [Suwaunock] the most Fiery of their War Captains. I had a long talk
with him, stated to him my views and wishes, he agreed all was true & that he
would talk to the Captain [Killbuck] before the Council met. We met in Council the
Old Chief [William Anderson Kikthawenund] explained his situation with the
Osages, regretted I did not appear to believe what he said about his son's
[Sesocum] murder & said it was for the war chiefs to answer my talk of
Yesterday. Killbuck spoke, his language breathed nothing but war, regretted the
Interference of his G[reat]. Father, that if they had been let alone, they would
have had peace with the Osages before this. That now it was too late, their
Tomahawks were Sharpened & they could not, nor would not turn back, that if
they even thought of it their young men would not listen [to] it. Their Great Father
ought not to Interfere — that I must not suppose their hearts were bad, it was only
to the Osages. He could not account for their Great Father's Interference[.] The
Osages' Tomahawk was in their heads & their Greatfather[']s too. They would
send the Wampum & pipe to all the neighboring nations — they would not strike
before they were ready. One of them was to go to the Sacs [Sauk] & one to the
Cherokees. They did not wish to have any thing [sic] more to say to the Osages,
but War. They did not wish them to settle for the murders they had committed.
They wanted nothing but War & War they would have. They could not see what
use it was to meet the Osages at the Fort [Gibson] — they would not listen to
them. They did not want them to settle for the murders they had committed.

From this you will see that all prospects of a peace with those nations,
extcept through the interference of the Military, are vanished, which I hope the
Government will Interpose on I have assured them they will. But I would prefer
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that I should be Instructed to Say to them Fight your own battles and make your own Peace. I have written to Col. [Matthew] Arbuckle and forwarded your letter & that of General [Henry] Atkinson by Mr. [Thomas] Johnson a Lieutenant from Cantonment Gibson who arrived here in pursuit of deserters, the same day I did. I have stated to him that [sic] are the intentions of the Delawares. I have also written to Mr. [Edward W.] Du[V]al stating that one of the War Captains would visit the Cherokees and asked him to interpose & prevent the Cherokees from aiding the Delawares. You will no doubt instruct the Agent for the Sacs [Sauks] & Foxes to the same effect, among whom one of their Captains are to be sent for and from their Nations. If they join the whole Country will be in Commotion & the Osages in all probability entirely cut off.

I have thought it best to remain here until I hear from you for which purpose I send Antoine Tessant [Toussaint], with this letter. I could do no good by going on to the Cantonment. The Osages have started on their hunt and will not be back until early in August. Mr. P. Choteau [Paul Liguest Chouteau] has started for St. Louis & A. Choteau [Auguste Pierre Chouteau] has gone [to] the Arkansas [River] as Mr. Johnson Informs me. If, however you wish me to go on and wait until the Osages Return to Pay their annuities I will do so – but as their Agent will be on I suppose in time, I hardly think it will be necessary as it will be impossible for me to make any arrangements between the Delawares. I regret my failure in restoring harmony among these Tribes and can assure you that every exertions that could be made, was. They will go to War – and go fearless of all consequences.
The Kickapoos (Pamortan[']s [also Pauwoatam/Pemoatam band) have not returned nor will they return this Summer from Red River. No Kickapoos have been killed by the Osages. Pacan[']s band with about 70 Kickapoos are here and attended the Council at [William] Anderson's together with the Piankishaws, Shawonese [sic], Peorias & Weas.

A Serious evil has grown out of the permission to traders on the Red River, they take with them the Indians & induce them to remain there; Pamortan[']s band is in this Situation and do not intend to return, as is said here by the Indians. There are many Shawnese [sic] & Delawares likewise detained there, [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] complains of it & particularly against Marshall[+] & requests that his license shall be recall[e]d. I would recommend that no more licenses be granted to trade on Red River, with any of the Nations resident in Missouri. That Col. [Matthew] Arbuckle should be requested to stop all persons not having a License who shall attempt to pass his Garrison with goods for trading with Indians that Maj. [William] McClelland the Choctaw Agent, now at Cantonment Gibson, should be requested to require of the Kickapoos & other Indians of this State, to return home. Should Antoine[']s horse not be able to return, I will thank you to furnish him with another. It is a mule he is riding belonging to himself.

I am Sir Y[ou]r Sincerely

R. Graham
APPENDIX B-47. Johnston to Arbuckle. 7 June 1826.

Source: Fort Leavenworth Agency 1824-1836, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 300, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Cantonment Gibson[,] 7 June 1826[,] 

Sir[,] 

In obedience to your order. I proceeded to the Delaware Towne on White River. During my stay at the towne I was present at a council held by the representation of six small tribes living in that quarter and the United States Agent of the Delawares Maj. [Richard] Graham. 

The subject in debate was the pending War between the Osage and Delaware tribes. The agent states to them the impolity [sic] of the War - said that their claims could be more satisfactorily adjusted in an amicable manner by the interposition of the United States Government - that the President would try all possible means to prevent the War, and if these failed he would have recourse to Arms. 

The Delawares, in reply said that they had frequently made peace with the Osages, solely with a view of pleasing their White Father, well knowing at the time that the Osages would break the treaty - that during peace they never were safe - that they were robbed and murdered on all occasions by this treacherous tribe - and that as brave men their only alternative was to be exterminated with Arms in their hands or exterminate their enemies.
The idea of throwing United States' hooks between them and the Osages was treated lightly, not in my opinion from any contempt they had at the power of Government, but they had taken a Stand - had made choice of two evils, reckless of consequences. The preparation for war is now going on very deliberately. The young men were ordered a few days since on a hunt of twenty days, preparatory to the expedition, and about the first Instant the War Axe was to be sent to all the adjacent tribes. The Chiefs present at the Council appeared to the cool and determined. There was but little apparent excitement, and this was shown only by some individuals who had been personally injured. Their determination for War appeared rather to be the result of a deep rooted hatred for the Osages and a desire to have satisfaction in an Indian way - blood for blood.

I have the honor to be very respectfully your Obedient

Th. Johnston Liet 7th Infy
APPENDIX B-48. Chouteau to Clark. 10 June 1826.

Source: St. Louis Superintendency, 1824-1826, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 747, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

St. Louis[,] June 10[,] 1826[.]

Sir[.]

Having returned yesterday from my Agency at the Osage Village, which I left on the 25th ultimo, I make it my duty to report to you the situation of the Indians. It appears that some misunderstandings exist between the Osages & Delawares, who pretend that the Osages have killed the son of [William] Anderson, their principal chief. The Osages deny the act & on the contrary complain bitterly that the Shawnese [sic] & Delawares have killed five of Clermon's [Claremore or Gramon] men in December last, on the Arkansas River, & another in March at Bime's [Bean's] Salt works on the forks of the Arkansas, called the Illinois that two men of White hair's [Pahuska] band were killed on the Pomme de Terre [River], from, it is believed, the 10th to the 15th March be [by] either the Shawonese [sic], Delawares or Kickapoos.

They add, that in January a party of their men (Osages) met with five of the Pawnees of Texas, whom they killed, but finding one of those Pawnees had a scalp (lately made on some of the Neighboring Tribes) they delivered it over to some Shawnese [sic] together with a few horses, that they had taken from said Pawnees & which were claimed by the Delawares. The Osages requested me to
mention to you that being faithful to the Treaty made here in 1825 with the Delawares, they should wish them to comply also with the Article of the same and not to take up arms to revenge pretended hostilities. They are ready, if any of their men have injured their neighbors, to give them satisfaction in the way specified in the said Treaty, made in your presence, and wish the same justice to be done them for the act of hostility committed on them & enumerated above.

I can assure you, Sir, that for the last 12 months, which I spent with the Osages, no Delaware or Kickapoo Scalps have been danced, heard of, or even seen in that nation. And they hope that their Great Father the President will as he promised in the 11th Art. of the Treaty, extend his protecting arms over them, since they have so well complied with the Last Treaty. They wish also to hold in your presence at St. Louis a council with the Delawares and Kickapoos and Cherokees, to prevent this War of extermination which is likely to be carried on amongst them. They had but 2 horses known to belong to the Delawares & which some young Osages had Stolen from them. I sent them back to the owners by the Revd. Mr. [Nathaniel] Dodge, who saw them delivered in March last. I was, together with Maj. [Edward W.] Du[V]al, at a council held at Cantonment Gibson in May last, by the Cherokees and Osages, They [sic] Cherokees claimed of the Osages, a young man whom, they say, killed one of their Tribe about 2 years ago, the Osages refused to deliver him up immediately, wishing to advise with their principal Agent, whenever they will see him. I must also Inform you that the Osages are now all gone to their hunting grounds on the Arkansas river & will not probably return before the month of August.

P. S. [L.] [Paul Liguest] Choteau [sic] Sub Agent
APPENDIX B-49. Clark to Barbour. 11 June 1826.

Source: St. Louis Superintendency, 1824-1826, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 747, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Superintendency Indian Affairs St. Louis[,] June 11, 1826[.]

Sir[,] Report have been received from the Agents of the Delawares & Kickapoos, and Sub Agent of the Osages, and letters from Col. [Matthew] Arbuckle on the subject of existing difficulties between the Cherokees, Delawares & Kickapoos & the Osages, which appear to threaten serious consequences to the Osage Nation.

To give you a fuller view of the subject of controversy between the Tribes than was contained in my last communication of the 22nd May, I take the liberty of enclosing herewith copies of letters from Colo. Arbuckle with Reports of Maj. [Richard] Graham Ind. Agt for the Tribes within this State, and Mr. [Paul Liguest] Choteau the Sub Agent for the Osages.

It appears that 8 Osages & 11 Delawares have been killed since last August & some Kickapoos who have not returned from their hunts supposed to be killed.

The Delawares and Kickapoos accuse the Osages of killing their people and stealing their property. The Osages on their part deny the charge of killing any of the people of their neighboring tribes, since they made peace with the
Delaware in June last. They ask the protection of the Government and request a meeting of the Delawares, Kickapoos, and Cherokees at this place for the purpose of explaining and settling the existing difficulties between them and their Neighbors on fair terms.

In May last the Chiefs of the Cherokees and Osages met in Council at Cantonment Gibson, for the purpose of settling their dispute. The final adjustment of which was postponed until the arrival of their agent. A meeting of all the Tribes in hostility with each other at Cantonment Gibson in August has been proposed & recommended. The Delawares have objected to a meeting at that place, and appear determined to carry on a destructive war against the Osages, with the aid of the Cherokees and other Tribes whom they have solicited to join them. Every means under my control will be used to prevent further hostilities and to bring about peace and tranquility between those Tribes.

Yet, it is believed that all further measures, which it is in my power to pursue in restoring permanent peace of fair and just terms, calculated to produce friendly feelings between the contending Tribes cannot be effected under the present state of their feelings without the further aid of the strong arm of the Government.

I must therefore request to be instructed on the subject of the difficulties which now exist & may accrue between the Indian Tribes, who have been taken under the protection of the United States.

As an expedient [sic] I beg leave to propose the following arrangements, Viz: The Govt to order a meeting in council at this or some other place, of a full
deputation of Chiefs, Considerate men, and Warriors of the several Tribes of Osages, Delawares, Kickapoos, Shawonees [sic], Piankeshaws, Cherokees, etc. for the purpose of explaining and settling all differences amongst them, which when settled, Articles of Agreement in form of a Treaty be entered into between them, binding themselves to conform to the Treaty, and to refer all their disputes to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs or Agents, and obliging themselves to comply with the decision of the government in all matters of controversy. To effect this compromise and meeting a movement of Troops may be necessary.

I am inclined to believe that we shall not succeed in preventing entirely depredations or disagreement of a hostile nature between these Tribes, while they are scattered in every direction through the Country. At this time a considerable portion of the Delawares, Shawnees, Kickapoos, Piankeshaws and other Tribes are scattered from the [Great] Lakes to Texas. For the purpose of preventing this evil in a great measure, as well as to commence the great work of civilization, I must beg leave to suggest that authority be given by the Government to exchange the lands which have been assigned to the Shawneese [sic] and to the Delawares, Kickapoos, Piankeshaws, & Peorias within this state, for lands to be apportioned and laid off to them outside of the State Boundary, on and near the Kansas river, with authority to employ Sub Agents and other suitable persons to collect the scattering families and bands and move them on these lands. And when collected on the lands assigned them, the necessary assistance to be afforded them by the Govt in the erection of comfortable houses, good fences to enclose their fields, breaking up their ground & preparing
it for cultivation, some provisions, stock, and useful Articles for Agricultural purposes. And a like course pursued and assistance afforded to the Osages, Kansas etc. Their agents and Sub Agents be compelled to reside with or near those Tribes and comfortable plain houses be erected for each Agent, Sub Agt & Interpreter and such Mechanists & Agriculturalists as may be authorized.

The establishment of a military post [Cantonment Leavenworth] at the junction of the Kansas river with the Missouri for the purpose of affording protection and checking disorder, would give greater confidence to the Indian, in the permanency of their New Settlements, and will most probably facilitate the union of the Tribes.

I have the honor to be with Sentiments of high Respect


Wm. Clark
[T]he war Drum had sounded, the Village chiefs had put out their fire, the Captains had assumed the lead in council.

I was asked to see Them do The war dance made & the red post smude[d] [sic] by all their warriors. It appeared impossible to effect any [of] theirs [sic]. the chiefs[,] when done[,] avoided me for fear of bringing on themselves suspicion of being won over from the war.

In this difficulty I sought out Catchum [Tawhelalen], who had sent word to me by a trader that he expected I would pay him the money coming to his brother Lapinhihilie [Lapanihille] who had just died.

I had tried two of the principal war chiefs, whom I had long known. One had serind [served] together in the North West in army during the last war. I used every argument that could support. One was my friend agreeable to the Indian manners.

I succeeded. They were to meet me in council next morning & advocate my measures. They were seen going from my tent, my friend got drunk (purposely) & would not attend & the other spoke in favor of war[,] the dawn[.] followed & the red post was struck.

I gave all up. In the council[illegible] of the agency[,] Catchum [Tawhelalen (1780-1857)] [,] one of the Brav[e]s[,] a Captain, & the
Brother of Lapinhinilie [Lapanihilie] called on me for the [private annuity] money due his Brother[,] stating he was to receive it. I knew this man had [g]reat influence & the greater part of the war party just then about starting were of his band [Turtle]. After a long Talk with him, a provision to pay him the money & to recommend the continuation [sic] of it to support him in his pretin [sic] to his Brother[']s place as a civil chief [sic] & the protection of [the] Government in case of any violence in consequence of supporting the peace, he consented to do all I would ask.

The war party was broken up. I got another council with much difficulty & as suspected by Catchum [Tawhelalen] proceed [to] St. Louis instead of Fort Gibson to meet the Osages in time. I preceeded [sic] & paid Catchum [Tawhelalen] the $140 for the year 1826 six months of it was in fact his due & I had been requested by Lapihinilie [Lapanihilie] to continue his annuity to his Brother Catchum [Ketchum or Tawhelalen] in case he should die, stating the Com[man]d[er] [of the Treaty of St. Marys] had promised it should continue [sic] forever at least he so understood it.

I could not therefore hesitate a moment in paying & took his light [sic] a copy of which I herewith enclose. From this you will see that I did not look upon him as his [illegible] I did not pay him as such. In my abstract of Annuities[,] I give you the following extract 1826 June 13 voucher No. 6. Capt. Catchum [Tawhelalen] private annuity for 1826 due to Lapinhinilie [Lapanihilie] a Delawar[e]/deceased. There a/c [account] of war that an [illegible] with an Estimate for the year 1827 with the note state[d] above. With all this evidence
before the War Dept. for I presume the proper authorities examined into it a
remittance for Lapihinilie [Lapanihilie] Annuity for 1827 for was forwarded in the
Spring of that year. It was a natural conclusion for me then to suppose that
Catchum [Tawhelalen] looked as is [sic] the successor to Lapihinilie
[Lapanihilie], hence I suppose the [illegible] of the receipt for 1827. Here thu [sic]
sir I had dim [sic] a[n] act warranted or not, yet I thought justifiable & not only that
but really sir [sic] deserving the thanks of Government for stopping a war which
would have cost much blood & money, & for which I have been complimented
the means used were from the Contingent fund. So Mr. McKing says see the
extract from his letters. If so certainly no law or even regulation was violated, but
sir if there had been a species [sic] apprx [sic]: an an: for [illegible]. I would have
paid it further year under circumstances [strikeout in original][.]
APPENDIX B-51. Graham to Delawares. 20 June 1826.

Source: Richard Graham Papers, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO.

20 June 1826[.]

My Friends - The express I sent to St. Louis has returned. I will explain to you what the letter which I received by it contained - (here read such part of the letters as are necessary from No. 1 to No. 6)[.]

You now see that your great friend [William] Clark does not think that the difficulties, between you & the Osages are not so great but what they might be settled.

In his last letter which was written after he read mine, you plainly see that he is not pleased that you have shut your ears against the words of your great Father because he does not ask anything more of you. [H]e does just thinks [sic] it worth while [sic] to talk to men who have no ears. [H]e has sent the word on to the President that the Delawar[e]s will no longer listen to him, that they will go to war inspite [sic] of every thing [sic] he can say, & you hear what he says to me, that this war will bring great distress on the Indians & cost the re teales [sic], a great deal of money & that already troops have got in motion, this will be very expensive & will cost a peat [great] deal of money & will make the President very angry. [H]e has always protected you the Delawar[e]s have been his favorite children, he allways [sic] gave you what you asked for & loved to talk about the Delawar[e]s but now what will he say when he hears the Delawar[e]s will no longer listen to his word, that they stop their ears & shut their eyes & turned their
backs upon him that they will not hear or see him but wackssum [sic] him. If you persist in shutting your ears against his words, can you expect he will be as kind to you as he had been. [H]e will pity you, he will now think all the Delawar[e]s shut their ears against him, he will want to know which of them does, whither [sic] it is the chiefs or whether it is the young men. What am I to say to him, that it is the chiefs that shut their ears, or, that it is the young men, or that all the Delawar[e]s have let go his hand, & say they will not listen to his words. I hope you won't say no – don’t be worse than the Osages, they have said to their Great Father don’t let our hands go. We will listen to your words & what ever [sic] you tell us to do, we will do. [W]e made a treaty with these Delawar[e]s if either did wrong, you’re here to decide, which was wrong. If the Delawar[e]s are determined to make war upon us - let them meet us before your face & hear what both of us have to say & judge between us agreeable to the Treaty before we go to open war.

What [d]o there [sic] words mean? They mean that the Osages have thrown themselves upon their great Father & ask him to protect them, & if they have done wrong to tell them what to do & they will do it & they will respect the Treaty they made. What do the Delawar[e]s say - they have said we won’t go to any council, we will keep our ears shut against the words of our great Father, we don’t care what he says.

We will go to war if we have to go alone. [T]hink now if you were placed in the same situation with your grandchildren, who had agreed to leave all the differences to the Delawar[e]s, one of them told you they did not care what you
said they would not listen to you. [T]hat you ought to let them alone & they would raise the tomahawk. And the other was to tell you that they had not done an injury, but if they had, & you said to they would do anything of [sic] you told them.

Now which of these two would you protect - the one that would not listen to you, or the one that said what ever [sic] you tell us to do - we will do. [J]ust so with your great Father the President between you & the Osages. You made a treaty - this is a very solemn thing, the great spirit was looking down upon you when you made that treaty you said you would leave all differences to your great Father, that he should judge between you. [T]his you said before yr [your] great Father & the great Spirit witnessed it. Now you say we won't leave anything to our great Father, we don't care if we did sign the Treaty, we will strike the Osages without asking him. This is being very obstinate & the great Spirit will never smile upon the acts of men who break their word & you cannot expect that your great Father will be pleased. [N]o he will be very angry.

I tell you these words, they are from my lips the mouth of your friend who wishes you well & who wants you to go to war with clean hands & who does not think you ought to go to war until [sic] you have met the Osages & hear what they have to say. [I]f they talk good & [it] pleases you why settle your disputes if their talk is not good, & you are not satisfied then make war. That will be time enough. You can still make your preparations & hear theirs too. [T]his will please the President if you take any other course, you must not be surprised if his ears are shut when you talk to him, as yours have been shut to him, but I am in hopes you will now open them for three months & hear that I have said. The Osages will
not come near you for that time & will not strike unless you go to strike them.

[N]ow you have heard what I (your friend) says & I will say father [sic] that I
advise you simply to agree to meet the Osages & Cherokees at St. Louis. [T]he
Osages wish to meet you face to face before [William] Clark, there you can tell all
they have done & satisfy your great Father that your complaints are just & that he
ought to make the Osages render you justice or let you go to war. [H]e will listen
to you & you will please him by listening to what he says & he will no longer think
that the Delawar[e]s are foolish, that they are men & just men & as such he will
hold them fast by the hands.
June 20[,] 1826[

Anderson[.] I have heard your talk; we have made up our minds.

My Brother, I want to know what words you will give to the Cherokees. I wish you would give the same words you gave to us today. We want this because the war axe is sent to them & maybe they won[']t beleive [sic] it when they hear what we are going to do.

My Brother, my war cheifs [sic] have heard your words & think they are all right & good. We will go to St. Louis before [William] Clark & have a general council. We don[']t think it right to go to the Fort [Gibson]. We don[']t want to go there.

My Brother, we want to have the council in two months or 1 _ month[;] we think 3 months [is] too long, but we consent to the time you pisc [sic] 15 Sept.

My Father (William) Clark, I will give you the news I got from my friends the Cherrokias [sic]. The Cherroki [sic] brave after hearing the news what the Osages had done, got up and said that he could not stop his young men any longer. The Cherrokias [sic] then spoak [sic] and said it is true that the brave said that the Osages would never be at peace with any nation. Amongst us the red skin that if any of us is bad we then never stop untill [sic] we put them down. My Grand children, the Cherrokias [sic] has sent the wampum and tells me that I no [sic] very well what to say matters [to] the white people.

My Brother Clark you have heard what my grand Children the Cherrokias [sic] has told me.

My Brother Clark I now speak to you myself. I think as my grand children thinks that the Osages will never be at peace soe [sic] long as you let them alone. I tell you my reasons why I think my grand children tells the truth for since I crossed the Mississippi I have seen it myself.

My Father Clark you no [sic] well that this is three times that we have
made peace and you see they have begun again, you no [sic] my brother very
well how these Osages behave you have seen them a long time and no [sic]
there [sic] bad conduct towards all your red children, you see now my Brother
they have killed fore [sic] Kickapoos[,] one Cherrookia [sic] and [a] Kickapoo
woman taken prisoner and some Delliwares [sic] killed number not yet known,
soe [sic] soon as we hear from our grand children again we will write you.

Anderson's speach [sic] in answer to the Choctaws, and Genl Clark[']s
letter to them relative to visiting the Kansas river.

My Brother Clark I am glad that you have attended to our business in
seeing the Choctaws and hearing that they had [sic] killed our people,

My Brother I no [sic] for my people the red skins that we made laws a long
time agoe [sic] that if any of the foolish young men did bad that we could always
fix it without hurting each other.

Brother Clark when all my people come in I will tell them the news that we
got from our grand children the Choctaws, we have heard a good speach [sic]
from our grand children the Choctaws, and soe [sic] soon as my people are all to
geather [sic] we will answer them.

My Father Clark we work together and fix it soe [sic] that our friendship
shall be as strong as ever.

Brother Clark I shall send my speach [sic] I will send on to my grand
children the Cherrokias [sic] and my other grand children and send it then to the
Chocktaws.

My Brother Clark I tell you now that if there is no disturbance that I will goe
[sic] to the Cherriokias [sic] myself this Spring and settle all my business if I should be sick my braves will attend to the business soe [sic] that my grand children the Choctaws shall be satisfied.

My Brother it has been more than one year that I was fixing to send a speach [sic] to all my grand children in the south but was prevented by the Osages interrupting us, this is all I have to say to you at present in respect to the Choctaws.

My Brother Clark I wrote to you by Col. [Pierre] Menard that in fore [sic] months to Menard to come and all my sons and grand children would be here ready to goe [sic] and visit the land our friend Menard wrote to me to no [sic] hoo [sic] I wanted to goe [sic] wheather [sic] it was your son or the Col. himself, after I received your letter I wrote to you that you were old and our friend [John] Campbell alsoe [sic] that we wanted your son to goe [sic], in two months from this time I wish you to send me Tin [sic] of my grandchildren that are coming from the east side of the Mississippi to goe [sic] with us[;] this is all I have to say our friend Campbell will tell you more about it.

William Anderson [Kikthawenund] Chief of the Delliwares [sic]

February 21st 1827

I now speak to you on the subject of my son Shanock [Suwaunock] what the Osage agent wrote you is not true, that it was Natioman [Natcomin] hoo [sic] was drunk and spoke to the Osage Chief without having any ill intention towards hum as I gave my gun to Shoanock [Suwaunock], I now will speak to the Osage
Chief [Pahuska] himself that the man was drunk and was not in his proper sines [sic] which you no [sic] is the case with all Indians. I hope that White Hair [Pahuska] the Osage Chief will not think anything of it an[d] let it die. I disapprove of any such conduct in treating any Chief in that way and I shall speak to him about it soe [sic] soon as I see him.

William Anderson [Kikthawenund] Chief of the Delliwares [sic]
St. Charles, December 4th[,] 1822[

Dear Sir[,] 

Herewith you will receive a copy of a memorial [sic] to the President of the United States on the subject of a former letter to you. You no doubt are apprised that in addition to our local divisions we have an administrator and our anti administration party in our state. Mr. [John Quincy] Adams has heretofore been considered as favoring the restoration [sic] on Missouri and the removal of the Indians to this State is received [sic] by some as part of the same system & will be wielded by the opposition with a powerful [sic] effect.

These Indians are not now settled on the ceded land (which is a fact not known to many). They will be discontented if confined to them, the Delawares have made no permanent location or improvements and to me it would appear that now is the most proper time to remove them to a had [land] west of the state line on which may be their permanent residence.

I was aware that to procure these lands an appropriation must be made by Congress and the administration now have it completely in their power to throw the blame where it should be by asking for an appropriation for that purpose. In passing the memorial [sic] this was kept in view and I have written more fully to Gov. S. [Ninian] Edward.
Since receiving your letter I am informed that a band of the Ioways have determined to locate themselves at the mouth of the Nodoway [River].

If so the propriety of appointing an agent to reside at Chariton [Iowa] will be doubtful, unless the probable intercourse between the band thus removed and a band located on the river des moins [sic], and the occasioned visits of the Socks [sic] & Foxes to the Missouri should in your opinion justify such a measure.

If the Kickapoo are permitted to remain within the limits of this state[,] the appointment of some person will be necessary to prevent the reiterated complaints which[,] though so feeble as to seldom reach the administration[,] are now a smothered flame ready to vent on its friends in this state when the breath of party faction shall blow it into strength.

If the policy urged in the memorial [sic] be adopted it would appear to me that the appointment of any subagent to reside in this state will be unnecessary. Permit me to acknowledge my sense of obligation for the friendly confidence expressed in your letter and to assure you of my high respect.

Duff Green
APPENDIX B-55. Anderson to Clark. 19 August 1827.

Source: Fort Leavenworth Agency 1824-1826, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 748, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.


My Brother [William] Clark my people have been to see the land on the Kansas river. I have now sent you a map of the country Drawn by my son [Sarcoxie] whoe [sic] visited the land.

My Brother when we look at the size of the country we think it too small for seven tribes to settle on to make them happy. The reason I did not answer you before, I did not no [sic] how to conclude on the present matter.

My Brother I see the country before me as it is drawn and I am sure that your red children never can be happy on soe [sic] small piece of timbered land.

My Brother your red children here think they would be more happy if they were settled on the Virdegris [Verdigris River] on the other side of Choutoe's [Auguste Pierre Chouteau] establishment, the reason I could not tell what I would doe [sic] sooner was on account of the Osages[;] they are such bad people.

My Brother[.] If I new [sic] the Osages were at peace with the people around them, I would be willing to goe [sic] to the place I mention to you that is the Virdegree [Verdigris River].

My Brother I no [sic] now of five nations hoo [sic] are all looking at the
Osages to make war against them.

My Brother our friend [John] Campbell has red [sic] us the Com [sic] sent by the President our great father to be red [sic] to us and we are much pleased with it[;] our great father tells us that he wants us to settle on a good piece of land where me and my grand children shall be happy for ever [sic].

My Brother one of my men Capt. Natcoman [Natcomin] with three other nations went to see the Pawncas [Poncas] and Comanchees [sic] and have all got back safe.

My Brother I don’t want to get up from here directly as I hear soe [sic] much bad news all around me, for my part I don’t want to take any part in this bad work that is a [sic] goeing [sic] on amongst them.

My Brother you must bear with me a little[,] I will get up from here soe [sic] soon as this bad busniss [sic] is all over[,] I don’[t] think I doe [sic] anything bad here.

My Brother will you let us no [sic] wheather [sic] you can give us the land we ask you for or not on the Virdegree [Verdigris River] as we think it will make all your red children happy.

This is all I have to say to you at present[;] we all wish you well.

William Anderson [Kikthawenund]

John Campbell U.S. S Indian Agt.

August 19th[,] 1827

These few lines were added at the request of Anderson [Kikthawenund] and
Captn Patterson [Meshaquowha].

My Brother Clark you wrote to me last Spring to try to get all my people to gather from every quarter. I am trying to doe [sic] soe [sic] but I am afraid when they have soe [sic] small spot of land they will not come, the land you speak of on the Kansaw [sic] might of been large enough for my own people and the Shawnees and Kickapoos but what am I doe [sic] with all the balance of my grandchildren I doe [sic] not no [sic] what too [sic] think.

William Anderson

John Campbell U.S. S. Indian Agt.
APPENDIX B-56. Campbell to Graham. 19 August 1827.


James Fork of White river[,] August 19th[,] 1827[.]

Sir[,]  

After a serious combating for two months I have got an answer from [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] altho[ugh] it is not a satisfactory one to the nation, they are much divided amongst themselves, the lower party belonging to Ketcham[']s [Tawhelalen] band and part of the Wolf party are in favor of the Kansaw [sic], but the great men of [William] Anderson[']s Village have born them down, as they doe [sic] in all other affairs of the nation, Sacoxia [Sarcoxie] & Patterson [Meshaquowha] think that you did not give a fair view of the country in your letter to [William] Anderson & myself deted [sic] at the mouth of the Kansaw [sic] for there is a wide difference of opinion betwn [sic] you, as you will discover from the map drawn by Sacoxia [Sarcoxie], I am satisfied from the short time that they were on the ground that they could not of [sic] examined much of it, for it appears that they only went eight miles up from the mouth to the old Kansaw [sic] village, this is however a matter betwn [sic] you and them. I have done everything in my power to affect the wishes of the government. [William] Anderson has now set his face to the lands lying above Choutoe[']s [Auguste Pierre Chouteau] establishment on the Verdegree [Verdigris] community at the mouth and owning with the state line untill [sic] it would intersect the Osage tract,
and owning up the Arkansaw [sic] river thirty miles, not having a map of the country I could say nothing about it, that appears to be the land they are determined on if they move at all, I am satisfied that nothing more can be done with them untill [sic] Govnr [William] Clark calls them before him. I have has much difficulties with the Kickapues [sic] about there [sic] annuity, in the first place they were not deliverd [sic] within twenty five days of the time that you promised, in consequence of which they lost part of there [sic] summer's hunt. Secondly that you had promised Pachecha that the whole of the goods should be deliverd [sic] to him, you afterward told me to devide [sic] them equally betwn [sic] Wawgoe [Wawgar] and them, you then wrote me by Waugor [Wawgar] that if Laferin [La Farine] should send any of his young men to give them a part, this threw into such confusion that they would not listen or believe anything that was told them on the subject. Pachecha demanded the goods before the arrival of Laferin [La Farine]. I had them halld [sic] to there [sic] Village. I then counted there [sic] number little and big. I had ascertaind [sic] from Wawgar the strength of Laferin' [La Farine] party. I then divided them as I thought best in my own judgement [sic] without regard to instructions. I hope in future if I am to doe [sic] business with the Kickapoos that the department will furnish an interpreter [sic]. I have served in that capacity long enough without any compensation for it. It is well known that they are more trouble than all the agency besides, I have now taken from them five horses which they had stolen from the whites, such complaints as this I am constantly pestered with by the whites from almost every quarter. I enclose you a description list of the horses deliverd [sic] up. I shall not
hold myself accountable for any Copies, you will [get] them published I suppose in the publick [sic] prints soe [sic] that the owners may come and get them. I shall now be pestered for ten days with the Cherrokeas [sic] hoo [sic] will arrive here in three days – they will to there [sic] suprise [sic] be much disappointed they expect the Dellewares [sic] to Join them in carr[ing] [sic] on the warr [sic] against the osages, soe [sic] soon as I heard there [sic] Coming I sent for my friend Swannack [Suwaunock] and told him what I wished him to doe [sic], he immediately calld [sic] his young men and told them that two years he wanted warr [sic] and they stopt [sic] him now I am determined for peace there shall be no more warr [sic] with the dellewares [sic] against the osages. Twice you left here James Connor [Ahlahachick] has rendered me little or no services he has scarcely been sober three days at a time, he spent a new saddle a few days agoe [sic] for a few bottles of Whisky. I have notified him that I should dismiss him at the end of this quarter. Troit has done all the business for some time and I shall [illegible] him untill [sic] one can be got [sic]. I must after [sic] you to Genrl [William] Clark for all the news, you will write one by Simon I was compelled to give Simon thirty dollars in consequence of the flies being soe [sic] bad.

Your friend[,] John Campbell Sub Indian ag[en]t
APPENDIX B-57. Anderson to Clark. 22 February 1828.

Source: St. Louis Superintendency, 1827-1828, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 748, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Speech of William Anderson [Kikthawenund], Chief of the Delawares and his Councilmen to Genl William Clark Supt of Indian Affairs at St. Louis.

Brother. I hope you will listen to me.

Brother – I understand you very well what you have said to us by our friends Col. [Pierre] Menard & [John] Campbell our Sub Agents.

Brother – We have studied well upon this matter and have concluded upon our permanent residence to be on the Kansas River where you have pointed out to us.

Brother – You tell me that the place you have pointed out for us will make us all happy. I hope I may find it so.

Brother – You have told us often to ask what we were in need of. I am glad to hear that from you. I want you to add Three thousand dollars to our annuity.

Brother – If we ask you this favour, it is because what we now receive is barely enough to clothe one half of our people with one article of clothing.

Brother – And it will continue so until we can make part of our clothing ourselves, we hope that with the assistance of our great Father, it will not be long before we begin to do so.
B[rother] – When I see you have done this kindness for us, then it will make all your Brothers['] hearts glad.

B[rother] – You tell us to have all my relations the Delawares collected together and we would all be happy.

B[rother] – When I see that I am happy on the land that you have pointed out to us then I will do my best to collect all my people.

B[rother] – When those children have grown up to be men, then they will look to themselves and if they find that they are happy then they will thank the great man that made them so.

B[rother] – You tell me to ask what I am in need of and then you will assist me.

B[rother] – Since we came here we have bought and built a great many houses and we have done a great deal of work; we wish you to allow us what you think is right for it.

B[rother] – When we move from here to our permanent place of residence we wish you to furnish us some provisions at the Osage River and as it is a large river, we want you to have canoes there to cross our women and children.

B[rother] – When I get to my place of residence and see provisions there for us, then I shall be glad.

B[rother] – When I get there I wish to see grist mills as soon as possible to grind our corn, and a saw mill to saw plank that we may build comfortable houses.

B[rother] – I wish you also to have all kinds of tools there for farming and
for building our homes.

B[rother]- I do not ask you to build houses for us but if you will assist us we shall be glad.

B[rother] – I hope you will make fields for us with good fences and break them up on time and will think you do pity pity [sic] us.

B[rother] – Where we are a [sic] going, Our Grandchildren are always at near and when our young men go out hunting, if they should be killed or their horses stolen we will not follow them for fear of disturbances between us, but we will look for redress to our brother who has put us here.

B[rother] – When I get to my land, my young men will still hunt some yet and when they go among your people I hope that they will treat them well.

B[rother] – Our Creator has created us and has placed us on the earth and has given us the wild game to subsist upon, our young men hunt some yet, but it will not be very long until there is no more game and then our young hunters will lay bye [sic] their guns and go to work.

B[rother] – My people are poor and cannot get to their land without help. I hope you will give us Thirty horses to give those poor people who are not able to get there without them; when you do this kindness, I will think you do pity us.

B[rother] – I tell you I am poor. I wish you to furnish us with means to move our heavy property.

B[rother] – When I left White River in Indiana our debts were paid to our traders by our great Father. I want you to do the Same again and you will make our hearts glad.
B[rother] – I did not believe at that time that we would ever be obliged to ask you to do the Same favour for us but we are in a worse situation that we were then, because at that time part of us only were indebted. But now almost the whole of us are greatly indebted.

B[rother] – We see clearly that we are unable to pay our debt with Skins as usual.

B[rother] – We wish once more to pay those who have assisted us when we could not help ourselves. We are much indebted and if you do not pity us and pay them, they are broke and we are the cause of it.

B[rother] – Some of our nation are also traders and we wish you to consider them as white men and have their debts paid for them also and it will please my heart.

B[rother] – I want you to listen to me, you have put our Blacksmith [James Pool] here with us the One that is here now, we like him and we do not want any Other. I want to give him Something and I hope my request will be granted. I want you to give him one mile Square of land in this boundry [sic] where he wishes to locate it. You must not think it is his works that makes him give them land. I pity him. You must not think that he will stay here when we get up he will go with us where we are going and I hope he will be with us as long as he can see and when he gets so old that he cannot See he will think of his land.

B[rother] – The quantity of Iron allowed to our nation is greatly insufficient[;] four times that quantity will be little enough and at least two hundred pounds Steele [sic] as we must have a great many tools of different kinds as well
in farming as in hunting.

B[rother] – Where we came from in Indiana, those half breeds were taken into consideration. We wish Sophia Gilliss who is a half Delaware to have one mile Square of land to be located by her parents on public land not Otherwise appropriated.


B[rother] – This ground that you have Surveyed for us on [James Fork of] White River, we like it very well, we know it is worth a great deal for we find lead mineral every day, but you want it and we agree that you Shall have it.

B[rother] – There is with us three of your people; they were brought here by us, they have done a great deal of work, we wish you to take it on you to think of them and it will make our hearts glad.

B[rother] – I have many Other things that I do not think of at this time but will mention when we go to Saint Louis.

William Anderson [Kikthawenund]
James Fork Feb[ruar]y 22nd[,] 1828
John Campbell U.S. Sub Indn Agent
APPENDIX B-58. Anderson to Clark. 23 February 1828.

Source: St. Louis Superintendency, 1827-1828, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 748, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

My Friend and Brother [William] Clark. I want you to listen to me a little more on Private business [sic], this matter I do not want my nation to know any thing [sic] about this request as it Only concerns my Own family.

My Brother. You Say that you are getting old and so am I[,] therefore I wish before I leave this world to do all I can for my family.

M.B. You know well that ever Since you know me that you have never asked me to do any thing [sic] that I did not do it, so soon as it was in my power. I now wish you to assist me in my request.

M.B. I have five Sons [Suwaunock, Pooshies, Secondine, Sarcoxie, and adopted son Kockkatowha] and One daughter [Quatatas or adopted daughter Mekingees]. I want you to assist me Speaking to my great Father the President, to give to each of my Six Children One hundred dollars a Year, as long as they live as they all have large families of Children to Support.

M.B. You know that myself and sons are part white and we now want to try to live like our White Brothers and to follow their advice and example in every thing [sic]. If you will do me this favour, you will make my heart glad and my Children also.

M.B. I wish you also to assist my great friend Capt. Patterson
[Meshaquowha] who is also getting old, he is now the head of the Wolf party and has much to do and is not able to hunt anymore for his living. I wish you to try to get the same Sum of money a year that I have asked for my Sons and you will please my heart and his also.

William Anderson [Kikthawenund]

James Fork[,] 23rd February 1828
APPENDIX B-59. Anderson to Clark. 29 February 1828.

Source: St. Louis Superintendency, 1827-1828, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 748, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

My Brother, you tell me that you pity me.

Brother. I want you to give me from the mouth of the Kansa[s] Ten miles down the Missouri; thence a due west, until it intersects the west boundary line of the State.

Bro. If you give me that, I will think you pity me.

Bro. If you will listen to me now, I will be glad and if you do I will think you pity me.

Bro. From a long time, whenever you wished me to do anything I have always listened to you, ever since the peace of Genl. [Anthony] Wayne.

Bro. If you do not do me this kindness, I will thin[k] you do not pity me at all.

Bro. Two years ago I saw one of the Congressmen in St. Louis[,] that man Said to me it is my wish that Congress would place the Delawares in a place where they could be happy[,] that man said Our Brothers the Delawares have come a great ways.

Bro. If you will give that land to me, all my brothers will all have their eyes that way.

Bro. A great many of my relations are Scattered. I will call them all
togerher [sic] and tell them this land will make them happy.

Bro. I will take all the land on the other side of the Kansa[s] River, that you assigned me[,] I will not throw it away it will do for my people.

Bro. If you will give me this piece of land, altho[ugh] it is in the land of the State of Missouri, and it is but a Small piece do take pity on my Father, and grant me this request. God has placed in the heart of great men, a heart, to take pity on the poor.

Bro. This is all I have to say[,] no more at present, Genl [William] Clark, I take you by the hand. I hope you are well.

William Anderson [Kikthawenund]

James Fork[,] Feby 29th[,] 1829

John Campbell U.S. Sub Indn Agt
APPENDIX B-60. Excerpt of Clark to Porter. 13 January 1829.

Source: St. Louis Superintendency, 1829-1831, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 749, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Washington[,] 13th January 1829.[.]

To effect this object [removal], it is proposed to assign to the Delawares a like quantity of land to that they are now in possession of with an annuity of $600 to each of the three bands and 200$ to the [Stockbridge] Munsees; 1000$ for useful domestic animals, 1000$ to assist them in preparing their lands for cultivation, 500$ for agricultural implements, and 2000$ for provisions until they can raise a supply.

Viz The whole amount required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20 years annuity for stock, assistance, provisions, etc[,]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delawares &amp; Munsees</td>
<td>$2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kickapoos</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piankishaws</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weas</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peorias</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnese [sic]</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Add for the expense of negotiating with the Tribes 16000$ in presents
provisions etc[.] will make an aggregate of $40000[.]

The effect of these allowances, properly applied would enable those tribes
to subject themselves by cultivation and may tend to induce other tribes within
the states to remove and join their red bretheren [sic] in a Country calculated to
afford them subsistence on lands of their own.
APPENDIX B-61. Vashon to Eaton. 27 October 1829.

Source: St. Louis Superintendency, 1829-1831, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 749, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

The tribes of this agency at present are spread from the Kansas to the Southeast part of Missouri, a distance of near 300 miles & therefore it is difficult [sic] to render the attention which their condition requires. Great efforts have been made for several years past to induce them to remove to the country selected on & above the Kansas [River]. And after examining into the cause of the difficulty & obtaining some necessary information, proceeded with a party of confidential Indians, without funds or orders, to endeavour to obtain their consent to move the time selected was when the traders were absent, to whom it is said the Indians owe $30000 & they pledged never to remove unless the Govt will pay their debts.

In my Council with the Delawares they first required $30000 as compensation for improvements, in addition to the paymt [sic] of debts, and an additional permt [sic] annuity of $3000 with Houses built, farms made, mills erected, stock of every kind furnished, & provisions on their way & for a year after with waggons [sic] etc[.] etc. My Council with them was necessarily continued for about three weeks, it being indispensably requisite to ascertain by what arrangement the Delawares could be induced to consent to remove as the removal of the Kickapoos, and the Crooked Creek Shawanees [sic], in a great
measure depended on theirs, and that of the Peankeshaws [sic], Weas, & Peorias entirely [sic] depended on their removal. The Supplementary Article to the Delaware Treaty herewith enclosed exhibits the best terms to which they could be brought, and as the removal of all the other tribes so much depends on theirs, you may rest assured that it is advisable to accede to their terms.
Superintendency of Ind. Affairs
St. Louis December 2nd[,] 1829
Sir[,] 

I have the honour to enclose here with a Copy of a Supplementary Article to the Delaware Treaty of St. Maries [sic], as proposed by the Chief of that Tribe [William Anderson Kikthawenund], and conditionally agreed to by Capt. [George] Vashon, their agent. Also a proposition to me from the Chiefs of the Kickapoos to exchange their lands which adjoin the Delawares within this State for lands above the Kansas River; which was respectfully submitted to the Government.

The accompanying Copies and Extract from Capt. Vashons [sic] to me No. 1, 2, 3, 4 explains to views of that Agent in reference to the proposed exchange of lands with those tribes.

I beg leave to suggest to you the expediency of authorising [sic] an exchange of lands with these Tribes, with as little delay as possible, as they are now willing to exchange on reasonable terms and may be induced to move out of the State, by giving them such assistance as will enable them to live untill [sic] they can abide themselves.

707
As the policy of the Government has been to remove the Indians out of the limits of the States, it is my opinion that a Treaty as can contain [sic] [illegible] should be had with the Delawares, Kickapoos, Weas, Piankishaws, Peorias, and Illinois within this State who have claims within any State and exting [sic] [illegible] wish these claims by an exchange of lands or limited annuities and such assistance in Agriculture, Stock, and provisions as may enable them, in their progress in Civilization, to assist themselves by their own exertions. Limited annuities I am inclined to believe would have a better effect than if they were perpetual, as the Indians at the present generation would see the necessity of early exertion to ensure subsistence [sic].

The arrangements made with the Delawares by Capt. [George] Vashon by the enclosed Supplement, appears reasonable and the Conditions (with the exceptions of the Annuity) is such as all other Tribes will require, that is to say, assistance in removing, Agriculture, and for provisions.

The $1000 additional Annuity to the Delawares should be applied to breaking up, fencing, and preparing the lands for Cultivation, and a portion in Stock etc. and a proportion of Annuity of $5000 required by the Kickapoos in exchange for the lands in Missouri, should be applied in the same way, and it is respectfully submitted that all the claims of those smaller Tribes of Piankishaws, Weas, and Peorias, and Crooked Creek Shawanees [sic] within the States, should be extinguished, by a specific and limited amount of assistance in Agriculture, provisions, and Stock, and compelled to move out of the States and settle on lands assigned to them West of the State boundary, which is superior to
the lands occupied by any of them.

To carry these arrangements into effect (if approved) it will require the several sums, as stated in the enclosed list.

I have the honour to be with high Respect,

Your Ob[edien]t. Serv[a]nt.

Wm. Clark

Our Agent [George Vashon] came here last summer to have a talk with us[;] he wanted us to go and take another look at the Kansas Land and I did send several of my young men, when my young men returned I asked them how they liked the Country and they said that they liked it very well, that the Land was very good. We made a paper before his departure from this place, saying if they should find the Land good, to sign the paper. We done it to satisfy the Agent, to show that the Land was good we sign the paper. If the Agent has wrote [sic] to you or to Congress more than I have stated, it is nothing. You always told me, my friends, that you would help me towards the happiness of my people this is what I have always believed, now we wish you to do it as we stand in need of your friendship. The time my friend [Pierre] Menard was here and spoke to us about two years ago. You said we ask to[o] much [sic] now, we will two [sic] away a little, the land that we have ask within the State, and also for the halfbreed[s] we will lay that aside. I have ask[ed] you for Three thousand dollars of adding to our Annuity – now we will take but $2000. Also for 30 horses, we will take now 20 horses. Brothers when we left the State of Indiana the debts of our nation were paid, and it would be very wrong if our Traders were to lose their money. We
would be very glad if it was the same this time. There is many of Old Men that are in debt and can't pay and some others are dead[,] it is our wish that we ask of you.

For our labour that we have done here, we cannot tell the worth of it ourselves, but we leave that to you, or our Great Father. We wish for you to build us a good Griss [sic] mill and keep it in to repair and to find and attend to it, and to make a good fence round our field, and to furnish us with farming utensils, as we ask you before. Brothers, you hear what we say if it pleased you & you give us what we ask, we shall be willing to move as quick as possible, and if you don’t give us what we ask we shall not go. The land is ours[,] When we get what we have asked, and ready to move, we want you to furnish us with wagons [sic] & and [sic] provisions sufficient to take us there, and till [sic] we raise enough to subsist upon. Say one year after our departure from this place. The reason wy [sic] we have not [said] this to our Agent [George Vashon], because he was a stranger to us, we don’t like to trust every stranger that comes into our nation, except our friends. This is all what we have to tell you now – Except we hope that you will do your possible to help us. Our Creator [h]as put in a man a good heart, so he might piety [sic] the poor.

James Connor [Ahlahachick], Interp.

Wm. Anderson [Kikthawenund]

Capt. Patterson [Meshaquowha]

Capt. Beaver [Punchhuck]

Capt. Shewanack [Suwaunock]
Capt. Pipe [Tahunqueecoppi]

Capt. Pushis [Pooshies]
APPENDIX B-64. Anderson to Clark and Menard. 18 January 1830.

Source: St. Louis Superintendency, 1829-1831, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 749, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Brothers,

You know that I am half white man. You know I have always tried to do good towards the happiness of my people. I have four sons [Suwaunock, Pooshies, Secondine, and Sarcozie] left and 3 dead [Sesocum and adopted son Lapanihilie; third is unknown], and those that are dead have a great many children left & I have to clothe them. I am not able to do it, and those that are leaving [living] I want them to get one hundred dollars each for life, as I have ask[ed] before, and I also want my nephew [more accurately brother-in-law] Capt. Patterson [Meshaquowha], as he has been appointed the Chief next to me, to get what we have asked for him, One hundred Dollars. He is an old man, not able to hunt and seekly [sic].

Brothers, my grandchild [through adopted daughter Mekingees] James Connor [Ahlahachick] that you have placed between us. I don't know of any thing [sic] that he has done wrong now[.] I don't know you have any reason to find fault of him.

My friend [William] Clark – it has been a long while since we have seeing [sic] Col. [Pierre] Menard, we beleive [sic] he has forgot us – we don[']t see him anymore, we wish to see him.
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Wm. Anderson [Kikthawenund]
APPENDIX B-65. Campbell to Clark. 25 August 1830.

Source: Fort Leavenworth Agency 1824-1836, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 300, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Shawnee Agency[,] August 25th[,] 1830[.]

Sir[,]  

I received a letter dated July 22nd from the Rev. Isaac McCoy [(1784-1846)], who informed me that he had been appointed by the President of the United States to run of the boundaries of the Delaware Land north of the Kansas River, and requesting of me to notify the Delawares that they must appoint an agent to accompany him on the survey.

Agreeably to his request I sent an express and gave them the necessary information: and agreeably to my request they sent Capt. John Quick [Journeycake], one of their principal councilmen to superintend the running of the boundaries. I enclose you the letter of [William] Anderson the Chief of the delawares [sic] in answer to mine written to him on the subject of their removal. You will discover from his letter he is now anxious to remove this fall and he demands the forty horses to be purchased and sent as soon as possible and also the number of waggons [sic] named in this Treaty.

Twenty five head of the horses can be purchased of the Shawnees and the balance can be obtained in this neighborhood at a fair price. Four waggons [sic] and teams can be furnished at this place, and if necessary the whole
number of waggons [sic] can be furnished here, and I presume at as reasonable a price as they can be got [sic] anywhere. If the waggons [sic] are procured here, they can take corn and provisions from this quarter and deposit [sic] it at the [Harmony] Mission station on the Osage river where they can get it on their return which will save considerable expenses.

I take the liberty of advising that they should be removed before the Prairies are fired [burned], on account of their stock. I would for the state of yours that it would be advisable to gratify them in their wishes to move this fall as there are still a great many opposed to moving.

You have also enclosed two documents concerning Natcoman [Natcomin] a Delaware Indian, which you will dispose of as you think proper.

John Quick [Journeycake] the Agent sent by the Delawares has now been instructed to request that provisions should be ready on their lands when they arrive, and that there should be a house put up to deposit their provisions in. It is also their wish that there should be some assistance afforded them in putting up some houses for the Chiefs as the weather will be cold, by the time they get removed. They state that assistance was promised them by Capt. [George] Vashon. This I know nothing about.

I have the honor to be etc.

John Campbell U.S. S. Ind. Agt.
APPENDIX B-66. Cummins to Clark. 4 November 1830.

Source: Fort Leavenworth Agency, 1824-1836, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 300, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Shawnee & Delaware Agency[,] 4 Nov. 1830[.]

Genl. William Clark[,] Supt of Indian Affairs[,]  

Chief [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] arrive[d] here the first day of this month with sixty one of the dellewars [sic], he said there are about thirty Families moore [sic] that will be hear [sic] in a few days and others preparing to come as soon as they could do so. Chief Anderson brought with him Two waggons [sic], a good many horses & Cows or Cattle, he will winter here on the north side of the Kansas River opposite the trading house For Shawanees [sic], they were out of Provisions. I have furnished them with Beef and Intend to furnish them with provisions untill [sic] I hear from you. I wish you to instrct me on the subject of Provisioning of the delewars [sic], that are hear [sic] and those that may arrive[.] I hope you will in this Be prompt and positive. They expect to be furnished with Salt meats and Corn, and that to be delivered to them where they settle.

Chief Anderson [Kikthawenund] says he was almost compelled to moove [sic] as soon as he did, that so soon as the White people learned that there [sic] treaty was ratified, they mooved [sic] in and settled all about them & had seeded many of there [sic] fields before he left there, he states he has mooved [sic] many
Times and a long ways, to gratify the wishes of the Gen[era]l Government. That he has now left [James Fork of] White River, where he had considerable Improvements, to comply with the wishes of The Government that he now expects assistance will be afforded him to open farms at there [sic] new home.

Chief [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] and his band was furnished with some provisions when on his way to this place, by the White People on accounts of which he kept and brought on to me amounting to thirty four dollars and eight cents.

With Respect, Your Most Ob[edien]t. Serv[an]t,

Richard W. Cummins Ind. Agnt.
APPENDIX B-67. Cummins to Clark. 2 December 1830.

Source: Records of the United States Superintendency of Indian Affairs, St. Louis, Vol. 6, Microfilm, William Clark Papers, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, KS.

Delaware and Shawonee [sic] Agency[.] 3rd December 1830[.]

Genl William Clark[,] Superintendent of Indian Affairs[,]

Your letters of the 5th and 14th of November came safe to hand, in both you authorized me to draw on you for funds which was [sic] appropriated for the present year for the purchase of such provisions as are absolutely required for the Indians of my Agency, it being part of the allotment for your Superintendency. Since the arrival of Chief [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund], the balance [sic] of the Nation except those that are on a hunting Expedition and a few that are still left on James Fork of White River fifteen or twenty they say, past [passed] my Agency a few days agoe [sic] to the Lands allotted to them of the Kansas River. I have not as yet been able to ascertain the precise number, they say about four hundred in all. The Chiefs demand of me their provisions as provided for in their Treaty, and say it was to be delivered to them on their land, if it was your intention, or wish that I should furnish them those provisions on their land I wish you to instruct me to that effect. I have told them that their Treaty was not yet ratified and that no appropriation was made to carry it into effect.

The principal part of them that are here are old Men, Women, and Children, many of them unable to pack their provisions from the Settlements,
those that are, will not pack for those that are not able, some have not [sic]
horses sufficient. They wish me to say to you that they [have] their Women and
Children on their lands and are well pleased and very glad and wish you to
represent the same to the Government.


Richard W. Cummens [sic]
APPENDIX B-68. Cummins to Clark. 2 April 1831.

Source: Records of the United States Superintendency of Indian Affairs, St. Louis, Vol. 4, Microfilm, William Clark Papers, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, KS.

Shawnee and Delaware Agency[,] 2d April 1831[.]

Genl William Clark Supt of Indian Aff[air]s

Sir,

I have furnished the Delawares with as much provisions only as was actually needful to keep them from suffering, which I had to transport to them, when they came last fall their horses were poor owing [sic] to the very extreme Hardness of the winter, the Indians generally as well as the Delawares lost most all their horses. They have none fit for service, a great many of the Indians are in a suffering condition owing chiefly to the unusual hardness of the winter. I believed it to be my duty to have some provisions waggoned [sic] to them, particularly, to the Delawares Chief [William] Anderson & his counsel [sic] men says that it was understood last fall on White River that the supplementary article to their treaty was ratified. That immediately the White People moved in among them and took possession of their farms. Commenced seeding their fields and selling whiskey to his People, so that he was compelled to move. I have also furnished that half of the Weas, that have been in the Mississippi swamps [in southeastern Missouri] for some time past with two waggon [sic] loads of corn and some pork. They came and joined their nation on their lands this Spring in a
starving condition, their Friends were unable to help them many of whom I was informed by the trader divided their corn with their horses as long as they had a year they are not trying to work but their dirt is so weak they are not able to do much I think the past winter, will learn [sic] the Indians in future to be more provident. They stand much in need of provisions. I would like to receive some instructions from you on the subject of furnishing them.

Respectfully your most Obed[ien]t Serv[an]t

Rich[ar]d W. Cummins

Indn. Agent
APPENDIX B-69. Myers to Menard. 7 August 1831.

Source: Records of the United States Superintendency of Indian Affairs, St. Louis, Vol. 6, Microfilm, William Clark Papers, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, KS.

August 7th[,] 1831[.]

Col. Pierre Menard

U.S. Sub Indian Agent

Sir[.]

Agreeably to your instructions of the Supt to you and your [illegible] of the 11th July last, I proceeded to the Indian Camps in the Swamps about 15 miles below what is called the West Prairie in the County of New Madrid. I reached there by water on the 28th of same month, and on the first day of August, I met the Indians in Council, and explained to them the object of my mission, and read and explained to them the object of my mission in my possession. They seemed very much surprised when they heard the complaints lodged against them, and could not imagine that the White people could fabricate such falsehoods.

They However the day after, and after some consultation among themselves informed me they would join their people on the Kansas river and would move as soon as assistance was offered to do so, that through the severity of last winter they had lost the greatest part of their horses.

I have carefully examined their situation, there will be about ninety two
persons to be removed, the greatest of them being Delawares of Chief [William] Anderson’s family & relatives together [16 families of Delawares amounting to 49 persons, 12 families of Senecas amounting to 32 persons, and 4 families of Shawnees amounting to 13 persons].

I am of Opinion it would require from 20 to 22 good pack horses to transport them they will also want a person to accompany them and procure provisions for them during their journey, some ammunition will also be necessary. There is a part of the senecas [sic] that are willing to move on the same principles as the Delawares, there is also a good many half muscoes [Muskogees/Creeks] & half Shawonees [sic] who are not willing to move till [sic] next Spring, but they wish to move towards the Arkansas river. Chillitaka their chief told me that he was willing to move now if he could dispose of his property, he has about 200 head of hogs besides a great many cattle.

Those who intend to move will be ready to move on the 1st day of September: Exertions will be made to retain them, but I believe it will not prevail with the Delawares.


W. Myers

Enumerations of the Indians residing in the Swamp in the County of New Madrid and belonging to the Superintendency of Genl. William Clark.

16 families of Delawares amounting to  49 persons

12       Senecas        32
The Balance are as before stated of half breeds of Shawanees [sic] & Muscoes [Muskogees] or Creeks on the Cerdi Gris [Verdigris] a Branch of the Arkansas River.

After a careful examination of their cornfields they contain fully as follows.

Lesor Koxey 75 bushels
Kochetouais 75
Moonshine 50
Jos. Smith 60
APPENDIX B-70. Anderson to Cass. 22 September 1831.

Source: Fort Leavenworth Agency, 1824-1836, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 300, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Kansas River[,] September 22d[,] 1831[.]

Father Cass[,] 

I inform you that nearly all our nation are on the Land that Government has laid off for us and I hope if the Government fulfil [sic] all their promises that before many years the balance of my Nation who are now scattered some on Red River and some in the Spanish Country will all come here on this Land we are well pleased with our present situation. The Land is good and also the wood and water but the Game is very scarce.

Father, We hope that all we had a right to expect in the treaty made with Capt. [George] Vashon will be accomplished. We had good reason to believe, as we had asked, that if not the whole at least the greatest part of our debt would be paid by Government for the last time and that a pension of Two Hundred Dollars per annum would be allowed to Capt. Patterson [Meshaquowha] and One hundred Dollars to each of my four sons Capt. Shoanack [Suwaunock], Pushies [Pooshies], Secondyan [Secondine], and Sacacocksy [Sarcoxie]. Those four latter I am informed by Our friend [Pierre] Menard are mentioned in the Treaty but nothing is said of the other and the money has never been sent even for the four last mentioned by our friend Menard has promised to advance the money to
two of them before he leaves this place the two others are absent.

Father, I told the Surveyor [Isaac McCoy] who came to lay off our Land that I wished Congress to put a Strong word in our hand so that we could live here forever in Peace and never to be removed my young men are very much indebted I would be glad if you could help us. There is no Game on the Land that we are on for this reason my Children are going a great distance to hunt if their debts were paid as we had thought they would remain at home and work the Land.

Father, I shake hand with you for all my nation and pray the Great Spirit to preserve you where you are for the good of the Red Skins.

Wm. Anderson

Source: Fort Leavenworth Agency 1824-1836, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 300, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

My Father Cass[,] You know how the Osages have treated us some years since when they killed two white men and robbed us of our skins[,] you know when we go a [sic] hunting our aim is to find something and what we had made the Osages took out of our hands[,] I wish you to take in Consideration what the Osages have done us and try to get us paid out of their annuities.

My friend when any person losess [sic] any thing [sic] if it is ever so little they wish to get it back so it is with us; the Osages have stolen a great [sic] deal from us and I hope that you will order their Agent to pay us out of their annuities.

My friend You know me very well[,] you know our names Shoanack [Suwaunock] and Natcoming [Natcomin] and this is the way we have been treated by the Osages[,] the amount that they took from us is One Thousand seven hundred Dollars besides two horses worth seventy Dollars and two Rifle guns belonging to the two White men that were killed also five Beaver Traps.

Shoanack [Suwaunock]

Natcoming [Natcomin]

Kansas River[,] Septr 23[,] 1831[.]
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APPENDIX B-72. LaFleur Statement. 28 September 1831.

Source: Fort Leavenworth Agency 1824-1836, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, 1824-1881, Microfilm 234, Roll 300, Record Group 75 Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[sworn statement made by Peter Lafleur, 28 Sept. 1831]

A List of Skins and Sundry Articles Stolen from a party of Delaware indians under Capt. Shewhanack [Suwaunock], Natcoming [Natcomin], and Capt. Patterson [Meshaquowha], which skins where [sic] left in Care of Peter Lafleur above the Big Band [Bend] of the Arkansas River in December 1824 viz.

To 1 keg Tobacco 150 a 75 $112.50
2 prs Stilliards [Steelyards] 1 Drawing 265 & 1 Dwg 50 9.00
50 ps of Lead 6.25
1 Drawing Knife, 1 foot hadds [adze], 1 hand saw,
3 Augers 15/4, 2 axes 11/, 3 Brass Kettles 17 36.75
11 packs [sic] Saddles sursingles [surcingles] and Ropes 44.00
1 Large Tent or Marquee 20.00
3 Bushels of Salt 12.00
4 Steel Traps 28.00
2 Rifles or gun 40.00
2 prs Saddle Bags Containing Sundry Clothing 30.00
1 frying pan & 3 Tin pan 5.50
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 horse saddle &amp; Bridle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Perogue [canoe] about 40 feet Long</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 Shaved Deer Skins 2750[#]</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>687.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 Beaver 190 [#]</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>570.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Otters</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Racons [sic]</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State of Missouri, County of Jackson
APPENDIX B-73. Dougherty to Clark. 22 July 1831.

Source: Records of the United States Superintendency of Indian Affairs, St. Louis, Vol. 6, Microfilm, William Clark Papers, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, KS.

Upper Missouri Agency[.]

Cant. Leavenworth[.] 22 July 1831[.]

To: Genl William Clark Supt Ind[ian] Aff[iai]rs

Sir.

In April last, [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] one of the principal chiefs of the Delaware nation visited this agency, as he said, for the purpose of expressing through me to the several tribes of Indians within my Agency and particularly to the Pawnees his great desire to cultivate and maintain with them the most strict and friendly intercourse and as a visible manifestation of his desire presented me with the wampum in conforming to the custom of his tribe, accompanied by a request that I would in his name and that of his tribe (whose feelings and wishes he represented) deliver the same to those several Indian tribes. I of course was highly gratified at the indication of good feeling shown by the Delawares toward their brethren [sic] under my charge and consequently assured Anderson that I would as soon as practicable make known to those Indians the views and wishes of the Delawares, and distribute the wampum in accordance with his desire, but have this far been prevented by being compelled to go immediately thereafter to St. Louis to purchase annuities for the Indians of 731
my Agency. This the subject remained until a few days since when Asha-mamuk [Suwaunock] the son of Anderson a man of much influence with his nation accompanied by about 40 other Delawares many of whom were also men of influence, visited this post and requested to be heard in relation to the Pawnees. Their request being granted by assembling them in Counsil [sic] Staha-wa-muk [Suwaunock] and others of his party who spoke on the subject gave evident indications of an unfriendly feeling towards the Pawnees. This feeling from the expressions used by the Delawares took its rise (as they wished to be understood) from the circumstance that a war party of the Pawnees had killed three Delawares in the winter of 1829. This unfortunate affair occurred high up on the Republican fork of the Kansas [River] and within the country claimed by the Pawnees as their hunting ground and from information the part that committed the act were in search of their enemy at the time and did not know to what tribe those Indians belonged and perhaps might have taken them for Osages between which tribes & the Pawnees there existed at that time, and had for many years previously, a most deadly hostility: nor has that feeling ceased down to the present time. These considerations were urged on Stsha-wa-muk [Suwaunock] in extenuation of the conduct of the Pawnees. He promised to remain at peace and take no farther step in the matter until the Pawnees could be heard from, but expressed a settled determination to go this fall with a hunting party towards the mountains which will if persisted in certainly lead him into the heart of the country claimed by the Pawnees as their hunting ground, and will it is presumed should they meet, bring him and his party in direct conflict with the Pawnees.
This man Stsha-wa-muk [Suwaunock], remained last winter on the Arkansas [River] with the Cherokees and Osages & has but very lately returned to his village on the Kansas. Is it not reasonable to suppose that in his late intercourse with the Osages and Cherokees, who are at war with the Pawnee, he has received impressions and imbibed feelings, which have caused him to change the ground so recently occupied by his father Anderson and instead of that friendly disposition manifested by him towards the Pawnees thus to assume a hostile and war-like tone? Or why this [illegible] change in the feelings of the Delawares? When the fact that the Pawnees had killed those three Delawares, was not only known to Anderson, when he was here in the Spring and then spoken of by him, but had been known by the whole tribe for two years previously.

In addition to the cause suggested, which it is believed is operating on the minds of the Delawares on this subject I will mention one other which doubtless is producing a considerable effect.

The Kansas [Kanza] who live near to the Delawares and who are in the habits of frequent intercourse with them have for the last two years been occasionally striking at the Pawnees and even so late as the past winter succeeded in taking several scalps nor do they seem inclined from any thing [sic] which I have been able to [entire line illegible] from [illegible] influencing in a more or less degree the movements of the Delawares. I am induced to conclude that at no distant day and probably this fall an open rupture will take place between the Delawares and Pawnees. In the event of a war between these
tribes, it is not probable that the Pawnee will become disaffected towards the
Whites? They know that the Delawares live on our boundary and are in the
habits of friendship with us, and in fact they view the Delawares nearly in the
same light they do the Whites, and speak of them as such. They occupy the tract
of country through which our traders pass to and from the mountains yearly and
are able were they so disposed to embarrass that trade much if not destroy it
entirely. This alone should form a powerful motive in our Government to maintain
friendly relations with the Pawnees, but this it seems to me is not all. [W]ould we
consider our borders safe, when a tribe of Indians that live immediately adjoining
out white settlements are at war with so powerful a tribe of savages as that of the
Pawnees who are able to embody at any time at least 2500 warriors. These
considerations relate solely to ourselves besides the additional one, which is to
prevent those unfortunate people from shedding each other[']s blood and which
has so frequently done actuated our Government to interfere between savage
tribes and [illegible] all their differences. If then, as is supposed probably that
hostilities will commence between the Delawares and Pawnees without the
timely interference of our Government is it not expedient and proper it should be
done. The anticipated result of things between the Delawares and Pawnees
might it would seem to me, be arrested and its horrid consequences prevented
by such interference. This would be effectual either by preventing the Delawares
from going at all on the Pawnee lands to hunt or by obtaining from the Pawnees
privilege for them to do so. Objections may be urged against the means
suggested of preventing the Delawares from going on the lands of the Pawnees
to hunt as our government has already promised them by treaty and in fact has marked for them a passway of ten miles wide leading into that very country & directly on the lands claimed and owned by the Pawnees [entire line illegible] with them.

The Delawares are fully sensible that our Government has guaranteed to them this passway or hunting road and seem determined to avail themselves of it. They might therefore have some just grounds of complaint against us, were we immediately after making the road for them to step forward and prevent their passing out on it to hunt. Situated then, as we are in relation to the parties I would most respectfully recommend that at as early a time as practicable and if possible before the Delawares go on their contemplated hunt, the Pawnees be assembled and a perfect understanding had with them on the subject and the privilege for the Delawares to hunt on their lands be obtained and their differences whatever they may be settled and put to rest.

The Pawnees will return from their summer hunt about the last of August and set out again for their fall hunts about the 1st of October. It would therefore be expedient should my suggestions on the subject merit notice to fix on some time about the middle of September to assemble the Indians.

I have the honor to be sir very respectfully Y[ou]r. Ob[edien]t. Serv[an]t.
Mr. Dougherty, Ind. Agt.
APPENDIX B-74. Dougherty to Clark. 9 November 1831.

Source: Records of the United States Superintendency of Indian Affairs, St. Louis, Vol. 6, Microfilm, William Clark Papers, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, KS.

Cant. Leavenworth[,] Nov. 9th[,] 1831[.]


Sir. In my letter to you of the 29th [last] I purposely omitted to mention any thing in relation to the difficulty between the Pawnees and Delawares. My reason for doing so, was the circumstance of my having addressed a note to Maj. Cummings. Agents for the Delawares on that subject and to which I wished an answer before I could write to you knowingly concerning it.

The following is a copy of my note to Major Cummings:

Cant. Leavenworth[,] Oct. 21st[,] 1831[.]

Sir,

I have just returned from the Pawnee village and avail myself of the first opportunity to inform you that I delivered to them the wampum and Talk of the Delaware Chief [William] Anderson [Kikthawenund] which he gave me for that purpose last Spring in presence of Major [John] Campbell, they appeared to be well pleased with Anderson's Talk and requested me to communicate to him and his people that they would be glad to become acquainted with them.

At the time they killed the two young Delawares near the Republican
Pawnee Village they know not who they were that some time previous to that affair six Pawnees had been killed by some strange Indians and thinking it probably that the two young Delawares were of the same tribe was the principal cause of their killing them.

They desired me also to inform the Delawares that they would hold fast the wampum Anderson had sent them, until [sic] he or some of his people should call as his village and see it again with their own Eyes. After which they hoped they would look upon each other as Brothers and that the road between their towns would be kept clean.

I communicate to you this information that you may make such use of it, as in your own judgement [sic] may seem proper.

I am your friend & obedient servant
Mr. Dougherty Ind. Agt.

Not having as yet received an answer from Major C[ummins]. I will address him again in the subject more fully and as soon as I can obtain the feelings of the Delawares towards the Pawnees and the views of the Agents. I will be better able and will not fail to inform you as to my opinions touching any further measures calculated to bring about a good understanding between these Tribes.

I have recently been informed indirectly that Anderson died while I was at the Pawnees delivering his Wampum of Peace. I understand also that a Party of Delawares previous to my return had gone off through the Pawnee Country on a
trapping expedition.

I am of opinion that all emigrating Indians should be restrained as far as possible from those Buffaloe [sic] and Beaver hunting Expeditions by which their minds are directed from agricultural pursuits. This however will be very difficult to execute so long as the Fur Traders are located among them for the plane [sic] reason that it is the Trader's interest to urge all Indians with whom he carries on trade to the Chase.


Mr. Dougherty Ind. Agt.
APPENDIX C. Trading Invoice for William Gillis at James Fork of White River 1827.

Source: Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO, Richard Graham Papers, Box 4.

Invoice of Merchandise, the property of Wm. Gilliss, to be Traded at James Fork White River with the Delaware Indians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 pcs</td>
<td>3 pnt Mna [sic] Blankets</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>247.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &quot;</td>
<td>2 [1/2] &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>308.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 &quot;</td>
<td>2 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 &quot;</td>
<td>1 [1/2] &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>32.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 &quot;</td>
<td>1 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 pcs</td>
<td>Scarlet Cloth</td>
<td>71 yds</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>124.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>16 &quot;</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot;</td>
<td>green &quot;</td>
<td>33 &quot;</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>67.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot;</td>
<td>Gray mint &quot;</td>
<td>18 &quot;</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>30.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 &quot;</td>
<td>Sava list Blue &quot;</td>
<td>144 &quot;</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>216.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>42 &quot;</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>84.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot;</td>
<td>Gray list &quot;</td>
<td>40 &quot;</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>64.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>21 &quot;</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>47.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot;</td>
<td>Strouds Narrow bird [sic]</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 &quot;</td>
<td>Blue Ground Calico</td>
<td>280 yds</td>
<td>[0].16</td>
<td>44.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>84 &quot;</td>
<td>[0].20</td>
<td>16.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>55 &quot;</td>
<td>[0].21</td>
<td>11.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Price per Yard</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ground &quot;</td>
<td>10&quot;</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>26.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assorted Cols [sic]</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>30.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaid domestics</td>
<td>15&quot;</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>56.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped &quot;</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>46.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleached &quot;</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>22.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown &quot;</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>28.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red ticking</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>29.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia Sheeting</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount Carried over $1898.19

Amount bro. ford [sic] $1898.19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Price per Unit</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/4 Chintz Shawls</td>
<td>10 pt</td>
<td>9 pc</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>40 shawls</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td>5 pc</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue India handkcs [sic]</td>
<td>10&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comn [sic] Madrass &quot;</td>
<td>10&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turky [sic] Red</td>
<td>10&quot;</td>
<td>10 pc</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thread, Awls &amp; needles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 dbl [sic] Trigr [sic] Rifles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 single &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mm [sic] saddles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 pc Com. Burle [sic] Bridles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot; Snaffles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot; Plated &quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 # Powder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 Lead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 [200] Rifle flints [0.0175 each]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Butcher knives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 &quot; Cartouche &quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 &quot; Inlaid &quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &quot; Wilsons Butcher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Brass Kettles</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 China Vermillion</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 bunches Cut beed [sic] assorted</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 &quot; Com &quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 pc Horse Bells</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 &quot; Tincups</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot; 1 size pans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &quot; 2 &quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot; x 3 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 pc Beaver Traps</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>87.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pc Military Feathers</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot; x &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot; Black Ostrich &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &quot; x &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 bunches Morris Bells</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0].40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount Carried [sic] over $3218.29

Amount bro forward $3218.29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 pc Ribbon No. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>15.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 &quot; x No. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0].80</td>
<td>14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 &quot; x No. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0].60</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Pipe Tomahawks [sic]</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Total] $3329.29

I certify that the above is a correct Invoice of the Goods intended to be Traded at the place and the Tribes within mentioned and that I take as assistants in the Trade Tim [illegible], M. Anthuinis, Henry Boileau, Alexis Lafleur[,] all Citizens of the United States whom I wish included in my License.

Ste. Genevieve,

October 1827[.]

William Gilliss
APPENDIX D. Trading Invoice for William Gillis at Three Forks of White River 1827.

Source: Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO, Richard Graham Papers, Box 4.

Invoice of Merchandise[,] the property of Wm. Gilliss[,] to be Traded at the Three Forks of White River with the Delaware[,] Shawnee Tribes of Indians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price per Unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 ps Blue Ground Callicow [sic]</td>
<td>280 yds</td>
<td>[0.16]</td>
<td>$44.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>120 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.20]</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>75 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.21]</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 &quot; White &quot;</td>
<td>300 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.15]</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>140 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.19]</td>
<td>26.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot; &quot; Assorted</td>
<td>112 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.22]</td>
<td>24.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 &quot; Domestic</td>
<td>430 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.13]</td>
<td>55.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>160 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.15]</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>118 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.17]</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 &quot; Striped</td>
<td>360 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.13]</td>
<td>46.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>180 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.16]</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>145 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.14]</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 &quot; &quot; Bleached</td>
<td>160 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.14]</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>92 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.16]</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 &quot; &quot; Brown</td>
<td>175 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.12]</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>92 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.13]</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &quot; Red Tickin [sic]</td>
<td>180 &quot;</td>
<td>[0.16]</td>
<td>28.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 &quot; Worshington [sic]</td>
<td>80 &quot;</td>
<td>[0].20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot; Rusia [sic] Shirting [sic]</td>
<td>33 1/3 &quot;</td>
<td>[0].23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot; Blue Straud [sic] Narrio List [sic]</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 &quot; B. Saved [Blue sava?] List</td>
<td>120 &quot;</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot; Scarlet</td>
<td>70 &quot;</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot;</td>
<td>16 &quot;</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot; Green</td>
<td>35 &quot;</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot; Grey</td>
<td>36 &quot;</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot; Sky Blue</td>
<td>21 &quot;</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot; Grey List</td>
<td>23 &quot;</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 &quot; 7/4 Chintz Shawls,</td>
<td>9 ps Shawls</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 &quot; 6/4 &quot;</td>
<td>50 Shawls</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot; 5/4 &quot;</td>
<td>4 pc</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Sub Total] $1341.07

Amount Brought Forwd [sic] $1341.07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 &quot; India Handkfs [sic]</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 &quot; Madrass</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 &quot; Turky [sic] Red</td>
<td>12 ps</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thread[,] Alls [sic] &amp; Needl[e]s</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 &quot; Dble [sic] Trigger[e]d Rifles</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 &quot; Sngle [sic]</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 &quot; Com[mon] Men Sad[d][e]s</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 ps Com[mon] Curb Bridles</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&quot; Snaffles</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Plasn [Plated] &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot; Curb</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 # Rifle Pawder [sic]</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 &quot; Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 &quot; Rifle Flints</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 pc Butcher Knives</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&quot; Cartauch [sic] &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&quot; Inlaid &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&quot; Wilson &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 Brass Kettles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&quot; China Vermillion</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Buntokes [Bunches] Cut Ben [bead] or Aport</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 &quot; Small &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 pc Horse Bells</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>31.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&quot; Tin Cups</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&quot; 1# Size Tin Pans</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>14.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&quot; 2# &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&quot; 3# &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 pc Beaver Traps (Best)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pc Military Feathers</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>[6].00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Price 1</td>
<td>Price 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ostrich Feathers</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Best</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 bunches</td>
<td>Morris Bells</td>
<td>[0].40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Best Pipe Tomahawks</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/2 pc</td>
<td>Leather Sircingly [sircingle]</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Sub Total] $2458.32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Price 1</th>
<th>Price 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 psc</td>
<td>Mna [sic] 3 pt Blankest</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>227.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2 _ [1/2] “</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>237.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2 “</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 _ [1/2] “</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>28.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 “</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 pcs Mantrea [sic] Ribbon No. 6 | 1.30 | 18.20 |

I certify that the above is a current Invoice of the goods intended to be traded at the place and the Tribes within mentioned and that I take as assistant in the Trade William Clatkie [Clatkey], Pierre [or Peter] Lafleur and Clode [Claude] Cartine who are citizens of the United States except Clode [Claude] Cartine who is a foreigner, who I wish Included in my License.
St. Genevieve, October 1827

William Gilliss (Gillis 1827b)
APPENDIX E. Trading Invoice for Louis Vallé at the Junction of Sac and Osage River 1827.

Source: Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, MO, Richard Graham Papers.

Invoice of Merchandise the property of Louis Valle Agent of the Firm of B.L. Valle Co. to be Traded at the Junktion [sic] of the Jocks [Sac] and Osage River with the Delaware, Shawnees and Kickapoos tribes of Indians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To 12 White Ground Calico</td>
<td>336 yds</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0].15</td>
<td>50.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>[0].30</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>[0].23</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Blue Ground &quot;</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>[0].16</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>[0].20</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Striped domestics</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>[0].13</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>[0].16</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Plaids domestics</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>[0].13</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>[0].15</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Brown domestic</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>[0].12</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Bleached &quot;</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>[0].12</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>[0].15</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Red licking [sic]</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>[0].15</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>[0].20</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Russia Sheeting</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Stroud Narrow 16th Cord</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Savate[sic] Indigo Blue Cloth</td>
<td>118 1/2 yds</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>177.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>131.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gray test</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>81.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grass Green</td>
<td>33 1/4</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>59.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Scarlet Cloth</td>
<td>52 1/2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>89.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>67.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>2 1/2 pnds [sic] mma Blankets</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>323.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>292.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>37.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8/4 chins [sic] Shawls</td>
<td>4 pc</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>9 1/2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>76.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Madrass handkfs [sic]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Amt. Carr over</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2165.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Amount bro forward</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2165.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>To 8 Blue India handkfs [sic]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Turkey red</td>
<td>8 1/2 ps</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>14.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Small Blue</td>
<td>6 1/2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

749
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price 1</th>
<th>Price 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sky Blue &quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double trigger Rifles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>168.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single &quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>144.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 [200] Rifle flints [@0.0175 each]</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powder</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>[0].30</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>[0].05</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thread awls and needles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men Saddles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com barle [sic] Bridles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Snuffler [sic]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 Plated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plated Stirrups</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinyahs [sic]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlaid D. Knives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartouchy [sic]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Wilsons</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horn handled</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China vermillion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass Kettles</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>[0].06</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundles Cut Glass Beeds [sic]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>[0].30</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price</td>
<td>Total Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lees Beeds [sic] &amp; white/</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Ostrich feathers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sml. Military feathers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$8.50</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 bunches Mirris [sic] Bells</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$0.40</td>
<td>$4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heome [sic] Bells</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tincups [sic]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver traps</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$87.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Tin pans</td>
<td>6 doz.</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>$14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Size</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td>$14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Size</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
<td>$16.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Tommahawks [sic]</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribbon No. 6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>$15.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$0.80</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Total] $3438.30

I certify that the above is a correct Invoice of the Goods intended to be Traded at the place and the tribes within mentioned and that I take to assist in the trade.

[C]asear Renconeau, Basile Boye[r] [Basil Boyer (1808-1860)][,] M. Suebrile and 751
[...] Boid [Boyd] who are citizens of the United States & wish them included in my License.

St[e]. Genevieve

October 1827

L. Valle
APPENDIX F. Deaths Reported in 1825-1826 Conflicts, based on Primary Sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sesocum, William Anderson's son</td>
<td>August or early September 1825, &quot;Roasting Ear Time&quot;</td>
<td>Returning from Red River (Oklahoma or Arkansas)</td>
<td>Bow and arrow</td>
<td>Osages Sesocum in the company of ten Delawares</td>
<td>Anderson 1826a, 1826b, 1826c, 1826d; Anderson and Killbuck 1826; Campbell 1825e; Chouteau 1826; Clark 1826c; Graham 1826b, 1826c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven Cherokees, One Delaware boy, and One Shawnee</td>
<td>Fall 1825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Osages As reported by Cherokee chief</td>
<td>Campbell 1826a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Delaware boy</td>
<td>November 1825</td>
<td>Between Canadian Fork and Red River Oklahoma</td>
<td>Shot with arrows</td>
<td>Osages Between 20 and 26 horses stolen</td>
<td>Anderson 1826c, 1826d; Anderson and Killbuck 1826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Osages of Claremore's band</td>
<td>December 1825</td>
<td>Between Canadian Fork and Red River Oklahoma</td>
<td>Kickapoos and Delawares</td>
<td>Retaliation killings. Killing took place within 3 miles of Dela-</td>
<td>Anderson 1826c, 1826d; Chouteau 1826; Clark 1826c; Graham 1826b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Delaware woman, Two Delaware men, and a 2-year-old boy</td>
<td>January and February 1826, “Sugar Making Time”</td>
<td>Osages returning from war with Pawnees</td>
<td>One man escaped. Eight horses stolen, 600 furs destroyed</td>
<td>Anderson 1826c, 1826d; Clark 1826c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware George Whiteeyes and his father George Bullet, One Delaware woman, and two Delaware boys</td>
<td>February or March 1826</td>
<td>Red River Oklahoma</td>
<td>Osages</td>
<td>Campbell 1826a; Clark 1826c; Menard 1826a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown number of Comanches in a hunting party. Comanches may actually be Pawnees.</td>
<td>Early March 1826</td>
<td>Osages</td>
<td>Osages retrieved scalps from the Comanches/Pawnees thought to be Delaware and/or Kickapoo</td>
<td>Chouteau 1826; Graham 1826b; Graham 1826c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Osages of White Hair’s band</td>
<td>10 March 1826</td>
<td>Pomme de Terre River (Missouri)</td>
<td>Shawnnees, Delawares, or Kickapoo</td>
<td>Chouteau 1826; Clark 1826c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Delawares</td>
<td>13 March 1826</td>
<td>Red River, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Osages</td>
<td>An Express rider may have also been killed</td>
<td>Anderson 1826b; Clark 1826c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Delaware man, One Delaware woman, 2 girls, and a 1-year-old child*</td>
<td>19 March 1826</td>
<td>Roubidoux Fork of the Gasconade River, Missouri</td>
<td>Bodies mangled and child thrown in the fire</td>
<td>Fifty Osages or 30 Osages</td>
<td>Anderson 1826c, 1826d; Campbell 1826c; Clark 1826c; Graham 1826b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Osages of Claremore's band</td>
<td>24 March 1826</td>
<td>Red River, Oklahoma</td>
<td>By Tomahawk</td>
<td>Ten Kickapoo and Ten Delawares</td>
<td>Arbuckle 1826b; Campbell 1826a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Delaware, Joe Elliot</td>
<td>27 March 1826</td>
<td>Near the Delaware Village, Missouri</td>
<td>Scalded</td>
<td>Eight more Delawares of his camp are missing, son of Pooshies wounded</td>
<td>Anderson 1826b; Clark 1826c; Graham 1826c; Menard 1826a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstated number of Delawares</td>
<td>Late March 1826</td>
<td>Gasconade River, 20 miles this side</td>
<td>Osages</td>
<td>The sawmill was also &quot;killed&quot;</td>
<td>Anderson and Killbuck 1826, Campbell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the Sawmills&quot; (Missouri)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1826b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Osage of Claremore's band</td>
<td>28 March 1826 or April 1826</td>
<td>Bean's Salt Works on the Illinois Fork of the Arkansas River (Arkansas)</td>
<td>A party of Delawares returning from Red River</td>
<td>Anderson 1826c, 1826d; Arbuckle 1826b; Campbell 1826c; Chouteau 1826; Clark 1826c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Americans</td>
<td>11 May 1826</td>
<td>Red River Oklahoma</td>
<td>Osages</td>
<td>Arbuckle 1826b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstated number of Kickapoos</td>
<td>Between August 1825 and June 1826</td>
<td>Osages</td>
<td>Kickapoos have not returned from their hunt</td>
<td>Clark 1826c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Delawares and Kickapoos</td>
<td></td>
<td>Osages</td>
<td>Graham 1826c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* May indicate the same event
APPENDIX G. An Index of all Metal Detector Finds at 23CN1 and 23CN455 during the 2003-2004 Field Seasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23CN1</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Projectile point, expanding stem fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Projectile point, contracting stem fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Biface or fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Cone, hollow or fragment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Buckle, rectangular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Jaw harp or fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Flintlock rifle spring</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Incised ornament fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Silver plated</td>
<td>Button with laurel and fleur-de-lis on front, Best Plated on reverse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Knife handle, Cartouche style filigree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Cone, tinkling</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Unidentified scrap</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Button with circles and Imperial London stamped on back</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Ornament, triangular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Fragment, waste, pooled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle fragment, dark green translucent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feaunal</td>
<td>Freshwater mussel shell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Biface or fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Projectile point or knife fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Sandstone cobble</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Unidentified scrap</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Bolt, square-headed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Wire or wire nail fragment</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Hoop/ring fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Pipe with screw-on cap</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Square nail or fragment</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Barbed wire fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Folding knife</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Square spike</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Stirrup fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Bottle cap</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Buckle, rectangular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Flintlock gun sear</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Tab with expanding stem, patented on one side</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Cone, tinkling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Minie ball</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Ball/Shot</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Unidentified fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle fragment, dark green translucent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN1, 2005 Area B</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Burned limestone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td>Projectile point, corner-notch fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Machinery fragment, figure-eight shaped</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Ladle/History fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Snaffle bit fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Eyebolt fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Square nail or fragment</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Square stock fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Cone, hollow or fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Bracket fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Knife blade fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Scissor blade fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>File with tang fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Hook, J-shaped</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Wire or wire nail fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Unidentified scrap</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Button, stamped eagle inside circle with seven stars outside circle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Pearlware, blue transfer print, rim sherd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Whiteware, undecorated sherd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Ball/Shot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Unidentified scrap</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle fragment, brown, transparent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN 2005 Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Staple, ¼ inch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Horse shoe fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Kettle fragment with leg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Jaw harp fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Farm machinery fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Knife blade fragment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Screw, wood</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Square nail or fragment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Wire or wire nail fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Unidentified scrap</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Ball</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Cone, tinkling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Unidentified scrap</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Unidentified scrap</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CN 2005 Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Bridle bit fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455 SW side</td>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Square nail or fragment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Wire or wire nail fragment</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Square spike or fragment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Square stock with hook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Lock plate fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Farm machinery fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Knife blade and tang</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Plow fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Bracket, square fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Lock tumbler fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Barrel key fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Barrel tang fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Cast vessel/kettle fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Ferrous</td>
<td>Unidentified scrap</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Unidentified scrap</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Projectile point, triangular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Hinge, semi-circular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper/Cuprous</td>
<td>Unidentified scrap</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Ball/Shot</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AA #</th>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Suite</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>d13C</th>
<th>14C age BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA86515</td>
<td>23CN1FII-I</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>-25.2</td>
<td>0.8969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reported by Mitzi DeMartino [mailto:mitzi@physics.arizona.edu]
## APPENDIX I. Calibrated AMS Date for Feature 11 Using CALIB 6.0.0.

RADIOCARBON CALIBRATION PROGRAM*

CALIB REV6.0.0

Copyright 1986-2010 M Stuiver and PJ Reimer

*To be used in conjunction with:


Annotated results (text) - -

Export file - c14res.csv

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab Code</th>
<th>Sample Description (80 chars max)</th>
<th>Radiocarbon Age BP</th>
<th>Calibration data set: intcal09.14c</th>
<th>% area enclosed</th>
<th>cal BP age ranges</th>
<th>relative area under probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23CN1</td>
<td></td>
<td>874 +/- 39</td>
<td>intcal09.14c</td>
<td>95.4 (2 sigma)</td>
<td>698 - 834</td>
<td>0.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reimer et al. 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>841 - 909</td>
<td>0.276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References for calibration datasets:

PJ Reimer, MGL Baillie, E Bard, A Bayliss, JW Beck, PG Blackwell, C Bronk
Ramsey, CE Buck, GS Burr, RL Edwards, M Friedrich, PM Grootes, TP

762

Comments:

* This standard deviation (error) includes a lab error multiplier.

** 1 sigma = square root of (sample std. dev.^2 + curve std. dev.^2)

** 2 sigma = 2 * square root of (sample std. dev.^2 + curve std. dev.^2) where ^2 = quantity squared.

[ ] = calibrated range impinges on end of calibration data set

0* represents a "negative" age BP

1955* or 1960* denote influence of nuclear testing C-14

NOTE: Cal ages and ranges are rounded to the nearest year which may be too precise in many instances. Users are advised to round results to the nearest 10 yr for samples with standard deviation in the radiocarbon age greater than 50 yr.
Sample ID: 874+/-39
Cal curve: intcal09.14c
2 sigma
APPENDIX J. Raw Data of MiniRes Resistivity Survey in 23CN1 Area B

Transect A.

Stations are listed in order from South to North. Each station is 1 m apart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>On High</th>
<th>On Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station A5</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=23.1</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=9.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=5.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=3.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A4</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=25.2</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=9.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=4.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=2.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A3</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=27.1</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=9.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=5.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=2.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A2</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=30.1</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=10.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=5.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=2.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A1</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=23.1</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=9.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=4.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=2.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A6</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=36.6</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=12.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=5.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=3.3356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A7</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=47.1</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=15.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=6.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=3.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A8</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=38.2</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A9</td>
<td>( a = 0.25 \text{m} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 2 )</td>
<td>( r = 42.1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 3 )</td>
<td>( r = 13.640 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 4 )</td>
<td>( r = 6.229 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 5 )</td>
<td>( r = 3.360 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A10</td>
<td>( a = 0.25 \text{m} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 2 )</td>
<td>( r = 45.4 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 3 )</td>
<td>( r = 15.470 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 4 )</td>
<td>( r = 7.475 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 5 )</td>
<td>( r = 4.340 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A11</td>
<td>( a = 0.25 \text{m} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 2 )</td>
<td>( r = 31.2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 3 )</td>
<td>( r = 12.706 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 4 )</td>
<td>( r = 6.159 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 5 )</td>
<td>( r = 3.535 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A12</td>
<td>( a = 0.25 \text{m} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 2 )</td>
<td>( r = 39.1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 3 )</td>
<td>( r = 14.546 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 4 )</td>
<td>( r = 6.992 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 5 )</td>
<td>( r = 4.182 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A13</td>
<td>( a = 0.25 \text{m} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 2 )</td>
<td>( r = 46.6 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 3 )</td>
<td>( r = 16.318 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 4 )</td>
<td>( r = 8.361 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 5 )</td>
<td>( r = 5.128 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A14</td>
<td>( a = 0.25 \text{m} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 2 )</td>
<td>( r = 42.4 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 3 )</td>
<td>( r = 16.762 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 4 )</td>
<td>( r = 8.383 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 5 )</td>
<td>( r = 5.108 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A15</td>
<td>( a = 0.25 \text{m} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 2 )</td>
<td>( r = 52.5 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 3 )</td>
<td>( r = 17.710 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 4 )</td>
<td>( r = 8.766 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 5 )</td>
<td>( r = 4.773 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A16</td>
<td>( a = 0.25 \text{m} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 2 )</td>
<td>( r = 46.9 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 3 )</td>
<td>( r = 18.021 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 4 )</td>
<td>( r = 8.423 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 5 )</td>
<td>( r = 4.605 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
<td>a (m)</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A20</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A26</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=57.4</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=21.4</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=10.513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=6.117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A27</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=42.5</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=16.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=7.980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=4.756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A28</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=53.6</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=23.4</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=11.271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=6.908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A29</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=55.7</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=22.4</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=11.174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=6.465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A30</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=52.2</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=20.6</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=9.939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=5.556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A31</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=28.7</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=11.447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=5.982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=3.718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A32</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=29.7</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=11.845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=5.856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=3.783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A33</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=33.5</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=12.580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=6.586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=4.431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A34</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=34.5</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=13.778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=7.294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=4.875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A35</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=34.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=13.768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=7.843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=5.204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A36</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=48.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=20.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=10.760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=7.266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station A37</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=41.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=17.761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=10.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=6.568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transect B**

Stations are listed in order from South to North. Each station is 1 m apart.

Transect B is 1 m west and runs parallel to Transect A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station B1</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=14.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=9.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=6.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B2</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=14.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=8.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=6.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B3</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=14.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=7.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=5.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B4</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=13.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=7.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=5.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B5</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B6</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B7</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B8</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B9</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B10</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B11</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B12</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B13</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B15</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B16</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B17</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B18</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B19</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B20</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B21</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B22</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=13.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=6.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=3.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B24</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=12.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=6.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=3.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B25</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=12.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=5.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=3.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B26</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=15.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=66.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=3.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B27</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=14.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=6.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=3.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B28</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=15.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=7.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=4.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B29</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=18.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=8.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=4.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B30</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=13.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=6.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=3.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station B31</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=16.822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transect C**

Stations are listed in order from South to North. Each station is 1 m apart.

Transect B is 1 m west and runs parallel to Transect B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station C1</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=31.5</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=14.330</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=8.907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=6.055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=36.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=17.051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=10.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=7.175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station C3 a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=31.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=13.447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=7.905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=5.651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station C4 a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=26.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=10.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=6.619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=4.552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station C5 a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=12.767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=7.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=4.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station C6 a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=29.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=12.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=7.153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=4.807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station C7 a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=31.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=11.693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=6.469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=4.348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station C8 a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=22.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=9.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=5.253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=3.397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station C9 a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=21.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=9.203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=4.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=3.411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station C10 a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=20.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=7.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=4.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
<td>a (m)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>6.261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>3.704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>31.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>11.441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>5.929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>3.347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>12.748</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>3.468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>13.906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>6.177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>3.929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>13.321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>7.103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>4.253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>13.116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>6.435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>3.848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C26</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>13.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>6.380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>3.656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C27</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>14.390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>6.775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>3.618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>15.366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>6.775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>3.618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
<td>a (m)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C31</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C33</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C34</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C36</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C37</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transect D

Stations are listed in order from South to North. Each station is 1 m apart.

Transect D is 5 m east and runs parallel to Transect A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station D1</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=43.5</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=15.048</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=8.111</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=4.502</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station D2</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=37.9</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=14.919</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=7.535</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=4.871</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station D3</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=35.9</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=14.686</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=8.050</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=4.582</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station D4</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=38.5</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=14.777</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=6.895</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=4.576</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station D5</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=29.4</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=12.408</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=6.443</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=4.229</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station D6</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=38.1</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=14.054</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=7.012</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=4.539</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station D7</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=34.5</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=13.915</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
<td>a (m)</td>
<td>n=2 r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Station D17**  
\( a = 0.25 \text{m} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Station D18**  
\( a = 0.25 \text{m} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Station D19**  
\( a = 0.25 \text{m} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Station D20**  
\( a = 0.25 \text{m} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Station D21**  
\( a = 0.25 \text{m} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Station D22**  
\( a = 0.25 \text{m} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Station D23**  
\( a = 0.25 \text{m} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Station D24**  
\( a = 0.25 \text{m} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Station D25**  
\( a = 0.25 \text{m} \)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>a (m)</th>
<th>n=2</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>n=3</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>n=4</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>n=5</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D26</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>r=40.8</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=18.439</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=7.637</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=4.342</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D27</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>r=42.1</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=16.212</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=7.515</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=4.179</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D28</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>r=38.0</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=16.342</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=6.982</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=4.076</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>r=44.6</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=17.861</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=8.400</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=4.530</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>r=32.9</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=15.665</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=6.498</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=3.712</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D31</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>r=46.6</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=20.6</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=9.375</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=5.365</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>r=48.8</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=17.453</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=7.741</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=4.082</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D33</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>r=53.3</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=19.700</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=9.327</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td>r=4.820</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station D34</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=56.5</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=23.0</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=10.499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
<td>r=5.760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station D35</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=106.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station D36</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station D37</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station D38</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transect E**

Stations are listed in order from South to North. Each station is 1 m apart.

Transect E is 7 m east and runs parallel to Transect D. Note: All values are negative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station E1</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station E2</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>a=0.25m</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-41.6</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=-12.0</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=-5.756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=-3.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station E4</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-34.6</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=-12.562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=-5.328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=-3.166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station E5</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-31.8</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=-11.622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=-5.290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=-2.940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station E6</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-24.9</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=-9.176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=-4.381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=-2.426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station E7</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-34.9</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=-10.756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=-5.183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=-2.832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station E8</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-37.3</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=-12.357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=-6.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=-3.608</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station E9</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-36.6</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=-13.077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=-5.724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=-3.022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station E10</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-39.7</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=-12.551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=-5.852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=-3.507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station E11</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-32.3</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=-9.135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=-4.890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>-2.808</td>
<td>-35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>-31.9</td>
<td>-30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>-38.9</td>
<td>-30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>-38.9</td>
<td>-34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>-23.9</td>
<td>-16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>-21.6</td>
<td>-21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>-35.5</td>
<td>-35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>-35.5</td>
<td>-35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station F1</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=-15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=-7.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=-3.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station F2</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=-12.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=-7.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=-3.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station F3</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=-16.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=-8.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=-4.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station F4</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=-16.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=-7.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=-4.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station F5</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=-17.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=-7.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>r=-3.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station F6</td>
<td>a=0.25m</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>r=-51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>r=-17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>r=-7.313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transect F

Stations are listed in order from South to North. Each station is 1 m apart.

Transect F is 5 m east and runs parallel to Transect E. Note: All values are negative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>n=2</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>n=3</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>n=4</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>n=5</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>-52.0</td>
<td>19.819</td>
<td>-9.226</td>
<td>5.071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>-48.4</td>
<td>16.228</td>
<td>-7.127</td>
<td>3.676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>-38.8</td>
<td>11.643</td>
<td>-5.289</td>
<td>3.341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>0.25m</td>
<td>-43.5</td>
<td>13.255</td>
<td>-6.457</td>
<td>3.873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This report will detail the artifact conservation work performed on select iron artifacts from Delaware Town (23CN1) in Christian County, Missouri excavated in 2003-2004. Conservation work was performed by Melissa A. Eaton at the Center for Archaeological Research at Missouri State University in Springfield, Missouri with financial assistance from the Ozarks Chapter of the Missouri Archaeological Society. Additional materials were graciously donated by the Missouri State University Chemistry Supply Room and Chemical Supply company in Springfield, Missouri.

The history of the conservation of antiquities dates to before 1550 AD when the aim was the restoration of function often involving the replacement of materials, which implied that the history of the artifact held no special importance (Curt Moyer 2003, pers. comm.). This practice culminated in the 1830s when artwork was being cleaned to restore aesthetic qualities, known as the "flaying controversy" (Curt Moyer 2003, pers. comm.). By 1895, there was a large shift towards "scientific conservation", which relies on an interest in information rather than in restoration of function or aesthetics (Curt Moyer 2003, pers. comm.). Conservation in archaeology follows two main goals: 1) to elucidate understanding about artifacts, technology, and use, and 2) use principles of chemistry in order to preserve artifacts from further deterioration (Curt Moyer 2003, pers. comm.).
Conservation today is guided by four basic principles, which will be further explained in the context of Delaware Town (23CN1) artifacts:

1) Less is More.
   
   The physical or chemical intervention should be the least invasive and subtle. This is why more destructive measures such as electrolysis and harsher mechanical and chemical tools were not used on these artifacts. First of all, most of the artifacts were small and/or delicate in nature and may have suffered more damage than necessary by more invasive procedures.

2) Make it Reversible.
   
   It is always advantageous to ensure that what is done can be easily undone in case of retreatment or mistakes. Because retreatment of iron artifacts is inevitable due to the fact that there is no method to completely remove the destructive chlorides, it is important to be able to take off the protective coating without the need to abrasive measures. As such, Acryloid/Paraloid B-72 is soluble in toluene and can be removed easily.

3) Every Material Addition should be Visible as such.
   
   In order to prevent fraudulent claims, conservators and museums have a standard of “visible repair” so that all additions, replacements, or repairs can be visible as such at the distance of a few feet. Pieces of iron artifacts that were glued back together in the Delaware Town (23CN1) collection are visible as such and the repairs are also reversible.

4) Record and Publish a Record of Conservation
It is important for museum records, curators, and future conservators to have a record of methods used on conserved artifacts in the case of posterity as well as when the items require retreatment in the future. A draft report of the conservation work performed was filed with the Center for Archaeological Research in Springfield, Missouri.

The steps of the conservation process utilized with the artifacts from the Delaware Town (23CN1) site involved an initial examination and documentation to assess the artifact's condition. Then, a treatment proposal with chemical and equipment list was filed with the Center for Archaeological Research. As the conservation process occurred, detailed records on each artifact listed what methods and instruments were used during every treatment session. Both cleaning and physical/chemical stabilization of artifacts occurred during the treatment process.

Stabilization treatments vary depending on the material and manner of decomposition. For example, if dealing with a composite artifact with two metal types (e.g., an iron and silver gilded button), treatment must be geared in accordance with the most stable metal (silver, in this case). Artifacts found in waterlogged and dry sites require different treatments. In the case of the Delaware Town (23CN1) site located inland on a river terrace, the iron artifacts suffered from minimal chloride infiltration.

As in the case of all iron artifacts, chemical stabilization is the most important step in the conservation of this type. Chlorides aggressively attack iron
ions and cause oxidation residues (rust) to deform and cause pits in the original metal (robbing archaeologist of important information about these artifacts) and depositing residues on top of transformed surfaces. During conservation, the goal is to remove harmful species, such as chlorides deposited from saltwater, ground water, residues on hands, et cetera. Also, the addition of beneficial species can be introduced, like inhibitors. Physical stabilization aims for increasing the strength or structure of artifacts. In the case of Delaware Town (23CN1) artifacts, a consolidant was applied to the outside surfaces to hold the artifact together using friction and to also act as a protective coating from further chemical exposure.

Iron is a relatively stable element, a metal, which has been historically useful since prehistory. All metals are mixed with nonmetals to form a semi-stable ionic bond (metals lose electrons and non-metals gain that electron and they form a bond). Historically useful metals are often very chemically reactive enough to separate metal and non-metal constituents (i.e. unstable to a point, prone to rust or corrode), but stable enough to have a serviceable life. Iron is one of the most unstable of historically useful metals (with the exception of zinc, which is rarely used outside of alloying or use as an anode). Metals have a combination of hardness and flexibility and can be restructured without breaking, which is why they are so useful in industrial technology.

Some metals, like zinc and copper, form a stable and impermeable patina corrosion layer that acts as a protective barrier from the environment and halts chemical reactions. In iron, the "patina" that forms is known as rust, which is
thick, porous, and provides no protection whatsoever. In fact, the destructive chlorides (Cl) in iron recycle corrosion processes by removing iron (Fe ions) from the artifact, depositing it with an hydroxide compound (OH or oxidation) on the surface and the chloride detaches and goes back into the iron artifact for more.

Chloride removal in other metals (copper for example) can be difficult and time consuming. However, in iron, most of the chlorides are water soluble. One common method for removing chlorides involves the use of passive soaking. Salt-free water must be used to ensure that the chlorides leave the artifact via osmosis (the principle that ions in an area of high chloride concentration will move to an area of low concentration). This method requires frequent changing of the water to ensure the osmosis will not reverse back into the artifact and continue the outward flow of chlorides into the de-ionized water. Chlorides levels must be measured weekly and can be done economically with a simple chloride titration test kit. Since osmosis will never completely rid the artifact of all chlorides, a certain level of decontamination has been agreed upon (approximately 8 parts per million or ppm). The continued presence of chlorides in the artifact post conservation will leave it at risk to extremely slow corrosion processes, which can be slowed further by removing exposure to moisture, oxygen, and further chloride contamination through a protective consolidant. In this case, the consolidant is a polymer, Acryloid/Paraloid B-72 (Ethylmethacrolate), which forms a thin, continuous, non-yellowing adherent plastic to the surface of the metal.
After cleaning, stabilization, and consolidation, proper storage conditions are important to slow any further action by remaining chlorides. Namely, a low relative humidity (<15%) environment is necessary because water fuels many oxidizing reactions. High temperatures should be avoided because heat speeds up chemical reactions. Furthermore, metals should not be permitted to come in contact with other metal objects because this interaction will set up a galvanic cell where the metal items will begin transferring electrons and fostering instability and corrosion.

The following is a record of the conservation techniques used on two batches of iron artifacts treated in Spring 2005 at the Center for Archaeological Research in Springfield, Missouri. There were 24 iron artifacts treated from the 2004 field school and eight iron objects treated from the 2003 field school.
Object 1279-1:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 Feature 2 PP74
Description: iron double pot hook, 155.3 mm in length, 8.3 mm in diameter
Treatment Record of 1279-1
2/16/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a dental pick, and razor blade. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.
2/17/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 22-48ppm. Did not change water bath.
3/16/2005 Re-label and re-bag.

Object 1279-2:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 Feature 2 PP84
Description: iron knife with tang, 41.3 mm wide at blade, 26.5 mm wide at handle
Treatment Record of 1279-2
2/16/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a dental pick, and razor blade. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.
2/17/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Did not change water bath.


3/16/2005 Re-label and re-bag.

Object 1279-3:

Provenience: 1279 23CN1 Feature 2 PP102

Description: iron cone, open on both ends, overlapping seam, 16.2 mm diameter, 43.2 mm length

Treatment Record of 1279-3

2/16/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a dental pick, and razor blade. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

2/17/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Did not change water bath.


3/16/2005 Re-label and re-bag.
Object 1279-4:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 Feature 2 PP73
Description: iron square nail, Type 2 nail, 29.8 mm length, 4.2 mm width
Treatment Record of 1279-4
2/16/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a dental pick, and razor blade. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.
2/17/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Did not change water bath.
3/16/2005 Re-label and re-bag.

Object 1279-5:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 Feature 2-Middle Water Screen
Description: iron square nail/wire, 5.2 mm width
Treatment Record of 1279-5
2/16/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a dental pick, and razor blade. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.
2/17/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Did not change water bath.


3/16/2005 Re-label and re-bag.

Object 1279-6:

Provenience: 1279 23CN1 Column 3 – TU 19, 22, 21, 28, 0-25 cm bs

Description: iron nail, Type 5, 61.5 mm length, 4.7 mm width, 8.4 diameter at head

Treatment Record of 1279-6

3/12/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

3/16/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 56ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.


3/30/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/6/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.


Object 1279-7:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 TU 16 level 3 bag 1, 20-25 cm bs
Description: iron knife blade with cuprous bolster, 94.3 mm length, 17.1 mm width
Treatment Record of 1279-7
3/12/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.
3/16/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 24ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.
3/30/2005 Chloride test 10 ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.
4/6/2005 Chloride test 8 ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.

Object 1279-8:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 Feature 2 PP63
Description: iron knife handle, 98.2 mm length, 18.3 mm width
Treatment Record of 1279-8
3/12/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

3/16/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 24ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.


3/30/2005 Chloride test 10ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/6/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.


Object 1279-9:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 PP4
Description: iron ring, 67.2 mm diameter

Treatment Record of 1279-9

3/12/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

3/16/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 28ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.


3/30/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.
4/6/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.


Object 1279-10:

Provenience: 1279 23CN1 PP28-1, TU 28, 60 cm N, 34 cm W, 23 cm bs

Description: iron blade, 97.3 mm length, 29.0 mm width

Treatment Record of 1279-10

3/12/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

3/16/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 28ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.


3/30/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/6/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.


Object 1279-11:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 MD439

Description: iron folding knife, 89.8 mm length, 33.4 mm width

Treatment Record of 1279-11

3/12/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

3/16/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 28ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.


3/30/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/6/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.


Object 1279-12:

Provenience: 1279 23CN1 Feature 2 PP22

Description: iron scissors, one blade is broken

Treatment Record of 1279-12

3/12/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

3/16/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 28ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

3/30/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/6/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.


Object 1279-13:

Provenience: 1279 23CN1 Feature 2 PP55

Description: iron scissors, 161.3 mm length, 63.7 width at handles, 17.1 mm length at blades

Treatment Record of 1279-13

3/12/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

3/16/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 28ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.


3/30/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/6/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.
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Object 1279-14:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 Feature 2 PP47
Description: iron folding knife, 6 rivets in handle

Treatment Record of 1279-14
3/12/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.
3/16/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 56ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.
3/30/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.
4/6/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.

Object 1279-15:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 Feature 2-Mid
Description: iron cone and tumbler, 49.8 mm length, 11.1 mm diameter at base

Treatment Record of 1279-15
4/8/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

4/13/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/20/2005 Chloride test 7ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/27/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.

5/2/2005: Mechanically cleaned using wire brush. Coat three times with 10% Acryloid/Paraloid B-72/Toluene solution. Air dry.


Object 1279-16:

Provenience: 1279 23CN1 Feature 2 PP45

Description: iron scrap, tin-plated

Treatment Record of 1279-16

4/8/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

4/13/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/20/2005 Chloride test 7ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/27/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.
5/2/2005: Mechanically cleaned using wire brush. Coat three times with 10% Acryloid/Paraloid B-72/Toluene solution. Air dry.


Object 1279-17:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 Feature 2 PP111
Description: iron horseshoe fragment, 20.9 mm width

Treatment Record of 1279-17
4/8/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.
4/13/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.
4/20/2005 Chloride test 7ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.
4/27/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.
5/2/2005: Mechanically cleaned using wire brush. Coat three times with 10% Acryloid/Paraloid B-72/Toluene solution. Air dry.

Object 1279-18:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 MD 483
Description: iron square nail, thick, Type 3, 44.1 mm length, 5.8 mm width, 11.1mm width at head
Treatment Record of 1279-18

4/8/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

4/13/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/20/2005 Chloride test 7ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/27/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.

5/2/2005: Mechanically cleaned using wire brush. Coat three times with 10% Acryloid/Paraloid B-72/Toluene solution. Air dry.


Object 1264-1:

Provenience: 1264 23CN1 MD 142

Description: iron gun/rifle spring, 56.7 mm width

Treatment Record of 1264-1

4/8/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

4/13/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/20/2005 Chloride test 7ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/27/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.
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5/2/2005: Mechanically cleaned using wire brush. Coat three times with 10% Acryloid/Paraloid B-72/Toluene solution. Air dry.


Object 1279-19:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 MD 447
Description: iron square nail, long, Type 7, 45.6 mm length, 4.1 mm width, 9.4 mm width at head

Treatment Record of 1279-19
4/8/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.
4/13/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.
4/20/2005 Chloride test 7ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.
4/27/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.
5/2/2005: Mechanically cleaned using wire brush. Coat three times with 10% Acryloid/Paraloid B-72/Toluene solution. Air dry.

Object 1264-2:
Provenience: 1264 23CN1 MD 196
Description: iron cone, long, flat bottom, 63.7 mm length
Treatment Record of 1264-2

4/8/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

4/13/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/20/2005 Chloride test 7ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/27/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.

5/2/2005: Mechanically cleaned using wire brush. Coat three times with 10% Acryloid/Paraloid B-72/Toluene solution. Air dry.


Object 1279-20:

Provenience: 1279 23CN1 Feature 2 NWST-1

Description: iron cone and tumbler, 40.5 mm length, 8.1 mm width at base

Treatment Record of 1279-20

4/8/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

4/13/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/20/2005 Chloride test 7ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/27/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.
5/2/2005: Mechanically cleaned using wire brush. Coat three times with 10% Acryloid/Paraloid B-72/Toluene solution. Air dry.

Object 1264-3:
Provenience: 1264 23CN1 Feature 2 PP13
Description: iron cone, short, 29.5 mm length
Treatment Record of 1264-3
4/8/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.
4/13/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.
4/20/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.
4/27/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.
5/2/2005: Mechanically cleaned using wire brush. Coat three times with 10% Acryloid/Paraloid B-72/Toluene solution. Air dry.

Object 1264-4:
Provenience: 1264 23CN1 MD 134
Description: iron cone, long, 54.8 mm length
Treatment Record of 1264-4
4/8/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

4/13/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/20/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/27/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.

5/2/2005: Mechanically cleaned using wire brush. Coat three times with 10% Acrylloid/Paraloid B-72/Toluene solution. Air dry.


Object 1279-21:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 Feature 2 NWST-1
Description: iron frizzen or J-hook, 6.1 mm width, 48.8 mm length

Treatment Record of 1279-21

4/8/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

4/13/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/20/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/27/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.
5/2/2005: Mechanically cleaned using wire brush. Coat three times with 10% Acryloid/Paraloid B-72/Toluene solution. Air dry.


Object 1279-22:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 TU 30 Level 3 Bag 1, 20-25 cm bs
Description: iron square nail, bent, Type 2, 46.5 mm length, 5.3 mm width

Treatment Record of 1279-22
4/8/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.
4/13/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 24ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.
4/20/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.
4/27/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.
5/2/2005: Mechanically cleaned using wire brush. Coat three times with 10% Acryloid/Paraloid B-72/Toluene solution. Air dry.

Object 1264-5:
Provenience: 1264 23CN1 Feature 2 PP6
Description: iron cone, 48.7 mm length

Treatment Record of 1264-5
4/8/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

4/13/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 24ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/20/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/27/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.

5/2/2005: Mechanically cleaned using wire brush. Coat three times with 10% Acryloid/Paraloid B-72/Toluene solution. Air dry.


Object 1279-23:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 MD 441
Description: iron square nail, long, Type 2, 54.1 mm length, 5.1 mm width, 9.4 mm width at head

Treatment Record of 1279-23

4/8/2005 Mechanically cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water, a wire brush. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

4/13/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 24ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/20/2005 Chloride test 8ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

4/27/2005 Chloride test 6ppm. Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.
5/2/2005: Mechanically cleaned using wire brush. Coat three times with 10% Acryloid/Paraloid B-72/Toluene solution. Air dry.


Object 1264-6:
Provenience: 1264 23CN1 TU 15 Feature 2 35-45cm bd
Description: iron cone/tube in 2 pieces, 50.6 mm length

Treatment Record of 1264-6

5/6/2005 Cleared artifact with double de-ionized water. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

5/16/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 10ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.


6/6/2005 Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.


6/10/2005 Re-label and re-bag.

Object 1279-24:
Provenience: 1279 23CN1 TU 41 level 1&2 Bag 2, 0-20 cm bs
Description: iron square nail, Type 3, 34.3 mm length, 4.0 mm width, 9.6 mm width at head

Treatment Record of 1279-24
5/6/2005 Cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

5/16/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 10ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.


6/6/2005 Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.


6/10/2005 Re-label and re-bag.

Object 1264-7:

Provenience: 1264 23CN1 MD 33

Description: iron jaw harp, 28.6 mm width

Treatment Record of 1264-7

5/6/2005 Cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

5/16/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.


6/6/2005 Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.


6/10/2005 Re-label and re-bag.
Object 1264-8:

Provenience: 1264 23CN1 MC 114

Description: iron jaw harp, broken

Treatment Record of 1264-8

5/6/2005 Cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

5/16/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.


6/6/2005 Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.


6/10/2005 Re-label and re-bag.

Object 1264-8:

Provenience: 1264 23CN1 Feature 2 (18cmbd) PP2

Description: iron cone, 46.0 mm length

Treatment Record of 1264-8

5/6/2005 Cleaned artifact with double de-ionized water. Soaked in a double de-ionized water bath.

5/16/2005 Test the bath water for chlorides using a LaMott titration system with 15mL sample. Measured at 16ppm. Changed double de-ionized water bath.

6/6/2005 Remove from water and soak in a bath of 80% anhydrous acetone.


6/10/2005 Re-label and re-bag.

The author would like to extend many thanks to Professor Curt Moyer at the College of William and Mary for the training in archaeological conservation methods in his Archaeological Conservation graduate course and to Professor Brian High with Missouri State University for providing de-ionized water, toluene, and mixing anhydrous acetone used in this project.
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