2005

Westward expansion, John Tipton, and the emergence of the American Midwest 1800-1839

Ginette M. Aley
Iowa State University

Westward expansion, John Tipton, and the emergence of the American Midwest, 1800-1839

by

Ginette M. Aley

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Agricultural History and Rural Studies

Program of Study Committee:
R. Douglas Hurt, Co-Major Professor
Andrejs Plakans, Co-Major Professor
Hamilton Cravens
George McJimsey
James Andrews

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2005

Graduate College
Iowa State University

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation of

Ginette M. Aley

has met the dissertation requirements of Iowa State University

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Committee Member

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Committee Member

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Committee Member

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Co-Major Professor

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Co-Major Professor

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Program

DEDICATION

To my children, Amanda and Jonathan, the memory of my parents,
and the Friendship that sustained me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was as much a window onto my life as it was a labor of love. Not all of it was pleasant nor done under the most conducive of circumstances, but my excitement and belief in its merits spirited me on toward its completion. I have received support and recognition at various stages and in a number of ways, and I would like to note these here. I did the bulk of my research at the Indiana State Library where the vast Tipton Papers are maintained. I cannot say enough about the professional courtesies extended to me there. A considerable amount of preliminary work was done at the Indiana Historical Society. Its facilities are impressive, and its staff was always attentive. Other libraries that I had the privilege of using include the Newberry Library in Chicago, Iowa State University's Parks Library, and Virginia Tech's Newman Library. I was fortunate to have also received funding from a number of sources including the Iowa State University History Department's Roswell Garst Fellowship and from Dr. and Mrs. Robert W. Lawrence. Bob is an Emeritus Professor at York College in York, Nebraska. He and his wife Ruth have committed themselves to helping advance the careers of aspiring women, and I feel honored to have received their financial contributions at critical junctures in my work. Family members who also assisted me and the completion of this work include Charles Turner of Falling Waters, West Virginia, (my paternal uncle), my parents, and paternal grandfather (through his bequest). The generosity of these people freed me up from the time-consuming task of seeking grants which allowed me to focus on researching and writing so that, along with my teaching responsibilities at Iowa State University, Virginia Tech, and Drake University, I could

achieve my goal of graduating with significant publications. I am grateful for their assistance.

A much earlier draft of Chapter Two, in which I examined the socio-economic connections between the developing agricultural frontier and rural society of the early nineteenth-century West, was selected as one of three papers featured at the Newberry Library's 2003 Great Lakes Rural History Seminar. I benefited from the scholarly interaction and subsequently revised the paper along the lines of several of the comments and published it as "Grist, Grit, and Rural Society in the Early Midwest: Insight Gleaned from Grain," *Ohio Valley History* (Summer 2005, forthcoming). My initial probing of the West of the early republic in terms of native-white relations caused me to ultimately decide to focus on John Tipton. This became the book chapter "Bringing About the Dawn: Agriculture, Internal Improvement, Indian Policy, and Euro-American Hegemony in the Old Northwest, 1800-1846," in Daniel P. Barr, ed., *The Boundaries Between Us: Natives, Newcomers, and the Struggle for the Old Northwest, 1740-1840.* (Kent State University Press, 2005, forthcoming). I also presented my research at a number of conferences including the Western History Association's Annual Meeting in Fort Worth, Texas, October 2003.

Friends, family, and mentors provided a nurturing environment for me to grow as a scholar. I relished the intellectual stimulation of fellow graduate students Kristin McMillan Lunak, Peter Hoehnle, and Sarah Mitchell which helped in a number of ways. My academic mentoring spanned two institutions, and I grew as a scholar and teacher at each place. At Virginia Tech, I learned especially from Professors Peter Wallenstein, Dan Thorp, Fred Baumgartner, and Glenn Bugh. Jack (William C.) Davis was a good friend at the right time, while Jan Francis is a staff member who impressed me with her commitment to students and

to assisting faculty. At Iowa State University, I had the good fortune to work as Hamilton Cravens' teaching assistant. I admire his understanding of the nineteenth century. Pam Riney-Kehrberg is a long-time friend whose work on Kansas wheat country I admire.

Other influences for which I am grateful include Andrew Cayton, a generous scholar in giving me time for conversation about writing on the Midwest; Malcolm Rohrbough, for giving me a semester in a frontier seminar under a true master of the craft; Dorothy Schwieder, for urging me to pay attention to the presence of underlying tensions in my research; Donald Fixico, for instilling in me the importance of attributing the Native American perspective with as much detail as possible; Don Pisani, for his enthusiastic encouragement of graduate students as well as his infectious attitude toward research; Vernon Burton, with whom I worked when he was president of the Agricultural History Society (AHS), for his encouragement of me to keep trying to publish as I go along; Pete Daniel, for his efforts in trying to enable me to work with him as a Smithsonian fellow, although we were not ultimately successful; Fred Williams, for his unwavering support of the AHS and the pursuit of good history; committee members George McJimsey, Andrejs Plakans, and Jim Andrews for their comments about my dissertation which were "right on the money" and much appreciated; and, Ralph D. Gray, Emeritus Professor at Indiana University—Purdue University (Indianapolis), whom I have never met, but who nevertheless offered me the three-volume set of John Tipton's published papers which, quite frankly, allowed me to finish the dissertation when I did. For their examples of excellence and integrity, the willingness to mentor, and their advice—my sincere thanks and gratitude.

I reserve my biggest thanks, respect, and gratitude for my advisor, Doug Hurt, whose constant support carried me in those fleeting moments of self-doubt. I could not have chosen

a more consummate or professional scholar to study under, and the longer that we worked together, the more I realized how fortunate my choice and his agreement were to my life. Much of this dissertation developed while we were at different institutions, but he made sure that we stayed connected through frequent emails and phone calls, as well as chance meetings. Although in our earlier association he would chide me for not listening to him, in fact I heard and considered every word. I have learned a lot from our many conversations ever since, in which he has shared with me about those who have influenced or guided him, decisions he made and regretted (that I might learn from), as well as his own career aspirations. My esteem for him, his scholarship, and his mentoring is matched only by my appreciation for his friendship, confidence, and respect. I am grateful for the time that he has invested in my work because I know that it could not have materialized otherwise.

PREFACE

At its heart, this is a social history of the process of westward expansion, the human drama that unfolded in the shaping of the American West of the early republic during the first four decades of the nineteenth century. Here, people and place were connected by a complex set of evolving relationships and contingencies. The forces of change were often rooted in the strength of personalities and competing ideologies. More than anything this study strove to piece together a rich and revealing interplay of voices, perceptions, and accounts that would enliven our understanding about the dynamism of the advancing agricultural frontier northwest of the Ohio River, and the men, women, and families who experienced it. At every turn this study enlisted the participants' thoughts, words, and deeds to describe the West as they knew it, as well as what they hoped it would become; admittedly, however, the dominant Euro-American perspective speaks the loudest. References to women, families, Native Americans, and African Americans were treated as gold and folded in wherever possible. The study found its major narrator in the introspective and enterprising visionary, John Tipton, a man who pursued a fascinating public career that consequently placed him at several critical junctures in the developing West. The study was further informed by the fact that Tipton was at the center of a vibrant and wide network of male correspondents, thus allowing it to go far beyond just one man's view of his place in the world.

Indianan John Tipton wrote about the life he lived, often recording his experiences in journals and letters either as formal records or as simply his own casual observations. That his voluminous papers have escaped an extensive analysis of their contents for insight on the social history of the Old Northwest and, especially, of Indiana is surprising given the breadth

of the topics at hand. As of this writing, no scholarly biography on Tipton has been published, and only one other dissertation has focused on him—William Frederick Collins' "John Tipton and the Indians of the Old Northwest." In admirable detail, Collins examines Tipton's military career and his relationship with the region's Indians, while also successfully capturing the military ethos of the period. Yet his analysis lacks depth in not going beyond the "discovery" that Tipton's entire public career "was related to American Indians." This is only true if his politically formative years as deputy sheriff and sheriff in Harrison County, Indiana, (1812-1814, 1816-1820) are for some reason discounted. To do so also unfortunately negates the importance of these years in terms of the African American past in southern Indiana, along with Tipton's public role in mediating race relations in at least one crucial moment in the young state's history. The current study addresses this omission.[i]

In addition, Tipton's private correspondence is examined for the first time to get a sense of how Tipton's male cohorts understood their roles as family men in a developing West. The result challenges our long-standing views on early nineteenth-century men as emotionally distant husbands and fathers while also critiquing the shortcomings of current historiographic interpretations of the patriarchal family structure. Research here does support a number of the findings of recent masculinity and manhood studies. Finally, the internal improvement movement, of which Tipton was a leading proponent, is elevated to the central place it had among Indianans and westerners of the 1830s *and their aspirations*. This last point is too often easily dismissed by scholars who focus instead on the financial disaster that the state's canal system became, rather than the economic deliverance that early Indianans (and, for that matter, Old Northwesterners in general) believed it represented. Its importance is more accurately understood when considered as part of a commercial nexus that also

linked Indian policy and the development of commercial agriculture. Thus, if we want to understand how westward expansion played out at ground level, or probe, for example, the pursuit of commercial agriculture or the burden of race relations in the decades surrounding Indiana's statehood, we must read Tipton's writings for what they say about the larger context of Old Northwest societies. Among the things we learn is that the anxious destinies of numerous groups of people were determined as much by paths taken toward an end, as by those scarcely considered at all.

NOTES--PREFACE

[i] William Frederick Collins, "John Tipton and the Indians of the Old Northwest" (Ph.D. diss., Purdue University, 1997), iii.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Westward expansion policies of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries took a frightening toll on the lives of those living in the contested spaces of the Old Northwest. Contests over sovereignty and the control of resources, chiefly land, kept tension and anxiety in tentative, unstable western societies at a tinderbox level. Guided by a complicated set of cultural assumptions and financial and expansionist motivations, federal policymakers of the early republic inaugurated the abrasive force and sweep of Euro-American hegemony across the landscape of the territory northwest of the Ohio River with the ordinances of 1785 and 1787. While the ordinances were auspiciously designed to generate land sales revenue, provide access to farm land, facilitate land surveys, and lay down rules for orderly settlement and governance, they nevertheless disregarded the claims of the region's first inhabitants, the Native Americans.[1]

The ordinances opened the door to interrupted waves of eastern, southern, as well as some foreign migration to the West. But the choice of path thereafter was often determined by knowledge of both the prevailing state of native-white relations as related by the accounts of travelers, settlers, and others, along with an understanding of the most recent settlement boundaries fixed by land cession treaties. An area promoted as open for settlement was as likely to have the effect of encouraging the movement of farm people as, conversely, letters such as the following from Kentuckian John Corlis to a relative contemplating a move to the Indiana Territory served to discourage migration: "Indiana," he advised, "is too much a frontier to the Indians that do frequently make war & depredate." Squatters represented one

class of settlers who appeared to care only about where the closest boundary lay so as to "squat" just over line. Robert Duncan's family joined others squatting within the area of an Indian village comprised mostly of Delawares in central Indiana in the spring of 1820. Duncan recalled that "all newcomers were then called squatters" in reference to the large numbers of illegal settlers who moved in, either in anticipation of the government's survey of recently acquired Indian lands or in pre-emption rights.[2]

Treaty and settlement lines embodied one element of a volatile and uneven equation involving government officials, settlers, and Native Americans. The essence of its volatility was rooted in each group's self-interestedness and determination to claim ownership, through various means, to what they believed to be "theirs." The obvious losers in this equation were the native peoples who could not fail to notice their conspicuously shrinking territorial bounds and land base. As late as 1821 Potawatomi Chief Metea aptly protested during a treaty council in Chicago that in the settlers' haste to create farms from Indian lands, "the plowshare is driven through our tents before we have time to carry out our goods and seek another habitation." As for the policymakers, drawing, adjusting (always adjusting), and maintaining the sets of lines that demarcated political and cultural dominion and sovereignty consumed them and continually heightened or inflamed native-white relations in the early West.[3]

Yet, that the social economy of the settlers and Native Americans was significantly shaped by the consequences of not only competing cultural values, assumptions, and needs but also of policy decisions made elsewhere illustrates how westward expansion played itself out on two different landscapes: the one mapped by policymakers and the one personally experienced and directly transformed by natives and settlers negotiating a concurrent

existence in frontier zones. One could also argue that these landscapes were as much connected as they were at odds. John Tipton's active involvement in fortifying and building up the West, and his wide ranging correspondence with others similarly engaged, starkly reveal how much more fundamentally important natives and settlers were to actually defining the emerging American Midwest. Official policy merely served as reference points. Moreover, Tipton embodied the idea that personality often could be more powerful and influential than policy in the West, as will become evident throughout this study.[4]

An additional force with political, social, even economic dimensions that persisted beyond the transition to statehood was the militia. During the West's multiple territorial periods government officials frequently called upon this frontier institution for a show of strength to protect federal or national interests on the ground. The militia was compelled to be responsive to all three groups—federal authority, settlers, and Native Americans—although obviously on different levels. But, as Francis Paul Prucha delineated in his seminal work *Broadax and Bayonet,* the military men provided more than simply a "milieu of security" and actually brought about significant developmental changes in the region in the course of their non-combat activities. This study broadens Prucha's characterization in showing western militias as important networks of relationships that men like Tipton used to advance their own agendas as well as to inform, connect, and build a region.[5]

As the narrative begins, the backdrop is the local interplay between settlers, Native Americans, and the militia during the territorial period and the consequences for the settlers who sought to claim a piece of the West in territorial Indiana for themselves. Studies of native-white relations tend to focus on the relationship between the government and tribal leaders or upon the frontier Indian wars. Conversely, this study explores the internal (or,

local) processes and influences that shaped the people, their outlooks, and the unfolding events. It considers, for example, the manifestation of communities in crisis because of war and the implications of gender in a military period. John Tipton's militia activities, when supplemented with other contemporary accounts, afford a connected perspective of an anxious western society. Tipton exemplified several generations of settler men and women who worked to create, materially improve, and in effect live out their lives at the vanguard of American westward expansion—with all of its rough edges.[6]

NOTES—CHAPTER ONE

[1] The Ordinances of 1785 and 1787 are reprinted in Henry Steele Commager, ed., *Documents of American History*, 7th ed., (NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963), 123-24, 128-32; for insight on how historians have interpreted the Northwest Ordinance, see R. Douglas Hurt, "Historians and the Northwest Ordinance," *Western Historical Quarterly* 20 (August 1989): 261-80 and Peter S. Onuf, *Statehood and Union: A History of the Northwest Ordinance* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987); federal land policy in the context of farm land policy is surveyed in John Opie, *The Law of the Land: Two Hundred Years of American Farmland Policy* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994), see especially chapters 1-3.

[2] John and Susan Corlis to Joseph, George and Mary Ann Corlis, 14 April 1816, Corlis-Respess Family Papers, Filson Special Collections, Filson Historical Society; this letter has been digitized and is found on the Library of Congress American Memory web site (http://memory.loc.gov/) under the heading "The First American West: The Ohio River Valley, 1750-1820," search term: Corlis; Robert B. Duncan, "Old Settlers," Indianapolis *Herald* 11 January 1879. This represents the first of four articles penned by Duncan that were later collected and reprinted as Robert B. Duncan, "Old Settlers," *Indiana Historical Society Publications* II (1894): 376-402 (quoted material is on page 377); two good sources on migrations westward during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries are Francis S. Philbrick, *The Rise of the West, 1754-1830* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), chapter 12 and R. Douglas Hurt, *The Ohio Frontier: Crucible of the Old Northwest, 1720-1830* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), chapter 6. Hurt is particularly good at explaining the near frenzy prompted by the prospect for profits to be made with the opening of western lands to Euro-Americans.

[3] Chief Metea's comments are quoted in R. David Edmunds, *The Potawatomis: Keepers of the Fire* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1978), 220.

[4] An insightful depiction of survey lines and Indian land cessions in Indiana that represented nineteenth-century policymakers' imaginary imprint of U.S. ownership and reorganization of a portion of western land, is found in George R. Wilson, "The First Public Land Surveys in Indiana; Freeman's Lines," *Indiana Magazine of History* 12 (March 1916): 1-33 (image is on page 5).

[5] Francis Paul Prucha, *Broadax & Bayonet: The Role of the United States Army in the Development of the Northwest, 1815-1860* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995); a good source that places militias within

the context of frontier societies is Malcolm J. Rohrbough, *The Trans-Appalachian Frontier: People, Societies, and Institutions, 1775-1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), chapter 1; see also Marcus Cunliffe, *Soldiers & Civilians: The Martial Spirit in American, 1775-1865* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1968), chapter 6 and R. Douglas Hurt, *The Indian Frontier, 1763-1846* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002), chapters 3 and 5.

[6] In my focus on local processes intrinsic to state and regional development I am heeding Andrew Cayton and Peter Onuf's suggestion that Midwest historians should "think about the region in more systematic ways" than had been done recently, in Andrew R. L. Cayton and Peter S. Onuf, *The Midwest and the Nation: Rethinking the History of an American Region* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990).

CHAPTER TWO

In the Shadow of the Tomahawk and Rifle: the Tippecanoe Era, 1800-1815

> Oct. 31st we took a north Course up the East side of [the] Wabash and then Crosst to the west with orders to kill all the Indians we saw[.]
> --from John Tipton's journal on the march to Prophetstown, 1811[1]

Native hostility to white encroachment and the persistent threat of tense encounters or attacks and raids by either side were arguably the strongest influences and a fundamental characteristic of frontier life throughout most of Indiana's territorial period that spanned 1800 to 1816. The tension became excessive during the first half of the second decade. John Tipton's records of his militia activities speak to the threats that permeated both the southern and northern parts of the territory. Yet the drawn-out contest that would explode in 1811 in the north, at Prophetstown, where the Wabash and Tippecanoe rivers converge, was precipitated not just by simmering hostility but also by the collision of conflicting perspectives on westward expansion—one on paper and one on the ground. These were in the form of Territorial Governor William Henry Harrison's rapid conclusion of a series of heavy-handed land cession treaties beginning with the southern third of the territory on the one hand, and in the dangerous escalation of discontent among native peoples about capitulating to the whites over land, on the other. This situation helped to spawn a spiritual resistance led by the Shawnee prophet Tenskwatawa, also referred to as the Prophet. Hopeful of inspiring a broad-based cultural renewal movement, the Prophet preached a gospel of complete cultural separation from the Euro-Americans, although he entertained limited cultural and economic relations with the lingering, troublesome British in the region.

Generally speaking, the Prophet's military counterpart—and Harrison's chief worry—was his warrior brother Tecumseh.[2]

In a privately communicated 1803 letter to Harrison, Thomas Jefferson outlined his policy objectives concerning the relationship between Native Americans, Euro-American agriculture, and land acquisition; namely that the natives were to be strongly encouraged to adopt settled agriculture over their hunting culture, and in this way be willing "to exchange lands, which they have to spare and we want." Most of all, Jefferson urged Harrison to move quickly in securing Indian land in the territory because the French, who were favored by Native Americans, were knocking at the door in New Orleans. Upon receiving his commission to treat with the Indians, Harrison wasted little time and successfully concluded twelve treaties between 1803 and 1814 involving the Delawares, Shawnees, Miamis, Eel River, Weas, Kickapoos, Piankashaws, Kaskaskias, Sauk and Fox, and the Potawatomis that dispossessed the tribes of about 75,000 square miles of land. But historian Robert Owens is only partially correct in arguing that "Harrison's actions, and not Jefferson's words, provide the key to understanding Indian policy in the early nineteenth century." True, Harrison was decidedly keen on concluding cession treaties and waging war, but his actions were just that—actions. And to separate Harrison's actions from the intellectual and socio-cultural underpinnings of Jefferson's policy actually appears to fail to understand federal Indian policy of the period.[3]

Particularly galling to the Prophet and Tecumseh was Harrison's Fort Wayne treaty in 1809 in which certain tribal "government chiefs" (a term of derision used by some of their peers), including Five Medals for the Potawatomis and Little Turtle for the Miamis, signed away over three million acres in present-day Indiana and Illinois. Pointing toward an

imminent violent contest over land, the Prophet made it clear that whites would not be allowed to survey or settle those lands. Historian R. David Edmunds contends that this treaty provoked immediate open hostility toward the whites, and the Prophet reinvigorated his attempts to inspire a pan-Indian insurgency against the United States. During a meeting with Harrison in August of the following year, Tecumseh noted the problem of designs imposed from afar and warned him of the dire consequences that would occur in the territory if the President did not restore their lands; "It is true, he is far off," he reasoned, "he will not be injured by the war; he may sit still in his town and drink his wine, whilst you and I will have to fight it out." And in a little over a year, on 7 November 1811, the two groups clashed at the Americans' camp outside of Prophetstown, at Tippecanoe. Twenty-five-year-old John Tipton was one of ninety men from the Harrison County militia who participated in the bloody Tippecanoe campaign.[4]

During the era of Tippecanoe and the War of 1812 in the Old Northwest, natives and non-natives lived upon what historian James H. Merrill has labeled a "landscape of encounter," the dramatic vicissitudes of which for a time dominated the quality of life in much of the region's territorial societies. Gradually, widespread face-to-face interactions began to wane and, as Merrell points out, by the removal period of the 1840s Native Americans would cease to hold the same central place in American society. This represents a major turning point in the region's history and an important reason why the preceding decades are crucial to understanding the local landscape of westward expansion, and how it was changing for both groups. Tipton's role in the Harrison County militia casts light upon the broader experience of living on the edge of encounters, including the farm people he was called out to protect who, with great fortitude, sought to outlast the attacks, conquer fear, and

harvest the fruits of their labors. They had migrated primarily to make farms, develop enterprises, and build communities—not fight wars. Yet public exigencies stemming from clashes over expansionist federal policies that played out on the ground frequently burdened them with trying to make farms and develop communities in the midst of war.[5]

The toll of westward expansion was heavy upon territorial society. Certainly the Jeffersonian image of the independent yeoman farm class did not square with the military reality of the period. The independence many settlers sought in migrating west suffered as lives were constrained by the repeated appearance of imminent threats and the defensive measures they were forced to take, some at the insistence of the government. In this, scholars often overlook the experiences of women and children in periods dominated by a military ethos particularly when that culture prescribes the most prominent role to men. This same ethos that somewhat formally prepared men for military duty generation after generation ironically made women vulnerable. They were often subjected to act as protectors and defenders without having the advantages of military experience when an Indian raiding party suddenly brought war to their farmstead while many of the men were away on a campaign. Of course, white women were not alone in this predicament. During this period the U.S. government pursued a policy of destroying Indian homes, villages, and food stores, and taking prisoners. In this way all territorial inhabitants lived under the pall of making and surviving war. The records suggest that just as scholars of westward expansion highlight Native American resistance, the same could be said concerning settler men, women, and children who "hardened" to the frontier experience.[6]

In a number of important ways, then, John Tipton's life mirrored the course of the history of Indiana and that of the emerging American Midwest. The militia was an

undeniably strong influence. One indication of the military's power as an important and enduring symbol of Tipton's era is that after receiving his commission as a major general in the second division of the Indiana militia in 1822, Tipton would continue to be referred to as "General" for the remainder of his life. "Gen'l John Tipton" was even inscribed on the monument at his grave despite the fact that he died one month after completing a second term as a U.S. Senator from Indiana in 1839. He was a man variously described as about five feet eight inches tall and of slight though solid build. In demeanor, Tipton was said to possess quickness, energy, sternness, and determination that served him well whether in pursuit of military, community, or public policy objectives. His later letters to his son Spear reveal a pronounced regret at his lack of formal education. To his credit he worked not only to overcome this deficiency for himself but also for the developing region in his eager promotion of educational opportunities as will be described in a later chapter. As a senator, Tipton was known to be a strong debater. A final consideration concerns Tippecanoe. As will become evident throughout this study, this battlefield encounter and Tipton's leadership there played an important role in the creation of identities and enduring memories—for Tipton, the West, and Indiana.[7]

John Tipton epitomized the frontier heritage and held as well a unique connection to the westward expansion epic. Indiana, his chosen home, represented the first U.S. territorial division of the Northwest Territory in 1800, and as such it comprised an expansive land area that originally reached west to the Mississippi River and north from the Ohio River to the Canadian border. Rather quickly, however, the territory was reduced in size when the Michigan and Illinois territories were organized from it in 1805 and 1809 respectively.

Regarding migration and settlement, Indiana historian James Madison explains that the bulk of the territory's earliest settlers migrated from the upper South, eventually crossing the Ohio River after departing from such places as western Virginia, North Carolina, and eastern Tennessee. In this way, the territory was settled basically from south to north, again indicating the pattern of Indian land acquisition by the federal government. Tipton's family roots were in eastern Tennessee, in present-day Sevier County. Like many westerners in 1786, Tipton was born into a farm family whose male members traditionally engaged in militia service; as of yet the records have revealed little about his female relatives. As he would do in Indiana, a number of his relatives took part in the West's major events: a great-uncle also named John Tipton opposed John Sevier and the independent Franklin state scheme of the late 1780s; another great-uncle fought at the Battle of King's Mountain; and, an uncle died at St. Clair's massive defeat in 1791. Tipton's father Joshua served in the Jefferson County militia as a lieutenant until 1793 when he was killed in an encounter with Cherokees. John was not quite seven years of age at the time.[8]

The Indiana Territory held out the possibilities of enterprise and land ownership ostensibly to white Americans, and, at the age of twenty one, Tipton is believed to have relocated there in Harrison County with his mother, siblings, and her brothers in 1807. This was the same year that a new land office opened in Jeffersonville though the district was not officially established until 1810. The Jeffersonville land office was one of three that offered Indiana lands for sale; Cincinnati and Vincennes were the other two, established in 1800 and 1804 respectively. At the time, Vincennes also served as Indiana's territorial capital. The Tiptons encountered an environment that was still considerably forested and overwhelmingly rural, dotted here and there with small pockets of determined agriculturists. The opening of

the Jeffersonville land office to facilitate an increasing number of surveys was *prima facie* evidence to them that they were welcome. In 1810 Tipton and his family were among the enumerated 24,520 non-Native American individuals in the territorial census who lived within the four established counties along the southern and eastern edges: Knox (7,945), Dearborn (7,310), Clark (5,670), and Harrison (3,595). Overall, men consistently outnumbered women but the disparity did not represent the significant gender imbalance that was often attributed to the West's population. Territorial society tended to be youthful with the vast majority of the settlers being under the age of forty-five years. A further indicator of youth and the prevalence of families is found in the fact that the largest age group comprised children under the age of ten. By comparison, while Native Americans were not included in the census one source has estimated that before the Michigan and Illinois territories had been carved out of the Indiana Territory in 1800, perhaps as many as one hundred thousand native peoples, primarily of the Algonquin culture, dwelled within the region, although this figure may be too high. The major nations were the Miamis, Potawatomis, Delawares, and Shawnees. Of course, the 1800 estimate would be substantially less in 1810 with the territory's reduction to create the new territories.[9]

While the dominant tension coursing through territorial Indiana society sprang from native-white relations, the issue of race and the question of slavery simmered during this period and greeted Tipton as well in 1807. His upbringing in the Upper South no doubt familiarized Tipton with the dynamics of race, society, and the law. Yet the matter was complicated north of the Ohio River given the anti-slavery wording and sentiment of Article VI of the Northwest Ordinance, and African Americans would learn that westward expansion in Indiana was very much influenced by the South's pro-slavery sentiment. Since 1800, the

year of the territory's inception, petitions from county residents and legislators alike argued for the suspension of the Article VI prohibition of slavery noting that slave labor was critical to agricultural production, the region's chief occupation. The pro-slavery position did not go unchallenged in the territory. That the debate was still fueling controversy and divisions and was being felt locally when Tipton arrived is evident in a series of legislative documents from that year. These include resolutions supporting the article's suspension as being "highly advantageous to the said Territory" juxtaposed with a counter petition from residents of nearby Clark County who "humbly showeth that great anxiety has been, and still is, evinced by some of the citizens of this Territory, on the subject of the introduction of slavery into the same." They emphasize that "in no case has the voice of the citizens been unanimous." Race represented another level of instability associated with westward expansion and would become a matter of some immediacy for Tipton after he became sheriff in 1816.[10]

Exactly where the Tiptons settled first is unclear, but they apparently resided near kin of John's mother, whose surname was Shields, in Harrison County. Around this time also (1807) although the date is unverified, it is presumed Tipton married Martha Shields who may have been his first cousin but who was at any rate the daughter of John Shields, the gunsmith and a blacksmith for the Lewis and Clark Corps of Discovery. For Tipton, Shields embodied a personal link to the American vision of westward expansion and served as a kind of affirmation of his role with respect to the West. Shields was a private engaged by Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark on 19 October 1803, and he garnered considerable praise in the journals for ingenuity at being able to perform his duties without always having access to needed supplies. Lewis and Clark named two streams after him, one of which continues to appear on area maps. After the expedition ended in 1806, Shields was

formally discharged and given a grant of land equal in size to that awarded those who had served in the Revolution. According to one largely undocumented sketch, Shields' grant was for land in Franklin County, Missouri. What is documented, however, is Shields' presence in Clark and Harrison Counties in the Indiana Territory. In a letter dated 15 January 1807, Lewis wrote to Secretary of War Henry Dearborn on behalf of Shields and recommended his services as "an artificer." He noted that "Nothing was more peculiarly useful to us, in various situations, than the skill and ingenuity of this man as an artist, in repairing our guns, accoutrements, etc." Dearborn's reply has not been found, yet the ensuing July Territorial Governor Harrison extended to Shields a captain's commission of a company of the first regiment in the Clark County militia. Reference to him also appeared in a road viewer's report from 1809 that noted a route passing "Captain John Shields' point" the same year that his will was probated. Tipton acted as executor of his estate.[11]

Until he took up his appointment as the federal Indian agent at the Fort Wayne agency in 1823, Tipton would be closely identified with Harrison County, but his earliest known territorial enterprise seems to have been based on the opposite side of the Ohio. Harrison County was the first to be organized by the Territorial Legislature, in 1808, and was named after the Territorial Governor; yet it was actually the territory's fourth county. Knox was organized in 1790 as a county of the Northwest Territory, and both Clark and Dearborn counties were organized via proclamations by Governor Harrison in 1801 and 1803 respectively. Evidence that native cultures long preceded the Euro-Americans there was seen in the mounds that at one time graced the southern part of Harrison County. The Buffalo Trace, an important old buffalo migratory and travel route that ran across the northern part of the county, was a vital, if not "favored," route between Clarksville (or, Louisville) and

Vincennes until about 1820. One authority has estimated that two-thirds of the early settlers migrating to southern Indiana from Louisville used this trail. Most of the early white population and, increasingly, some of the small number of African Americans, settled along the Ohio River which parallels the county's southern boundary.[12]

Harrison County has traditionally been called the "Cradle of Indiana" or "Indiana's birthplace" because of the influential role that the county-seat, Corydon, came to play in local and state politics. In 1811 one traveler described it as still a new place with only four or five rather "indifferant" houses. But a number of political issues flared during the War of 1812 that suggested the possibility that Corydon would be a more amenable location for the territorial capital than Vincennes, particularly after much of Harrison's force was massacred at the River Raisin on 22 January 1813. While fear was an immediate consideration, contentious political motivations for seeking a new capital closer to the population growth were apparent several years earlier. The move was approved by law on 11 March. This would be fortuitous for Tipton in that, coupled with his involvement in the militia, he was very much a public man interested in public roles; this circumstance yielded opportunities for an ambitious, energetic man that were not otherwise available and will be discussed in the next chapter. Corydon would later host the new state's constitutional convention in 1816 where the decision was made to retain it as the new state capital. Underscoring the Tippecanoe connection and influence, five of the forty-three delegates had been on the Tippecanoe campaign and most, according to one source, lived as "frontier farmers." Beside Tipton and his father-in-law John Shields, Harrison County notable farm- and mill- owners included Governor Harrison, Squire Boone (the religious and eccentric brother of frontiersman Daniel Boone), and Josiah Lincoln (Abraham Lincoln's uncle).[13]

The extent of Tipton's agricultural operations at this time was presumably small but from an 1809 county stock mark record that recorded his mark as a "Crop off the left ear and an underbit on the right," he did apparently raise some livestock. Tipton struggled financially in his early years in the Indiana Territory, taking on a forty-one dollar debt, along with his cousin James Shields, only to be sued for non-payment. Many migrants like Tipton would engage in enterprises that supplemented their farming and also took advantage of the potential commerce linked to the Ohio River, westward migration, and agriculture. In October of 1810 Tipton was awarded a permit to operate a ferry that ran back and forth across the Ohio, between Harrison County and a salt landing in Jefferson County, Kentucky. Reflecting the power of local democracy in territorial community-building and efforts to use territorial laws to shape the landscape to accommodate the settlers' commercial visions, Tipton, then immediately asked that a public road between his ferry and Mann's Lick (on the Kentucky side) be "viewed" and "marked," as was the custom. Numerous similar requests were recorded in the *Record of the Court of Common Pleas* for the March and July terms in 1809 and illustrated how quickly settlers tried to formally re-establish the structures of American society to which they were accustomed in their new habitat.[14]

As a ferryman, Tipton conducted his operations within a series of territorial laws that regulated while it also promoted commercial development, especially as it related to the Ohio River commercial and migration traffic. Given the poor quality and hazardous nature of shipping and travel in the early decades of the nineteenth century, Tipton's role was of some consequence to the community; in fact, the early laws of the Northwest Territory regarded a ferry as a "public convenience." The laws governing ferrying had begun to change just prior to Tipton's 1810 permit, shifting the burden of authority from the governor and the territorial

judges to the county and increasing in regulation. Ferries were taxed in consideration of their value and derived income, but none should be taxed more than ten dollars in one year. On the basis of an 1807 act, Tipton would have had to publish his application in at least three public places for three months before applying for his license. The tolls he could charge were fixed by the Court of Common Pleas and had to be posted. When requested, ferry operators were required to carry public messengers, expresses, and public servants including army and militia officers, without charge. Tipton would have had to make his ferry service available from daylight to dark, and, unless dangerous conditions prevailed, he was on call to transport public servants during the night. Revealing the agricultural orientation of territorial commerce and travel, the tolls that two of Tipton's fellow Harrison county ferrymen were permitted to charge were given as the following:

Wagon and team	1 dollar and 50 cents
Cart and team	1 dollar
Carriage and 2 horses	1 dollar and 50 cents
1 man and 1 horse	25 cents
1 horse	12 ½ cents
1 cow	12 ½ cents
Hog, sheep, or goat	2 pence [each]
Footman	9 pence

Because ferrymen provided an essential service to territorial communities, the 1807 law exempted them from the otherwise required jury service, road work, and militia duty.[15]

However, if an exemption from the militia was ever offered to Tipton he never took it. Instead, he used this frontier institution advantageously, perhaps not so much to advance a military career as a public one (which often appeared to be one and the same objective). Nathaniel Bolton, Indiana's State Librarian, spoke about this relationship in a lecture given before the Indiana Historical Society in 1853. The election of colonels, majors, and captains,

he noted, was "truly exciting" considering that "these stations" during Tipton's era were presumed to be "stepping stones to civil office." Given that relations between Native-Americans and Euro-Americans were desperately deteriorating and war was looming with the British, he would have plenty of opportunity. In just under one year's time from the date of his ferry permit, he and the rest of the Harrison County militia would join other military units in the march to Prophetstown and Tippecanoe. Militia duty, like road-building and ferrying, was an essential regulated component of fledgling western societies of the early nineteenth century. Unlike the other two, however, the militia was layered with other contexts; it existed in broader social and political worlds as well. The persistence of the militia on the landscape also serves as a marker, an indicator that the western society—not just the men engaged in the service—was living on the edge of conflict and violence.[16]

While 1807 is often given as the year Tipton migrated to the territory, a letter dated 16 April 1807 from territorial secretary John Gibson to Captain William Hargrove provides detail and context about this. The letter reported that a "band of roving Indians" had attacked a settler family traveling the road between Vincennes and Clarksville, killing the father and kidnapping the mother and five children. Gibson asked, "if it was possible without taking too many men out of your settlement," that twenty men be enlisted for ranger service with special preference "at all times" being given to those with prior Indian campaign experience. He was also quick to add that in doing so, however, no family should be left without some able-bodied male protection. According to a footnote added to the published letter by Indiana historian Logan Esarey, Governor Harrison organized three ranger divisions to safeguard this major travel route—one of these was commanded by then twenty-one-year-old John Tipton. This was ascertained by a receipt dated 16 October 1807 for powder and lead

from Hargrove written by Tipton as commander of the second division of the rangers. Clearly he had became known through his militia fighting well enough to be chosen for this command in April, or perhaps this ranger command was what lured him across the Ohio in 1807 to settle permanently in Indiana. Even while still a young man Tipton had gained respect for soldiering and commanding.[17]

Tipton's generation of men and women was accustomed to the presence and obligations of the military in their society, and expectations about it were codified in law. The militia law passed by the General Assembly in 1807 had at its heart the legal fact that all free, able-bodied white male citizens between the ages of eighteen and forty-five years were subject to militia duty. Those whom the law defined as Negro or Mulatto were not subject to militia service, but a designated poll tax of three dollars a year was imposed upon them. White men needed to enroll with the captain of the company in their jurisdiction and to equip themselves. Within six months a man should be armed with "a good musket, a sufficient bayonet and belt, or a fusee, two spare flints, a knapsack and pouch, with a box therein to contain not less than twenty-four cartridges,...each cartridge to contain a proper quantity of powder and ball." A good rifle with twenty balls could be substituted for the musket. By comparison, commissioned officers provided their own horses, saddles, swords and pistols. Besides arms, each man supplied his own uniform although the regimental officers decided upon the distinctive style. Tipton joined a company of mounted riflemen that was organized and commanded by Captain Spier Spencer, an intimate friend of Harrison, in 1809 and named "Spencer's Yellow Jackets" because, according to one source, the men's uniforms consisted of yellow flannel hunting shirts adorned with red fringes.[18]

As a frontier institution, the militia was governed by authority, hierarchy, and public exigency or defense. Its maintenance even after the Native American defeat at Tippecanoe in 1811 and the end of the War of 1812 several years later speaks to a widely-held perception of its political and social utility. Indiana Territory's militia enrollment ranged from 1,710 men in 1803 to 4,160 in 1811, to just over five thousand in 1814. Across the territory, militias were organized into divisions, brigades, regiments, battalions, and companies, and authority assumed the following pattern: a division was commanded by a Major General; a brigade by a Brigadier-General; a regiment by a Lieutenant-Colonel; a battalion by a Major. Military authority was backed by legal authority, so that fines could be imposed on those refusing to serve or for failing in their duties. Moreover, if the man being fined was under twenty-one years, the liability rested with his father. Fines were also imposed on account of desertion with the dollar amount increased by rank. For example, a deserting private incurred a fine not to exceed fifty dollars while that figure rose to seventy-five dollars for a non-commissioned officer, along with a demotion to private. If, instead of desertion, a man failed to report for a tour of duty, such as for a march, he could be fined up to one hundred dollars by a regimental court-martial, although allowances were made for circumstances such as illness.[19]

Mustering, or turning-out in uniform and with arms for drilling, represented another military obligation. The law required company musters every two months, the battalion muster in April, and the regimental muster in October. Mustering involved a roll call and an inspection, and the men were expected to be "under arms" for six hours that day. It usually coincided with a social gathering that might include a shared meal, dancing, sporting, and politicking, all of which reinforced the militia's immersion in territorial society. The militia

afforded men an exclusively gendered opportunity to translate battlefield bravado into social, political, even economic currency. Yet the human cost of military demands on the territory's men as well as on their personal attachments was often steep. Like many of his generation, though, Tipton would be successful at translating battlefield achievements into public opportunities.[20]

Native communities in the Territory were, by and large, communities in distress in the years preceding Tippecanoe, and many of the tribal nations had grown accustomed to living in the shadow of warfare, division, and drastic change, which is not to say that they accepted this situation. As William Frederick Collins has adequately described, a tribal geography was discernible: a Potawatomi village led by Winamac resided on the upper Tippecanoe River, while others dotted the Elkhart and Kankakee Rivers; Little Turtle's Miamis lived on the Eel River, while Pacane, Owl, and Richardville, an influential "mixed-blood," led their people on the Mississinewa; the Weas were also on the Wabash River; Little Duck's Kickapoos dwelled at the crossing of the Wabash and Big Pine Creek; and, Delaware and Shawnee villages inhabited east central Indiana by the upper White River. Community disintegration came in numerous forms. The fur trade had been upended by several factors including warring with the Americans in the 1790s, a shrinking market due to the European wars, and the near depletion of fur-bearing animals. Moreover, persistent white encroachment brought the threat of not only hostile encounters, land loss, disease, and pressure from the federal government's "Civilization Programs," but dissolution by whiskey as well. This last had a particularly pernicious effect on cultural, community, and family relations. So it was that when the Shawnee Prophet accepted Potawatomi war leader Main Poc's offer to settle near that tribal nation at the confluence of the Tippecanoe and Wabash

Rivers in 1808—around the time that Tipton emigrated to the Territory—he ministered to a distressed and frustrated people. By 1810, the Prophet's brother Tecumseh had rallied an estimated six hundred and fifty warriors to their movement along with suspected British support, although by no means did it gain universal Native American acceptance.[21]

Despite Tecumseh's admonitions to his fellow warriors to the contrary, a number of them began raiding white settlements in the Illinois country and attacking land surveyors in Indiana most notably beginning in the spring of 1811, raising fear and ire to an inescapable level and forcing Harrison to act on some level. In their talks in late July, Tecumseh and Governor Harrison could find no common ground, and this effectively extinguished the council fires between the two. Harrison decided to make his move against Prophetstown after Tecumseh freely boasted of heading south for more recruits, detailing his plans for using a combined force of regulars and militia companies to operate out of Vincennes "about the middle of September" in a letter dated 7 August to the Secretary of War William Eustis.[22]

Tipton and the Harrison County militia—Captain Spier Spencer's Yellow Jackets—departed Corydon on the afternoon of 12 September as a group comprising forty-seven men plus officers, and they were joined by other county militias and volunteers. Also called up and moving toward Vincennes was the Fourth Regiment of the U.S. Infantry from Fort Independence at Boston Harbor of which Josiah Bacon was a quartermaster. These represent the usual elements of the history of the Tippecanoe era; not only a man's war and a man's military, but also a one-dimensional interplay between natives and whites. Yet, the assemblage converging upon Vincennes for the start of the "Indian campaign" also included women and children, such as Bacon's wife, Lydia whose writing makes it clear that women performed a "tour of duty" during this period too. Soldiers' wives' involvement and

observations in the Old Northwest constitute a largely ignored dimension of the social history of the region despite their ability to round out the experiences of men like Tipton. Collective accounts reveal the extent to which the period's brutality was a *shared* experience in Tipton's world and to which native-white relations and Indian wars were enmeshed within frontier society, across gender lines. Women and children paid a toll as well. Soldiers' wives performed vital supporting roles and their lives were often in jeopardy, a situation perhaps best summed up in Lydia's words: "we hope for the best, & expect the worst." These accounts broaden the historical perspective by demonstrating cross-gender participation in frontier affairs including wars while also serving as reminders, for example, that many of the men involved were, like twenty-five-year-old Tipton, married men and fathers who had lives and attachments beyond the moment.[23]

John Tipton's journal of the seventy-four-day campaign, spanning 12 September to 24 November is arguably the most comprehensive rendering of the Tippecanoe battle and the militia activities leading up to it. It is also reflective of the widespread lack of formal schooling available to the frontier people. Tipton's journal is replete with inconsistent phonic spelling as well as what could be judged an unsophisticated use of the English language. For example, returning to camp after a scouting tour for signs of Indian presence, he wrote "no sine seed" for "no sign seen." One account has questioned the accuracy of Tipton's geographic references, even suggesting that "Some of that whisky which was so often issued to the men affected his geography." Nevertheless, historical authorities have adjudged it to be "a coherent and accurate document." Juxtaposed with Tipton's journal is that of Lydia Bacon which appears to offer the only account that has been brought to light of women experiencing Tippecanoe, although perhaps more exist than are currently known. In

these and others the harshness and extremity of frontier life in the western world is discernible in the tolls taken on men, women, and families during this period.[24]

In a landscape overrun with sporadic warfare as it was the fall of 1811, the battlefield itself was only one of several scenes of endurance, privation, and hardship, and was in fact the shortest of the nightmares. According to Tipton, it encompassed two hours and twenty minutes of "a continewel firing." The bulk of the militia's time in the Tippecanoe campaign was consumed by troop movement (marching), provisioning, and battle preparations that in this case also included the construction of Fort Harrison near present-day Terre Haute, Indiana and a blockhouse further on north toward Prophetstown. Tipton noted that a day's march in the cold, wet fall season on Harrison's line of march was anywhere from seven to thirteen to thirty miles. The men often "mooved Early," camped in cornfields, and occasionally had to "lay without fire this evening." Isaac Naylor, who would later become a circuit judge in Indiana, recalled that in his experience as a member of a company of riflemen during the campaign he marched close to 120 miles in about six days. Charles Larrabee of the Fourth U.S. Infantry remarked in a series of letters to his cousin Adam Larrabee that the march dragged on at a slow pace so that the scouting parties would "have time to examin all places where it was likely Indians might be secreted." He moreover contended that "marching against Indians" as opposed to "an army under discipline" forced the soldiers to "under go thribble [thrice] the fatigue" due to the wilderness factor.[25]

Indeed in shifting migration and Euro-American settlement northwest of the Ohio River, westward expansion created a wilderness theater or "crucible," to borrow from historian R. Douglas Hurt in his study entitled *The Ohio Frontier*, wherein the development of the Old Northwest and the stability of the region's people would be continually

challenged. As Larrabee indicated, the wilderness played a significant part in the Tippecanoe campaign which is evident in everything from the tedious troop movement to primitive living conditions to struggling to maintain the slim provisions. The duties that Tipton described in his journal—caring for the horses, marching, hunting, guarding and scouting, mustering and parading, constructing a garrison and blockhouse, fixing guns and wagons—were not out of the ordinary in terms of soldiering; however, many of the problems that challenged the campaign stemmed from being in the remote western country. Given that the campaign stretched throughout the fall the weather made the sparse shelter a miserable circumstance for the participants. Tipton frequently remarked about the rain, wind, cold, frost, and snow; in his 19 October entry, he wrote that "it stopt Raining and Began to Snow and Blow hard...it was the Disagreeablest night I ever saw," and in other places he wrote about feeling "very cold." Tipton and others noted that men sickened, some died and morale suffered. Already in early October he recorded that "Some men wants to go home," and the number of desertions accelerated. Management of horses and oxen was a vexing responsibility for Tipton who was frequently sent to round up those that became separated or missing from the group. That frustration however, as many things were, was compounded by whiskey-drinking. After mustering on 15 October, and after some drinking with another soldier, Tipton observed that he and his comrade had "Lost our horses found them a mile down the river then went to Drink [again.] Lost two horses again found them half a mile off."[26]

The most immediate challenge posed by the western country on the daily lives of the military men was in the area of provisioning and rationing. Throughout the campaign Tipton recorded the drawing of rations which on occasion would be corn and potatoes, or "whisky and floir [flour]," or "flour, whisky, and pickled pork," or "corn beef, whisky, flour[,] soap &

candles." Whisky was the common ingredient, and Tipton noted receiving anywhere from a quart to a gallon in a day; this would often lead to quarreling. Yet from the start rations were difficult to maintain, and hunger persisted. On 1 October Tipton wrote that the men drew whisky and flour, "but no corn since 29[th] of last month." Daily rations were supposed to entail twenty ounces of beef or twelve ounces of pork, eighteen ounces of flour or bread, four ounces of rum, brandy, or whisky, and small amounts of salt, vinegar, soap, and candles. Several sources noted the failure of contractors to supply the troops with food because of being unable to make the delivery, a situation that also threatened the success of the campaign. On 13 October Harrison wrote to the Secretary of War that the on-hand provisions were "by no means sufficient and the means of land transportation" were "altogether inadequate." Subsequently, on 19 October Harrison announced a reduction in the amount of the flour ration from eighteen to twelve ounces. The effect was immediately obvious to Tipton; two days later he noted, "We supt last night on a bit of bread about as big as a man's [two] fingers and this morning on venison without bread." According to Larrabee the contractor came under considerable criticism, yet he believed that it was hard to overlook the fact that the man was compelled to "transport the most of the provisions 600 miles."[27]

Up to this point, the militia had succeeded in supplementing the rations through their hunting and foraging skills. Tipton and others helped themselves to the numerous bee trees for honey and also brought in deer, pheasant, turkeys, pigeons, and fish. Larrabee related to his cousin that "the Militia are excellent hunters, and are seen coming into camp with deer and honey, both of which this part of the wourld abounds in." Some of the Kentucky and Indiana militia companies particularly impressed Adam Walker, also of the Fourth U.S. Infantry, although he found that the "large knife and hatchet which constituted a part of their

equipment, with their dress, gave them a rather savage appearance." Along with game, pasturage for the horses was plentiful as well. To Larrabee's dismay, however, the men were "much in want of vegetables." The militia also knew how to entertain themselves in camp. Tipton recorded the shooting games for whisky and money, and that one evening he got "goosed." Another evening two Delaware chiefs came into camp and played cards with the men. Other diversions included the holding of elections as well as the practice of a limited degree of personal hygiene; on 24 October Tipton was able to wash his clothes for the first time since perhaps even before the campaign began on 12 September.[28]

Although overlooked by scholars in terms of contributions to and participation in the Tippecanoe campaign, women were both a presence and an influence here; and, while Tipton's journals do not mention them, others do and a full accounting of the campaign would incorporate their experiences. One reason for this oversight may have to do with classification. When the *Indiana Magazine of History* chose to publish Lydia Bacon's journal in 1944, the document's editor described its value primarily as an early nineteenth-century travel account about the West that was written by a woman instead of a man. While it was certainly that, the significance of *why* Bacon was "traveling" was lost. Indeed given her clearly articulated sense of duty in being a partner with her husband on his soldier's errand, one might easily expect her to bristle at that classification. In one of the letters to her mother in January of 1812, following the campaign, she expressed that she was "a little vexed, with those wives you mentioned, in your letter, who would prefer, staying at home, rather than suffer a little inconvenience[.] [W]hat did they get married for[?]."[29]

Tippecanoe was a shared experience that for Lydia Bacon began earlier than for Tipton and the Yellow Jackets. On 9 May 1811 Lydia accompanied her husband Lieutenant

Josiah Bacon, a quartermaster, and the Fourth Regiment of the U.S. Infantry from Fort Independence, Massachusetts, to Philadelphia. There, several of the women proceeded to Pittsburgh via stage while the soldiers took up the line of march. On 26 June they arrived but only after a harrowing experience on the stage that rivaled the conditions of the soldiers' march. "The Stages," she wrote, "were very bad" and they were "obliged to walk the horses up the Mountains several miles together." "[J]ust imagine to yourselfe," she went on, "Lydia, seated on one side of [the] stage, for the benefit of the [landscape] view, holding on with both hands, exerting *every nerve* to maintain my Equilibrium, on one side of me, my neighbours elbow pushing in to my side, on the other...till I was black and blue, & bounce would go my poor head, against the top of the Stage, till my brains were ready to fly." They arrived to find small but comfortable military quarters which they occupied pleasantly until receiving orders to go to Newport, Kentucky via the Ohio River because, as she explained to her mother, "the Indians are committing depradations upon the White inhabitants who are located on our Frontiers, & the Govener of Indiana has requested some regular Troops to keep them quiet." They embarked in a convoy of eleven keel boats on 2 August.[30]

As the journey continued, Bacon's writings revealed more about the world of soldier's wives. One of them, she noted, gave birth in the night to a baby girl in a tent on the river bank. Prior to this one of the infants in the party died. Soldiers' wives were more than companions; some, like Bacon, had provisioning responsibilities. She wrote that they routinely bought eggs and butter along the way saying that "we get them cheap & good," although this was sometimes difficult to effect. On 8 August Bacon went ashore near a house in hopes of purchasing butter but western frontier culture took her by surprise. When she inquired of the "Lady" of the house if she had any to spare for purchase, her offhanded

reply was that in the course of making soap that day she had run out of grease and had made up the difference with butter. Bacon later commented: "fine Country[,] thought I[,] where people take butter for soap grease." She also maintained qualms about being expected to drink the river water "when I see the dirt that is thrown in to it." On 9 August they arrived in Newport and in less than a month they received orders to proceed further down the Ohio and then to ascend the Wabash to reach Vincennes in Indiana Territory.[31]

Bacon became part of Tipton's world of military preparations immediately upon arrival but, like many of the soldiers, she arrived suffering from the "fever Ague" which she described as a "tedious painful disease." The proffered remedy was a medicine that induced vomiting, however its potency was such that she only needed to place it by her bedside without even ingesting it because "the sight & smell had the desired effect." Under Harrison's command, the troops left Vincennes on 26 September to begin the march to Prophetstown that would include a stop to build Fort Harrison along the way. Bacon and the other wives remained at Fort Knox (Vincennes) with the "Invalid Soldiers;" because of an eye injury, Bacon's husband would join the troops several weeks later.[32]

Beyond assisting in the care of the sick and the children present, it is unclear how the wives occupied their time aside from wrestling with an obvious great anxiety about their husbands, but also to some degree about their own safety. They were quite exposed when the troops marched "for every *thing went* that could carry a musket & left us Women & Children without even a guard." This may have been an exaggeration considering that a 13 October letter from Harrison to the Secretary of War clearly indicated the former's intention to leave a small garrison behind for this purpose. Bacon and another woman kept loaded pistols at their bedsides but doubted "if we should have been able to use them had we found it necessary."

While Bacon expressed a sense of vulnerability that was often echoed by settler women as well, Lieutenant Larrabee from the same Fourth U.S. Infantry spoke highly of the strength of the "Girls in this part of the wourld." Apparently a certain captain was given a leave of absence from Fort Harrison "on account of Cowardice" and returned to Vincennes. But the captain's humiliation was not over yet. According to Larrabee, "the Girls offered to exchange dress with him and take his sword and fill his place in the army." A 2 November letter from Harrison to the Secretary of War substantiates at least that a Captain Paul Wentworth was insistent on being allowed to return to Fort Knox (Vincennes) with the implication and some support to the effect that he was unfit for duty because of his fear of Indians. Regardless, the story bespeaks an acknowledged influence in and respect for the presence of women in the campaign.[33]

The Battle of Tippecanoe commenced in the pre-dawn hours of 7 November with a sudden attack by the Prophet's warriors. Harrison's troops had set up camp on a rise approximately a half-mile west of Prophetstown and, as Tipton recorded, they were startled awake that morning by the "firing of guns and the Shawnies Braking into our tents." The Prophetstown Indians were led into battle by White Loon, Stone Eater, and Winamac. Much confusion prevailed due to the lingering darkness that made it so that "we Could not tell the indians and our men apart." Larrabee thought that the Prophet's warriors fought in a "desperate" manner in their relentless charging: "thay would rush with horid [yells] in bodies upon the lines[.] [B]eing driven back, they would remain in perfect silance for a few seconds...and then commence the rush again." Around seven a.m. Tipton's group finally "maid a Charge and Drove them out of the timber across the prairie." Afterwards, they buried their dead, attended to the wounded, looked for food, fortified the camp, and planned

the next day's attack on the town. Tipton (as well as Harrison) noted that the troops lost 179 in killed and wounded which corresponds to perhaps twenty percent of the total fighting force. This number included the death of the officers of Tipton's militia, and in an election held later that day he was elected captain of the Yellow Jackets to replace the now deceased Spier Spencer.[34]

The next day's counter-attack on the town found it already deserted, but Tipton and the others located a "grait[sic] Deal of Corn and Some Dead Indians in the houses." Given the destitution of their own provisions, having lost their beef cattle and possessing at best according to Harrison only about four days of the reduced flour rations, the corn would enable the troops to head back to Fort Harrison with their wounded. Tipton helped to load six wagons with corn and burn the remaining estimated two thousand bushels found inside a large store house, along with the rest of the town that was described by another as consisting of between one and two hundred huts or cabins. Larrabee's account also mentions that beans and peas were brought back to camp and that the men "ett well." As they decamped the next day, the men's knapsacks contained some beans, corn, and flour as sustenance for their journey; indeed by 11 November Tipton wrote that their conditions had deteriorated to the point that he "lived today Chiefly on Parched corn" and others apparently ate the available horse meat.[35]

While the battle as an event was described in more than one place as a slaughter on both sides, the aftermath in terms of the destruction—the wounded, the dead, and retaliations—illustrates the extent to which westward expansion exacted a toll on the ground that continued to shape territorial society in subtle and not so subtle ways. It also evidences the fact that these events were broadly shared experiences. Having been made captain,

Tipton's responsibilities included the care of his wounded men. During the slow movement of the troops toward Fort Knox and the blockhouse they had built on the way up, Tipton brooded over his men's conditions; on 10 November he recorded that one of them had the ague "and two more sick besides 14 that is wounded and yet living which gives me much trouble." The next day he was given tents and "had my sick all laid in them." At this point he himself was seen by a doctor to have his wounds dressed, for which he offers no other information. On 13 November he helped place as many of the sick and wounded as the boats would hold. The most graphic statement of the agony endured by the wounded came from Private William Brigham of the Fourth U.S. Infantry. He noted that the near one hundred and thirty wounded men "were painfully situated in the wagons, especially those who had broken limbs, by their continual jolting, on an unbeaten road though the wilderness." Brigham was one of the wounded loaded onto the boats and sent down the river toward Vincennes. During the night his boat struck a sand bank causing the occupants to remain there until the next morning. As he recounted, that night "was passed in a very uncomfortable manner—the weather was freezing cold, and our wounds which had not been dressed for two days past, became stiff and extremely painful." Tipton would learn later that his close "Perticuler friend" George Spencer, identified in another account as Captain Spencer's brother, died of his wounds in one of those boats. His 19 November notation of this event represents a rare emotional reference in his journal. Reports of the sick and wounded who reached Fort Knox show a large number of arm and leg injuries followed by amputations.[36]

While the dead would no longer contend with Tippecanoe, their loved ones and dependents by necessity would. Harrison was mindful of their loss and need of financial

assistance, and in his lengthy report to the Secretary of War dated eleven days following the battle he emphasized that many of the men killed were married and some of these "with large families of children." He placed before the Secretary the question: "Will the bounty of their Country be withheld from their helpless orphans, many of whom will be in the most destitute condition and perhaps want even the necessities of life?" Warring's ultimate impact on society and women and children filled Lydia Bacon with a deep passion. She, along with the other wives at Fort Knox, had waited anxiously for any official communication about the conclusion of the battle. Each of them, she said, expected to hear the worst. Eventually the express arrived carrying letters to the women, but the deliverer could not bring himself to hand them out and so gave them to Bacon who, because of nerves, had to pass them on to another. Bacon described being overcome to the point of fainting at the sight of her husband's handwriting and at holding that letter in her hands. Surrounded by other women, she opened it and began to read but was only able to get to the third or fourth line before bursting into tears at finding "that my beloved Husband & others, whom I valued, had escaped without injury."[37]

Through others she learned of the battlefield tragedies and was particularly moved by the circumstances surrounding the death of Captain Spencer, the man Tipton now replaced. Spencer had allowed his son James, who is documented in the records and whom sources list as being either twelve or fourteen years of age, to accompany him on this campaign. He used a gun adapted to his size, took his turn at guard like everyone else, and was said to have fought "as well as a man." But after the battle, James was found clinging to and crying over his father's dead body; he was also slightly wounded. Bacon noted that the elder Spencer's death would leave his family poor and James' mother alone "with a great number of Children

to support." Harrison supposedly assumed young Spencer's immediate care and enabled the boy's admission to West Point that January where he would later graduate second in his class. Tipton also remained close to the Spencer family naming a son born in 1814 Spear Spencer after his former captain, naming another son born in 1827 George probably after his friend and Spear's brother, a casualty of the war, and by marrying Matilda Spencer in 1825, Tipton's second wife and the captain's daughter. The widows would not be completely bereft because within a year of Tippecanoe a relief act was passed that entitled widows, or, if none, then the related children under sixteen years, to a pension equal to one-half pay for a period of five years. The widow's entitlement was dependent upon her marital status; if she remarried before the end of the five years, the remainder of the half-pay went to those children still under sixteen years. But the war's enduring outcomes for young Spencer's family distressed Bacon. Speaking more to a society that appeared oblivious to the gendered implications of warfare rather than just to her mother in a letter, she exclaimed: "Many Widows, & Orphans, are made so, by this dreadful fight[;] when will Brother cease to lift his hand against his Brother, & learn War no more[?]"[38]

Certainly the territory's native women and children knew considerably less safety and security than did the women and children at Fort Knox. Indeed their experiences during the era of Tippecanoe and its aftermath were more along the lines of settler women and children in that the hostilities were brought right to their doors and yards. Several soldiers' accounts of the Tippecanoe campaign observed native women and children in the town as the men approached it. An Ottawa named Shabonee, one of Tecumseh's lieutenants and scouts during the Tippecanoe campaign who also later became a Potawatomi chief, offered one of the few known native accounts of Tippecanoe although parts of it are specious. He recalled

that the women and children waited in town on the day of the battle "for victory and its spoils" and hoped for white prisoners whom they would use as slaves. Instead, he said, their town was burned to the ground and women and children "were hunted like wolves and killed by hundreds or driven into the river and swamps to hide." Yet, none of the soldiers' accounts nor any of Harrison's letters or reports referred to aggression against the women and children or even to taking the battle into the town. In fact one account specifically states that the women and children had "saved themselves by crossing the river during the engagement." Moreover, when the soldiers descended upon the Prophetstown on 8 November, the day after the battle, the accounts consistently and repeatedly stated that the inhabitants had already fled with the exception of an older "squaw."[39]

Shabonee's characterization of events would more accurately reflect the American military's treatment of native women and children in the period that followed Tippecanoe, in the raiding, burning, and destroying that came to characterize the western theater of the War of 1812 and life within the territory. In actuality each side staged raids against the other after Tippecanoe which would continue until the Americans soundly defeated the combined British and Native American forces at the Battle of Thames (just north of Lake Erie) on 5 October 1813. Nevertheless when Harrison instituted a policy whereby U.S. troops were sent to destroy Native American villages in the northeastern part of the territory, native women and children were afforded little protection from military aggression. One such series of campaigns was carried out by Lieutenant Colonel John B. Campbell in mid-December 1812 against the essentially unfortified Miami and Delaware villages and dwellings along the Mississinewa River. Before dawn on 17 December, Campbell and about six hundred troops from Ohio approached the town "undiscovered" and rushed in, killing eight warriors and

taking forty-two prisoners, all but eight of whom were women and children. His report stated that he "ordered the town to be immediately burnt, a house or two excepted, in which I confined the prisoners, and ordered the cattle and other stock to be shot." The troops then left the village and moved further down the river to destroy other Miami towns that had apparently been alerted as to the Americans' purpose and were thus abandoned. Yet Campbell still believed his efforts to be a success. He reported to Harrison that he had "burnt three considerable villages, [taken] several horses and killed a great many cattle, and returned to the town I first burnt, where I had left the prisoners." Another report revealed the assumption that capturing native women and children was part of the plan since they obviously would be the largest contingent present: "The object of the expedition being accomplished, which was to take prisoners and destroy the Indian towns..." After clashing with native warriors the next day, however, the Americans returned to Ohio.[40]

Scenes of destruction in the form of burned-out homes, villages, and settlements, along with ravaged farms, livestock, and food stores blighted parts of the territory's landscape and framed the westerners' world in one way or another. For the settlers fear, anxiety, living under siege or defensive fortifications, guarded activities and labor, curtailed family and community life, pervasive loss and death, all became second nature which means that to fully understand the West during the early republic it is necessary to continue examining the interplay between the militia and society. Settlers coped in various ways. A traveler to Tipton's southern Indiana named David Thomas observed, for example, that many had adapted their homes toward fortification by removing the roofs and adding a second floor that extended out over the first floor and in which they had cut slits through which they could shoot at raiders and defend their property. Thomas counted dozens like this on the road

between Louisville and Vincennes. Settlers demanded protection from militia members like Tipton in order to continue working their farms, and they also sought a level of compensation by the government for the excessive toll on their lives that frontier living exacted through relief petitions, as Tipton himself would do.[41]

Combating Indian raiding and protecting farm settlements absorbed much of Tipton's time after Tippecanoe through 1813. Upon Harrison's dissolution of the Tippecanoe campaign brigade on 18 November 1811, Tipton left Vincennes and "got safe Home" to his family on the 24th and attempted to pick up where he left off in two areas. In the first, Tipton resumed his pursuit of seeking public offices. A few months prior to the campaign, on 20 June 1811, he had received a commission to be one of the justices of the peace for Harrison County which gave Tipton his first working relationship with both the law and the legal system. As a justice, his responsibilities entailed keeping the peace, ensuring that the laws and ordinances designed to keep the peace were adhered to, and either chastising or punishing through fines or imprisonment those who broke the peace. Specifically, territorial laws stipulated that justices presided over matters involving common law petit crimes and misdemeanors, issued warrants, arrested rioters, investigated the murders, treasons, and felonies committed within the county, and sought sureties for the good behavior of idle, vagrant, and disorderly persons, as well as gamblers and swindlers. One year later, Tipton resigned this commission to accept that of the county's deputy sheriff, serving in this capacity until September 1816 when he sought and received the sheriff's commission. He held this position until 1820. As sheriff, Tipton embodied the long arm of the law in a more assertive manner than that of justice of the peace, and it was a public role for which his militia experience ably prepared him. He held these public offices concurrently with his

ongoing militia duties demonstrating how territorial society continued to strive forward even while in the midst of debilitating scattered warfare.[42]

In the second area, Tipton apparently went back to working his land, the nature of which is unclear except that his signature appears on two petitions: the first on 15 June 1812 seeking relief from Congress for payments on public land, and the second, indicating he was a squatter, on 1 February 1814 asking Congress to recognize the signers' pre-emption rights. Articulating their anxieties as well as frustrations with the government for its thin defense of the territorial frontier, Tipton and the others emphasized their sacrifices in taking up and trying to defend their lands against Indian aggression which included incurring physical attacks and wounds. All of this, they contended, actually worked to the government's benefit because they had taken up their own defense at their own expense. In return the petitioners sought protection of another kind—that is, a financial guarantee. In the second petition, for example, the signers wanted the right to enter their lands at two dollars an acre without forcing them to risk price inflation as a result of public sale. Congressional action on these petitions is undetermined, but according to county land records Tipton purchased a farm of just over sixty-two acres from John Brinley in 1814, near the location of his earlier ferry business.[43]

Frontier defense seemed to be the order of the day and a society-wide preoccupation. Just five months after Tippecanoe, on 16 April 1812, Harrison as commander-in-chief issued a military circular for militia members, alerting them to native hostilities on the frontiers and urging them to "take immediate measures" to get their commands in the best possible state of readiness. He instructed that Indians who committed mischief must be pursued by the officer closest to the scene "with vigor" who should then report the incident. Harrison further

recommended to citizens of the territory's southern frontiers including the Driftwood settlement in Harrison County to immediately construct "blocked houses or picketed forts" in which to dwell. Finally, he warned the native people who have heretofore professed friendship to the settlers to "keep clear of the settlements," although he asked the settlers to show as much forbearance as possible toward the Delawares.[44]

Tipton, who was promoted to Captain of a rifle company in the fifth regiment of Indiana's territorial militia that March and then to Major two months later, saw more defensive rather than offensive action in his 1812 militia activities. That summer, Tipton led two expeditions that were organized to guard frontier settlements both of which he described in journals. In the first expedition which lasted but twelve days, Tipton's company of twenty-eight men departed Corydon on 19 May, marching twelve miles in the rain the first day and forty miles to Fort Alexander at Vallonia the second. He noted that they "ware kindly Recievd" by the inhabitants, but thought that the "musketeers" were troublesome. Apart from guard duties and searching out the surrounding countryside for signs of hostile natives, Tipton wrestled with an unspecified pain in his side for which he was bled. Yet, he also managed to drink quite a bit of whisky, grog, and French brandy with his men and to participate in sham fights.[45]

The second expedition, which began on 2 July, originated with settlers' letters to Tipton and militia member requesting protection along the Driftwood fork of the White River as they harvested their crops, and also offering the company to share in a July Fourth dinner with them. This time, Tipton and his men performed the usual guarding duties as well as some agricultural labor in assisting with the pulling and lifting of flax. Flax was grown in patches and was fairly widely cultivated, mainly for use in the home manufacturing of cloth,

specifically for the tow linen used for gun cloths, towels, shirts, pants, and everyday dresses and for the finer linen used in more formal clothing. The company did not neglect its typical militia regimen of hunting, fishing, shooting games, and seemingly endless drinking, sometimes with injurious consequences. Tipton related that after breakfast and whisky one morning on their return trip, the men took to shooting and caused one of the horses to bolt and throw off the rider who broke his gun and "hurt him[self] verry much." When Tipton finally arrived home on 22 July he seemed disappointed at being gone twenty days and having done "no good after Indians." Tipton's expeditions and campaigns required frequent absences from home and suggest a significant social consequence in terms of its broader effect on the men and especially on their wives and families. The Tippecanoe campaign, for example, kept Tipton away from his home near Corydon seventy-four days, while these two summer expeditions caused him to be gone the equivalent of one month out of three. As Lydia Bacon expressed concerning the widows and orphans made by Tippecanoe and the frontier Indian wars in general, society's less visible members endured a kind of vulnerability and isolated life that the men did not. Scholars of the period tend to focus on the region's military history without fully exploring its social consequences.[46]

Tipton and his men may not have encountered any hostile natives during the summer expeditions but in fact the situation was worsening, and one Indian raid in particular, the Pigeon Roost massacre, would reverberate throughout the territory and the region in a way that resembled how rumors and reports of bloody slave insurrections inspired widespread terror among southerners. S. R. Beggs, a minister, was twelve years old at the time and recalled his vivid fears later in life: "I expected the savages would kill me [and] felt that I was not prepared to die." Perhaps more than any other civilian attack and much like

Tippecanoe, Pigeon Roost lingered in Indiana's social memory as a reminder of the hardship, brutality, and perseverance that was both endured and overcome by the territory's early settlers.[47]

Pigeon Roost was a small, unprotected settlement that was founded in 1809 and located several counties to the north of Tipton and Harrison County, in what is now Scott County. Its name is said to have derived from the large numbers of pigeons that "roosted" there. Up to this point, local native-white relations had been relatively peaceful, as one nearby resident put it: "We enjoyed peace, but not without fear," until about April 1812. As tensions escalated settlers built three blockhouses in the area—five, six, and eight miles distant—yet none in the settlement itself. A settler named John Kimberlin provided one of several accounts of the massacre which in general concur although he chooses to spell Collings as Collins. He stated that at around four o'clock in the afternoon of 3 September 1812 about a dozen raiders, identified elsewhere as Shawnees and perhaps some Delawares, commenced a surprise brutal attack on the settlement, the memory of which he said "can never be effaced." The warriors "attacked," "assassinated," and "butchered" the residents leaving a bloody trail from one dwelling to the next, beginning with the Elias Payne family. Some, like Henry Collins, were shot while working in the field pulling flax, others including fleeing children were hunted until killed and their bodies mutilated. Particularly "merciless" to Kimberlin was the intrusion upon the Richard Collins domicile. Like many of the other male settlers, Collins was away on a campaign, and his wife and seven children were unable to successfully defend themselves. Repeated in numerous accounts and reports, the details of their killings were horrifying, suggesting an expression of racial hatred usually reserved for

Euro-Americans. Another woman whose husband was away on military service sought safety with her two children in a sinkhole in an adjacent cornfield and survived.[48]

As the alarm spread throughout the settlement, the raiders finally encountered resistance in their attack on the home of the settlement's leader William Collins, and four of them were shot and killed, another wounded. Kimberlin credits Jane Biggs, wife of John Biggs, with "the heroism of woman" in going for help. One account related that she had taken her children to bring in their cow for milking. Concerned about the gunfire she heard coming from William Collins' place, she "concealed her children" in the woods and snuck out to determine the source with her infant. Observing the raiders Biggs struggled to mute the cries of her baby with a shawl only to discover later that she had suffocated it. It is unclear whether she then ran the two miles to the home of Robert Biggs around midnight or the five miles to Zebulon Collings' blockhouse. Regardless, her efforts led to the forming of a party of male settlers who shortly thereafter arrived upon the scene—but after the last attack. The murders had been accompanied by the ransacking and strewing of household items across the yards and the burning of homes. Cattle had also been shot through with arrows and bullets, and their frantic bellowing and movement had alerted some settlers to the attack, allowing them to escape to the closest blockhouse. By three o'clock the following morning, the raiders had fled and another group attacked and burned Fort Harrison on 4 September giving the impression to Acting Governor John Gibson that "a general attack is greatly to be apprehended."[49]

The initial party organized in response was joined in its pursuit of the raiders by approximately six hundred volunteer militiamen from Indiana and Kentucky, and while some of the settlers' belongings were soon recovered, the raiders were not. In the end, nine women

and men and fifteen children were killed in the raid. Isaac Naylor, previously mentioned as a participant in the Battle of Tippecanoe, arrived upon the scene with other mounted riflemen within twelve hours of the Indians' departure, around two o'clock in the afternoon on 4 September. The scene of "desolation, carnage and death" that greeted them reminded him of Tippecanoe—only worse. He remembered "the Tippecanoe battle-fields strewn with dead and dying soldiers," how they had "fallen in deadly strife with a savage foe whom they had conquered." There, each had fought and fallen in a soldier's "costume" and was "entitled to a soldier's grave. Not so in the Pigeon Roost massacre." What Naylor and the others witnessed at the settlement was, he said, "indiscriminate slaughter, from the sucking babe to the hoary-headed grandmother."[50]

Pigeon Roost, like Tippecanoe, resonated throughout territorial society and the military in ways not fully appreciated by scholars. The raid's brutality and its victims, for example, prompted several reactions related to the fact that settlers there had not built a blockhouse, revealing an assumption that settlers were expected to assist in their own defense. In fact, blockhouses quickly went up after the word spread about the massacre. Pigeon Roost resident Kimberlin and others regretted their false sense of security and that they had not been "more zealous in keeping in readiness a protecting fort." A fort and just "five men of us," Kimberlin believed, could have defeated the raiders and spared the lives lost. In a 12 September letter to Colonel William Hargrove of the rangers, Gibson expressed harsh exasperation with the "twenty-four foolish people" murdered at Pigeon Roost and absolved the local Clark County militia from any blame. Unfairly suggesting that they had made victims of themselves, Gibson decried the "venturesome people...in all sections of the country [who] cause their own destruction and keep the country in a great turmoil."[51]

From his perspective in trying to manage a region at war, settlers who failed to protect themselves strained the already thin—and rapidly thinning—militia defense resource. In a follow-up letter to Hargrove, Gibson again castigated the "fool-hardy people" for having made "no attempt at preparing a place fore defense" and ordered him to seek out other such settlers. In places where at least three families resided, they must build a fort, and Hargrove was admonished to "see that they do it." Where fewer than three families resided in an isolated area, they must be moved to where they can be protected, and, revealing a sense of the prevalence of men away on militia duty, to "where the men of these families can help protect others." Pigeon Roost also caused anxiety among local militia about those members being called out to serve elsewhere, and this would put Tipton, as Major, in an awkward position. On 12 September he received regimental orders to immediately order out thirty-six men from his battalion, and if volunteers were not forthcoming he was to draft them, according to territorial law. Sentiment against these kinds of moves is found in a letter signed by four Harrison County militia men. The writers beseeched the territorial governor to allow those drafted out of the local militia to return and serve their tour of duty closer to home by assisting in the guarding of their own frontiers. Indians appeared to be preparing for an attack on local exposed settlements and had already done so at Pigeon Roost, not only destroying the inhabitants but also causing many settlers to move away. If the Driftwood settlement "breaks up," they cautioned, "there is a great many that will move from this place also."[52]

Tipton's militia activities after Tippecanoe and the events surrounding the Pigeon Roost massacre exemplify how the War of 1812 played out in the Indiana Territory and in the West, until the October 1813 American victory at the Battle of the Thames. After this,

Americans essentially controlled the West, and local hostilities receded. Both suggest that settlers including Tipton and the local militia exerted an under-recognized influence in this period of warfare in the Old Northwest, and their responses and adaptations to their experiences remain largely unexplored. Zebulon Collings, one of the massacre's survivors, described its effect upon how he lived afterwards and the survival strategies he developed. He wrote that the "manner in which I used to work" necessitated that "[o]n all occasions I carried my rifle, tomahawk, and butcher knife in my belt." His farming was done in the shadow of the natives' tomahawks; "[w]hen I went to plow I laid my gun on the plowed ground and stuck a stick by it for a mark so that I could get it quick in case it was needed." For further protection Collings kept "two good dogs," one outside and one inside such that the outside dog's barking at an intruder would agitate the inside dog to bark and thus alert him to possible trouble. For two years following the massacre at his settlement, he "never went from home with any certainty of returning, not knowing the minute I might receive a ball from an unknown hand." Tipton may have been among the local militia volunteers who, like Naylor, immediately rode up to Pigeon Roost to offer defensive support. His documented connection to the massacre, however, is in the senate bill he later introduced on Kimberlin's behalf on 31 December 1833 for relief in the form of one hundred and fifty dollars to cover the provisions and forage used by those volunteers. The measure was approved the following year.[53]

Tipton's preoccupation with militia affairs and frontier defense continued through 1813 and 1814. In early February 1813 he was put in command of companies from the 2nd and 5th regiments who, along with other divisions, were now responsible for establishing and maintaining a line of blockhouses as protection for the residents and to keep up constant

communication between them. The next month, Tipton undertook a brief offensive expedition with twenty-nine chosen men against marauding natives who had been terrorizing citizens living in frontier areas of Harrison and Clark counties. Moving twenty-five miles up the Driftwood River, Tipton's men came upon the trail of about fifteen Indians with the eleven horses they had stolen. They followed the trail to an island in the river where the Indians had encamped and crossed to meet them head on. The Indians greeted them with gunfire which was returned for about twenty minutes, with one of their number killed and an indeterminate number wounded before being forced off the island by Tipton's group. Tipton noted that from the number of new rafts being made on the island, the natives clearly intended to launch new attacks. In mid-April, after several whites were killed and more horses stolen, he set out again with another group of thirty men. This expedition was plagued by daily heavy rains, many creeks and streams that had to be "rafted" or waded through, and insubordination that cost them the element of surprise. But for a time the island was called Tipton's Island.[54]

Tipton's report to Acting Governor Gibson conveyed an acquired knowledge of both military and Indian policy in his expressed concerns about defending Harrison and Clark counties. If more effective measures were not taken, he warned, these counties would "break." Moreover if the rumors were true that rangers would be sent in to dismiss the militia, "our case is a dangerous one, as it is hard for mounted men to range through the swamps and backwaters" of the area. The expeditions were arduous, the last one requiring them to live three days on a little venison without bread. As to the culprits, Tipton emphasized to Gibson that the Delawares could no longer be counted on for friendship, even if they were only harboring the raiders. He ventured his disagreement with a policy whereby

the government "was supporting one part of that tribe [while] the others were murdering our citizens." According to Tipton, the settlers had grown weary of the attacks, and were "living between hope and despair, waiting to know their doom."[55]

Yet one should not be left with the impression that settlers possessed a fatalistic outlook upon their situation despite the weight of fear and anxiety. As Zebulon Collings illustrated with his dogs, they developed coping strategies. John Ketchum, a former ranger and resident of the area called the "Forks" (between the Muscackituck and the Driftwood forks of the White River) who served with Tipton locally, recalled that during the raiding period about fifty families left the territory. But fifteen to eighteen tough-minded families accustomed themselves to living in the forts and blockhouses and to working their lands in companies; "some stood sentinel, while others worked." Although he agreed that the citizens of Harrison and Clark counties looked to be "Indian bait" in their isolation, he believed that those who moved to the forts or blockhouses sent a message to the hostile natives "that we would sooner fight a little than quit our location." Ketchum said that many if not most of the fort dwellers were actually squatters determined to work and keep their lands in hopeful anticipation of pre-emption rights. Generally speaking those in whom fear prevailed left the territory; but those who endured, Ketchum explained, *hardened*, some deciding to return to their home a short distance from the fort and having a night of music and dancing—even as their horses were promptly stolen.[56]

During this period, Tipton continued to gain the favor of military authorities with two more commissions, that of Lieutenant Colonel on 4 June 1813 and Colonel on 22 April 1814, the latter being given him at the age of twenty-eight years. Even though the American victory at the Battle of the Thames effectively ended the widespread native-white hostilities

in the West, sporadic conflicts erupted and Tipton would remain active within the militia for a number of years. With the war's end the focus in Indian affairs in Indiana was shifting away from warfare to the disposition of Indian lands, and this would represent a major turning point in Indiana's history from the standpoint of the native peoples as well as the settlers. He would have a hand in this as well within a decade. By 1816, the year of Indiana's statehood, Tipton assumed a more visible local role as Harrison County's sheriff. For many settlers it was now time to pursue full-time what they had originally come to do in Indiana—to continue the process of making over of a part of the West for themselves.[57]

On one level, the Battle of Tippecanoe may not have accomplished much from a military perspective, as historian Andrew R. L. Cayton and others have pointed out. Native American resistance was not crushed, Prophetstown was rebuilt (then re-burned, abandoned, and not at all impressive as of Tipton's return visit a decade later), raiding parties proliferated and wreaked fear, havoc and mayhem on both sides, and an American victory yielded no peace. Yet, as has been observed here, a strict military analysis of Tippecanoe overshadows the social history of the era and diminishes what the event meant to the participants *and* to the larger territorial society. To the settlers, according to one historian writing in 1900, the "victory" demonstrated that despite the horrendous loss in wounded and killed, Americans could beat an attack—even a sudden attack—by Native Americans in the territory. It just failed to turn the tide of power and control as Harrison and his men had hoped. And finally, in measuring the battle primarily upon the strength of objectives and outcomes, we lose sight of this period as one of shared experiences.[58]

NOTES—CHAPTER TWO

[1] John Tipton, Tippecanoe Journal, 31 October entry, John Tipton Papers, Collection no. L-160, Indiana State Library, Box 1, Folder 3 (hereafter cited as Tipton MSS); many of the Tipton papers including the Tippecanoe journal were published in three volumes as Nellie Armstrong Robertson and Dorothy Riker, eds., *The John Tipton Papers* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1942), references in this chapter all refer to volume 1; in addition, some of Tipton's journals were also published separately such as "John Tipton's Tippecanoe Journal," *Indiana Magazine of History* 2 (December 1906): 170-84.

[2] A good description of native-white relations as it pertained to territorial Indiana society is found in James H. Madison, *The Indiana Way* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 36-46; with regards to the "unsettling" of the native population in favor of white settlers, Andrew Cayton calls the second decade of the nineteenth century "a watershed" in the state's history and notes the emergence of "an atmosphere of solidity about the white American presence," in Andrew R. L. Cayton, *Frontier Indiana* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998, 261; for Richard White's essential analysis of the "politics of benevolence," see Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), chapter 11; an informative source that focuses on the native perspective of Tippecanoe, the pan-Indian movement, and relations with the British through the War of 1812 is R. David Edmonds, *The Shawnee Prophet* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983).

[3] Thomas Jefferson to Governor William H. Harrison, 27 February 1803, is printed in Albert Ellery Bergh, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson,* vol. X (Washington: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Assoc., 1903), 368-73; an in-depth explanation of Jefferson's letter to Harrison (and others) is given in Anthony F. C. Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians: The Tragic Fate of the First Americans* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999), chapter 7; the text of Harrison's treaties are found in *American State Papers*, Indian Affairs, vol. 1, 687-8, 689-90, 693-5, 696-7, 704-5, 761-3; the classic reference on land cession treaties chronologically and by "tribes" is Charles C. Royce, *Indian Land Cessions in the United States* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900; reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1971), (see plate cxxvi); Robert M. Owens, "Jeffersonian Benevolence on the Ground: The Indian Land Cession Treaties of William Henry Harrison," *Journal of the Early Republic* 22 (Fall 2002): 435.

[4] Royce, *Indian Land Cessions*, 676-79, plate cxxvi; Alfred A. Cave, "The Shawnee Prophet, Tecumseh, and Tippecanoe: A Case Study of Historical Myth-Making," *Journal of the Early Republic* 22 (Winter 2002): 648-49; Elmer Barce, "General Harrison and the Treaty of Fort Wayne, 1809," *Indiana Magazine of History* 11 (December 1915): 352-4; Edmunds, *Shawnee Prophet*, 80-93; for more on the attempt at pan-Indian unity see R. David Edmunds, *Tecumseh and the Quest for Indian Leadership* (Boston: Little, Brown, Co., 1984); George Dewey Harmon notes that between the Treaty of Greenville (1795) to the Fort Wayne Treaty (1809), a period of 14 years, the federal government acquired by treaty nearly 110 million acres of land, more than half of which was in the Ohio Valley, in George Dewey Harmon, *Sixty Years of Indian Affairs: Political, Economic, and Diplomatic, 1789-1850* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941), chapter 8 (above reference is on page 91 for Tecumseh quote see Benjamin Drake, *Life of Tecumseh* (Cincinnati: E. Morgan, 1841; reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1969), 129 (page reference is to reprint edition).

[5] James H. Merrell, "American Nations, Old and New: Reflections on Indians and the Early Republic," in Frederick E. Hoxie, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, eds., *Native Americans and the New Republic* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999), 333-53.

[6] Although her study concentrates on women settlers who were part of the westward movement onto the prairies considerably *after* the end of the War of 1812, Glenda Riley has argued that "shared experiences and responses of frontierswomen constituted a 'female frontier,'" and that gender was the overriding determinant of their "responsibilities, life styles, and sensibilities." This model may be overly simplistic and even contradictory in the use of the phrase "shared experiences," because it can be equally argued that there was a considerable amount of experiences that was shared *across* gender in the pioneering experience. We may perhaps discern more about the dynamics of frontier societies if we seek cross-gender instead of gender-specific analyses; see Riley's discussion in Glenda Riley, *The Female Frontier: A Comparative View of Women on the Prairie and the Plains* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1988), chapter one; conveying the need for more research on the lives of women in the Old Northwest, R. Douglas Hurt points out that the role of women on the Ohio frontier "has not been extensively, rigorously, or critically studied" in Hurt, *Ohio Frontier*, 407.

[7] Governor Jonathan Jennings to John Tipton, Commission as Major General, 25 Jan. 1822 to 22 Oct. 1824, Box 2, Tipton Mss; Tipton is buried at the Mount Hope Cemetery in Logansport, Indiana, and images of his

gravesite can be viewed at the "Find a Grave" web site at www.findagrave.com, keyword John Tipton; an imprecise and sometimes incorrect sketch of Tipton is found in William Wesley Woollen, *Biographical and Historical Sketches of Early Indiana* (Indianapolis: Hammond & Co., 1883), 185-95.

[8] Clarence Edwin Carter, ed., *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, vol. VII, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1934-69), 7-10; territorial dimensions, migration and settlement patterns are described in Madison, *Indiana Way*, 37, 58-62 (see also the map on page 39); Collins, "John Tipton," 47-8; see also the Tipton chronology and family genealogy in Robertson and Riker, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 1, xv-xviii; Paul Gates has written a thorough though occasionally inaccurate introductory essay to Tipton's life in ibid., 3-53.

[9] Robertson and Riker, *Tipton Papers*, 4; Malcolm J. Rohrbough, *The Land Office Business: The Settlement and Administration of American Public Lands, 1789-1837* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), chapters 1 and 2 (see also the land district maps on pages 24, 28-29); William Wesley Woollen, et al, eds., *Executive Journal of the Indiana Territory, 1800-1816* (Indianapolis: Bowen-Merrill Co., 1900), 82-85; John D. Barnhart and Dorothy L. Riker, *Indiana to 1816: The Colonial Period* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau and Indiana Historical Society, 1971), 361-62; the Native American population estimate for 1800 is cited in Homer J. Webster, "William Henry Harrison's Administration of Indiana Territory," *Indiana Historical Society Publications* IV (1907): 189; another historical Native American population perspective uses fur trade records i.e. a 1764 survey that included the Great Lakes and Ohio Country regions which listed the employment of 10,000 native hunters. It is difficult to discern how close this number could approximate Webster's near 100,000 population estimate in 1800 even if non-hunter males, women, and children were factored into the fur trade survey number, but is described in Barnhart and Riker, *Indiana to 1816*, 131-32, n1 and n2; an explication of the historical landscape of Indiana's native peoples is Collins, "John Tipton," chapter 1.

[10] The Northwest Ordinance is reprinted in Henry Steele Commager, ed., *Documents of American History*, 7th ed., (NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963), 128-32; "Petition of October 1, 1800," "Legislative Petition of 1807," and the "Counter Petition of Clark County," and other related documents have been collected as Jacob Piatt Dunn, "Slavery Petitions and Papers," *Indiana Historical Society Publications*, vol. 2 (Indianapolis: Bowen-Merrill Co., 1894), 13-19, 65-66, 73-78 (quoted material is on pages 65 and 76); the extent to which the debate over the suspension of Article VI concerned territorial citizens and legislators alike can also be examined

in Gayle Thornbrough and Dorothy Riker, eds., *Journals of the General Assembly of Indiana Territory, 1805-1815* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1950); Paul Finkelman, "Evading the Ordinance: The Persistence of Bondage in Indiana and Illinois," *Journal of the Early Republic* 9 (Spring 1989): 21-52.

[11] Robertson and Riker, *Tipton Papers*, xvii; Captain Meriwether Lewis and William Clark to John Shields (Corps of Discovery discharge), 8 October 1806, Lewis to Shields (receipt of pay), 10 October 1806, Lewis to Shields (letter of recommendation), 10 October 1806, and William Henry Harrison to John Shields, 8 July 1807, Commission for Captain in the Clark County Militia are all found in Tipton MSS, Box 1, Folder 1; to locate specific references to Shields in the journals see Gary E. Moulton, ed., *The Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, August 30, 1803 – August 24, 1804* vol. 2 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986); Captain Meriwether Lewis to Secretary of War Henry Dearborn, 15 January 1807 is printed in Donald Jackson, ed., *Letters of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, With Related Documents, 1783-1854* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1962), 367; Charles G. Clarke, *Men of the Lewis and Clark Expedition* (Glendale: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1970), 53-54; Robert E. Lange, "John Shields: Lewis and Clark's Handyman Gunsmith – Blacksmith – General Mechanic – For the Expedition," *We Proceeded On* 5 (July 1979): 14-16; "Road Viewers' Report," *Record of the Court of Common Pleas for the Year 1809* July Term, Harrison County Courthouse, Corydon, Indiana. My research on Shields is ongoing.

[12]Barnhart and Riker, *Indiana to 1816*, chapters 8 and 9; George R. Wilson and Gayle Thornbrough, "The Buffalo Trace," *Indiana Historical Society Publications*, vol. 15 (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1946); George R. Wilson, *Early Indiana Trails and Surveys* (1919; reprint, Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1991), 16-32 (page references are to reprint edition); William H. Roose, *Indiana's Birthplace: A History of Harrison County Indiana* (1911; reprint, revised by Arville L. Funk, Chicago: Adams Press, 1966), 3-4 (page references are to reprint edition).

[13] "To Illinois in 1811," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* 36 (1943): 209; Louis B. Ewbank and Dorothy L. Riker, *The Laws of Indiana Territory, 1809-1816* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1934), 335-38; Logan Esarey, *History of Indiana, From Its Exploration to 1922*(Dayton: Dayton Historical Publishing Co., 1923), 239-42; Waldo G. Mitchell, "Indiana's Growth 1812-1820," *Indiana Magazine of History* 10 (December 1914): 370-71; for an account of the River Raisin military disaster, see Robert B. McAfee, *History*

of the Late War in the Western Country (1816; reprint, Bowling Green: Historical Publications Co., 1919), chapter five; characteristics of the constitutional convention delegates included four that were born in Ireland and again reflect the complexity of territorial populations, and this is found in Barnhart and Riker, *Indiana to 1816*, 443; Roose, *Indiana's Birthplace*, 3-4.

[14] George F. Pope, "Stock Mark," November 1809 and the debt note from James Shields and John Tipton to Marchal Duncan, 21 October 1809 are printed in Robertson and Riker, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 1, p. 59; Worden Pope to Tipton, "Ferry Permit," 8 October 1810 is published in Ibid., 59-60 with an explanation in note 4, but is also in Tipton MSS, Box 1, Folder 2; "Road Viewers' Reports," *Record of Common Pleas*, March and July 1809 terms; Stella Josephine Hisey, "Harrison County 1808-1825" (master's thesis, Indiana University, 1936), chapter 4; one of several sources that situate Tipton's location near Brinley's Ferry on the Ohio River is Roose, *Indiana's Birthplace*, 10-11.

[15] George Rogers Taylor, *The Transportation Revolution, 1815-1860*, vol, 4, *The Economic History of the United States* (New York: Harper and Row, 1951), chapter 2; Theodore Calvin Pease, ed., *Laws of the Northwest Territory, 1799-1800*, 287-88; "An Act To Establish and Regulate Ferries" (1807) and "An Act to Regulate County Levies" (1807) are published in Francis S. Philbrick, *Laws of the Indiana Territory, 1801-1809* (Springfield: Trustees of the Illinois State Historical Library, 1930), 352-55, 481-95; *Record of Common Pleas*, July 1809 term; an informative discussion about ferrying in Harrison County during the territorial period is found in Hisey, "Harrison County," chapter 5.

[16] Nathaniel Bolton, *A Lecture Delivered Before the Indiana Historical Society on the Early History of Indianapolis and Central Indiana* (Indianapolis: Austin H. Brown, Printer, 1853), 165.

[17] John Gibson [for William Henry Harrison] to Captain William Hargrove, 16 April 1807, in Logan Esarey, ed., *Messages and Letters of William Henry Harrison* vol. 1, 1800-1811 (New York: Arno Press, 1975), 208-09 n4; receipt is reprinted in William M. Cockrum, *Pioneer History of Indiana Including Stories, Incidents and Customs of the Early Settlers* (Oakland City, IN: Free Press Of Oakland City Journal, 1907), 202.

[18] "An Act Establishing and Regulating the Militia" (1807), Philbrick, *Laws of the Indiana Territory*, 399-425 (quoted material is on page 399); see also the Territory's legal definition of negro and mulatto in Ibid., 40; Ewbank and Riker, *Laws of the Indiana Territory, 1809-1816,* 484-85; Hisey, "Harrison County," chapter 6; a

description of the "yellow jacket" uniform is noted on a diagram of the American encampment at Tippecanoe, in "Battlefield of Tippecanoe," *Indiana Magazine of History* 2 (September 1906): 163.

[19] Esarey, *History of Indiana,* 204; Philbrick, *Laws of the Indiana Territory*, 399-425; Hisey, "Harrison County," chapter 6.

[20] Philbrick, *Laws of the Indiana Territory*, 399-425; Esarey, *History of Indiana*, 188-89.

[21] My discussion about the geography and disposition of the territory's native peoples follows Collins, "John Tipton," 53-56, 59, 60; Tecumseh itemizes Native American grievances in "Tecumseh's Speech to Governor Harrison," 20 August 1810, Esarey, *Messages and Letters of Harrison*, 463-69; for American perceptions and alarm about the movement's gathering strength see William Henry Harrison to Secretary of War William Eustis, 25 April 1810 and Michel Brouillet to William Henry Harrison, 30 June 1810, in Ibid., 417, 436-37; an example of a southern Choctaw leader who staunchly opposed Tecumseh's message is found in J. Wesley Whicker, "Tecumseh and Pushmataha," *Indiana Magazine of History* 18 (December 1922): 315-31.

[22] William Henry Harrison to Secretary of War William Eustis, 6 August 1811 and Harrison to Eustis, 7 August 1811 are in Esarey, *Messages and Letters of Harrison*, 542-46, 548-51.

[23] Tippecanoe Journal, Tipton MSS, Box 1, Folder 3; Secretary of War William Eustis to Governor William Henry Harrison, 17 July 1811, Esarey, *Messages and Letters of Harrison*, 535-36; Doug Hurt points out that as many as 200 women and children accompanied Arthur St. Clair's failed 1791 campaign and were as brutally overcome by Little Turtle's warriors as were the American military men in Hurt, *Ohio Frontier,* 114-16; Lydia Bacon's journal was published in book form under the title *The Biography of Mrs. Lydia B. Bacon* in 1856, however considerable editorial license was apparently exercised, so I use a copy of the original as found in Mary M. Crawford, ed., "Mrs. Lydia B. Bacon's Journal, 1811-1812," *Indiana Magazine of History* 40 (December 1944): 367-86 (quote is on page 377); John Tipton's genealogy shows that he had two sons, Joshua and William Henry Harrison, who died prior to Tippecanoe and a daughter named Matilda thought to have been born that year, in 1811.

[24] Tippecanoe Journal, 5 October entry, Tipton MSS; John T. Campbell, "Some Comments on Tipton's Journal," *Indiana Magazine of History* 3 (March 1907): 30-33 (quoted material is on pages 32 and 33).

[25] Tippecanoe Journal, 7 November, Tipton MSS; Isaac Naylor, "The Battle of Tippecanoe," *Indiana Magazine of History* 2 (December 1906): 163-64; C[harles] Larrabee to [Adam Larrabee], 11 December 1811 and C[harles] Larrabee to [Adam Larrabee], 5 February 1812 are published in Florence G. Watts, ed., "Lieutenant Charles Larrabee's Account of the Battle of Tippecanoe, 1811," *Indiana Magazine of History* 57 (September 1961): 223-47.

[26] Tippecanoe Journal, 7 October, 15 October, and 19 October entries, Tipton MSS.

[27] Ibid., 1 October and 21 October entries; Harrison to Secretary of War, 13 October 1811, Esarey, *Messages and Letters of Harrison*, 599-603 (quoted material is on page 600); C[harles] Larrabee to [Adam Larrabee], 5 February 1812, "Lieutenant Larrabee's Account," 239, 240; Donald R. Hickey, *The War of 1812: A Forgotten Conflict* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989), 78-79.

[28] Ibid., 239; Adam Walker, "A Journal of Two Campaigns of the Fourth Regiment of U.S. Infantry in the Michigan and Indiana Territories," (1816) is published in Esarey, *Messages and Letters of Harrison*, 697; Tippecanoe Journal, 19 September, 11 October, and 24 October entries, Tipton MSS.

[29] Crawford, "Lydia Bacon's Journal," 367-69 (quote is on page 385).

[30] Ibid., 371-73.

[31] Ibid., 374, 376-77, 379.

[32] Ibid., 379-80; Bacon recorded that Harrison paid a call upon her at Vincennes on 1 October and noted his hunting shirt made of calico and trimmed with fringe, yet he and the troops had already departed to construct Fort Harrison further up the Wabash on 26 September. Additional details that she provides however suggests that the meeting did take place although her date is off by about a week.

[33] Ibid., 383; Harrison to Secretary of War, 13 October 1811 and Harrison to Secretary of War 2 November 1811 in Esarey, *Messages and Letters of Harrison,* 601, 607; C[harles] Larrabee to [Adam Larrabee], 11 December 1811, "Lieutenant Larrabee's Account," 234.

[34] Tippecanoe Journal, 7 November entry, Tipton MSS; C[harles] Larrabee to [Adam Larrabee], 5 February 1812, "Lieutenant Larrabee's Account," 242-45; Harrison's reports of the battle are "The Battle of Tippecanoe," 7 November 1811 and Harrison to Secretary of War, 18 November 1811 in Esarey, *Messages and Letters of Harrison*, 608-13 and 618-30 respectively; see also Harrison to Secretary of War, 8 November 1811,

615, in Ibid. Harrison revises the total of men killed and wounded to 188 as an attached return to the 18 November letter in Ibid., 630-31; see also Richard G. Carlson, ed., "George P. Peters' Version of the Battle of Tippecanoe (November 7, 1811)," *Vermont History* 45(Winter 1977): 38-43; Cockrum *Pioneer History of Indiana*, 256-71.

[35] Tippecanoe Journal, 8 November – 11 November entries, Tipton MSS; Harrison to Secretary of War 8 November 1811 in Esarey, *Messages and Letters of Harrison*, 615; "Statement of William Brigham," in Walker, "Journal of Two Campaigns," 705; C[harles] Larrabee to [Adam Larrabee], 5 February 1812, "Lieutenant Larrabee's Account," 245; there is some debate as to whether the Prophet's followers were really more "allies" than converts, but one study that assesses the roles of Prophetstown and sacred power in the Native Americans' spiritual resistance movement is Timothy D. Willig, "Prophetstown on the Wabash: The Native Spiritual Defense of the Old Northwest," *The Michigan Historical Review* 23 (Fall 1997): 115-58.

[36] Tippecanoe Journal, 10 November – 19 November 1811 entries, Tipton MSS; an abstract of George Spencer's will, deemed nuncupative, reveals that prior to his death he told fellow private Mason Carter that he wanted all of his real and personal property given to the four younger children of a woman named Ruth Walker of Nelson County, Kentucky; others understood the risks of battle like Joseph Maxwell and made their will before leaving on the campaign, as noted in Dorothy Riker, "Abstracts of Early Wills of Harrison County, Indiana," *Indiana Magazine of History* 37 (March 1941): 92-95; "Statement of William Brigham," in Walker, "Journal of Two Campaigns," 706; (Captain) Alfred Pirtle, *The Battle of Tippecanoe* Filson Club Publications, no. 15 (Louisville: John P. Morton and Co., 1900), 67-68; Return of the Killed and Wounded, 19 November 1811 in Esarey, *Messages and Letters of Harrison*, 637-43; some of the soldiers, of course, suffered incapacitating injuries that necessitated additional financial assistance from the state as seen in Memorial: Relief to Samuel Little, 1814, Ewbank and Riker, *Laws of the Indiana Territory, 1809-1816,* 803-804.

[37] Harrison to Secretary of War, 18 November 1811 in Ibid., 628; Crawford, "Lydia Bacon's Journal," 382-83 (quoted material is on page 383).

[38] Ibid.; Pirtle, *Battle of Tippecanoe,* 69; Tipton Genealogy in Robertson and Riker, *Tipton Papers*, xvii; Crawford, "Lydia Bacon's Journal," 382-83 (quoted material is on page 383); U. S. *Statutes at Large*, 2: 704-05; U.S. *Senate Documents*, 15 Congress, 1 session, 2: no. 170: 353-54.

[39] J. Wesley Whickar, ed., "Shabonee's Account of Tippecanoe," *Indiana Magazine of History* 17 (December 1921): 353-63 (quoted material is on pages 359 and 360); Matthew Elliott to [Isaac?] Brock, 12 January 1812 in Esarey, *Messages and Letters of Harrison*, vol. 1, 616-18 (quoted material is on page 617); one explanation for questioning the reliability of Shabonee's account is offered in Alfred A. Cave, "The Shawnee Prophet, Tecumseh, and Tippecanoe: A Case Study of Historical Myth-Making," 22 (Winter 2002): 654 n26.

[40] Hickey, *The War of 1812*, 137-39; Logan Esarey, ed., *Messages and Letters Messages and Letters of William Henry Harrison*, vol. 2 1812-1816 (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Commission, 1922); William W. Giffin, "Destruction of Delaware and Miami Towns in the Aftermath of the Battle of Tippecanoe: The Impact of Perspective on History," *Papers of the Algonquin Conference* (2000): 68-76.

[41] David Thomas, *Travels Through the Western Country in the Summer of 1816* (1819; reprint, Darien, CN: Hafner Pub. Co., 1970) (quoted reference is to reprint edition); John A. Jakle, *Images of the Ohio Valley: A Historical Geography of Travel, 1740-1860*), 92-4.

[42] Brigade Orders, Esarey, *Messages and Letters of Harrison*, 632; Tippecanoe Journal, 24 November 1811 entry, Tipton MSS; Harrison to Tipton, Commission as Justice of the Peace, 20 June 1811, and Tipton to Harrison 3 June 1812 (resignation to accept deputy sheriff position) in Robertson and Riker, *Tipton Papers*, 60-61 and 94 respectively; Philbrick, *Laws of Indiana Territory,* 223-25.

[43] Carter, *Territorial Papers* vol. 8, 183-85, 281-82; Robertson and Riker, *Tipton Papers*, 122 n12; Robertson and Riker cite Harrison County land deed records for Tipton's 1814 60-acre land purchase, yet Tipton shows up in the Harrison County tax list the previous year as being taxed on 60 acres so perhaps some arrangement was made with Brinley prior to the actual purchase; see 23 July 1813 Tax List, Tipton MSS, Box 1, Folder 5; a similar memorial is Memorial: Relief to Land Purchasers, 1813 in Ewbank and Riker, *Laws of Indiana Territory, 1809-1816, 790-92.*

[44] "A Military Circular of 1812," *Indiana Magazine of History* 2 (December 1906): 185-86.

[45] Harrison to Tipton, Commission as Captain, Territorial Militia 5 March 1812 (confirming the battlefield election) and Harrison to Tipton, Commission as Major, Territorial Militia 14 May 1812 in Tipton MSS, Box 1, Folder 4; Journal of Expedition to Guard the Frontiers 19 May – 31 May 1812, Ibid., Folder 3 (this journal is easier to read as published in Robertson and Riker, *Tipton Papers*, 91-93).

[46] Journal of Expedition to Guard the Frontiers 30 June – 22 July 1812, Tipton MSS, Box 1, Folder 4; R. Carlyle Buley, *The Old Northwest: Pioneer Period 1815-1840* vol. 1 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1951), 182-83, 203-04.

[47] S. R. Beggs, *Pages From the Early History of the West and North-West* (Cincinnati: Methodist Book Concern, 1868), 13.

[48] John B. Dillon, *A History of Indiana, From its Earliest Exploration...* (Indianapolis: Bingham & Doughty, 1859), 488-91, 492-93; Gerald O. Haffner, "The Pigeon Roost Massacre: An Eyewitness Account," *Indiana History Bulletin* 53 (November – December 1976): 158-61; Roy H. Beldon, *The Collings Story of Pigeon Roost Massacre* (n.p., n.d), 4, 6, 11.

[49] Haffner, "Pigeon Roost Massacre," 160; Beldon, "Collings Story," 9-10; John Gibson to [General Samuel Hopkins] 9 September 1812 is published in "Some Letters of John Gibson," *Indiana Magazine of History* 1 (September 1905): 129; Edmunds mistakenly puts the Pigeon Roost massacre *after* the attack on Fort Harrison, but the massacre preceded it, occurring on 3 September while the Fort Harrison attack occurred on 4 September, see Edmunds, *Shawnee Prophet*, 129-30; Pigeon Roost accounts all note the date of attack as 3 September. A first-hand account of the Fort Harrison attack is Z[achary] Taylor to Governor Harrison, 10 September 1812 in Esarey, *Harrison Messages and Letters*, vol. 2, 124-28; the context of settler life in the shadow of blockhouses, Indian warfare, and Pigeon Roost is also described in John C. Lazenby, "Jackson County Prior to 1850," *Indiana Magazine of History* 10 (September 1914): 261-65.

[50] Isaac Naylor, "An Account of Pigeon Roost Massacre," in Charles Martindale, "Loughery's Defeat and Pigeon Roost Massacre," *Indiana Historical Society Publications* 2 (1888): 128-31 (quoted material is on page 130).

[51] Haffner, "Pigeon Roost Massacre," 159-60; Gibson to Colonel Hargrove, 12 September 1812 Esarey *Messages and Letters of Harrison* vol. 2, 133-34.

[52] John Gibson to [Colonel Robert Robertson] 12 September 1812 is published in "Some Letters of John Gibson," *Indiana Magazine of History* 1 (September 1905): 131; Gibson to Colonel Hargrove, 18 September 1812 in Esarey, *Messages and Letters of Harrison* vol.2, 138-39; Regimental Orders, 21 September 1812 in Robertson and Riker, *Tipton Papers*, 99-100; George Beck [and others] to [John Gibson], n.d. in William H.

English Collection, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library. This letter has been digitized and is found on the Library of Congress American Memory web site (http://memory.loc.gov/) under the heading "The First American West: The Ohio River Valley, 1750-1820," search term: Beck The Beck letter appears to be one of the first to relate information about the massacre to the governor, adding that some Delawares may have been involved. Also, a Captain Dewalt skirmished with the fleeing raiders and recovered "a quantity of plunder from that place;" the Beck letter reflects increasingly widespread opposition among militia men and frontier communities to defending distant frontiers at the expense of their own families' and communities's safety as discussed in Mark Pitcavage, "'Burthened in Defence of our Rights:' Opposition to Military Service in Ohio During the War of 1812," *Ohio History* 104 (Summer-Autumn 1995): 142-162.

[53] Beldon, "Collings Story," 13; "A Bill for the Relief of John Kimberlin," 23rd Cong., 1st sess., 31 December 1833; Haffner, "Pigeon Roost Massacre," 161.

[54] General Orders, 9 February 1813, Tipton to Robert M. Evans, 26 March 1813, Tipton to John Gibson, [?] April 1813 are all in Robertson and Riker, *Tipton Papers*, 103-108; Nina Kathleen Reid, "Sketches of Early Indiana Senators—(IV) John Tipton," *Indiana Magazine of History* 9 (December 1913): 250-51.

[55] Tipton to Gibson, [?] April 1813, Ibid.

[56] John Ketcham, "John Ketcham Ranger Service," Esarey, *Messages and Letters of Harrison* vol. 2, 274-85.

[57] Thomas Posey to Tipton: Commission as Lieutenant Colonel, 4 June 1813, Thomas Posey to Tipton: Commission as Colonel, 22 April 1814, and Thomas Posey to Tipton: Commission as Sheriff, 16 September 1816 are all printed in Robertson and Riker, *Tipton Papers*, 109, 112-3, 119-20.

[58] Pirtle, *Battle of Tippecanoe*, 87.

CHAPTER THREE

Boundaries, Taxes, and Race: John Tipton as Public Official, 1816-1822

> [H]olding those in slavery whom it hath pleased the Divine Creator to create free, seems to us to be repugnant to the inestimable principles of a republican Government.
> --Clark County [IN] residents, Counter Petition, 10 October 1807

"Rarely in human history," writes historian Andrew Cayton, "have so many people transformed a physical and human landscape so thoroughly and so quickly as white Americans transformed the Wabash valley between the 1790s and the 1820s." These transformations were evident in a number of areas—social/cultural, environmental, visual, economic, political, demographics. They also grew out of evolving relations of power and race. In Indiana, complicated native-white relations dominated the course of events before statehood in 1816, as discussed in the previous chapter. Yet a major undercurrent coursing through territorial society and the first decade after statehood concerned the socio-legal status accorded to African Americans in the West. Their relationship with white westerners was of far more consequence than their relatively small numbers would imply and was part of a complex of relations that comprised the social landscape of the West's frontier societies. Cayton contends that these societies can be understood by exploring the ways in which people have historically organized and understood themselves in relation to each other. However mutuality and accommodation were not at the heart of these interactions during this time period. On the one hand persistent white encroachment pushed natives and whites to fierce clashes over control of the most basic resource to each, land and space; while on the other hand racial and cultural prejudices based on skin color encouraged whites to erect racial

boundaries. Ultimately the growing hegemonic ascendancy of white Americans in the West following the War of 1812 meant, at least to them, that they would be the ones to direct this organization of human interactions.[1]

The era's discourse on republicanism influenced how Indianans would justify and carry out this process. On 5 December 1804 Territorial Governor William Henry Harrison proclaimed that as a result of the local voting returns, the territory had passed to the second or representative grade of government after only four years since its inception. Over the next year, the newly formed territorial legislature and President Thomas Jefferson exchanged letters that reveal the Jeffersonian view that westward expansion promoted "the Cause of Republicanism." "[B]y enlarging the empire of liberty," Jefferson stated, "we multiply its auxiliaries, & provide new sources of renovation, should its principles, at any time, degenerate, in those portions of our country which gave them birth." The landscape of republicanism in the West was one of construction and identity. Americans had begun re-inventing the Indiana landscape with their style of subsistence-to-productive market agriculture, physical structures, social relationships, fledgling transportation networks, and an array of fictive lines of demarcation and ownership during the territorial period. Statehood in 1816 intensified these activities and encouraged more mapping, defining, and adjusting of boundary lines as political leaders hastened to shape what they saw as unorganized space into the more orderly pattern of counties and townships authorized by the Ordinances of 1785 and 1787. In this world boundaries mattered.[2]

Counties, county seats, boundary lines, and other markers served a definitional purpose in the jagged sweep of westward expansion. Given that at the time of statehood more than half of the land area yet remained in the hands of Native Americans, Indianans'

push to lay out and steadily establish boundary lines and thus, in their eyes, legitimacy and authority, took on an added level of significance. The geo-political landscape of the period, however, was not the only arena in which boundaries figured prominently. As in other Old Northwest states such as Illinois—and despite the anti-slavery principles of the Northwest Ordinance's Article VI forbidding the introduction of slavery or indentured servitude—Indiana had been plagued by the controversial and tense ambiguity over racial boundaries since its territorial days. Legal historian Paul Finkelman's analyses illustrate the heated conflicts that arose among citizens, statesmen, and African Americans over whether to prohibit or protect a "popular institution" that was used, for example, to procure agricultural labor. To others the institution was an anathema and a stain upon a republican society. In the matter of race and slavery in the West, republicanism resembled an idealistic parent that looked away from its offspring's deviancy.[3]

The state-building activities that followed statehood afforded ambitious, reputable white men interested in public roles and official duties numerous opportunities. Among his other attributes, John Tipton possessed a favorable combination of leadership, opportunism, and the proverbial good fortune of being at the right place at the right time. He also managed to end his public career as a second-term senator in 1839, at the age of fifty-three years, without ever having had to tread the murky waters of serious public scandal, which is not to imply that he had no enemies. He certainly had detractors. Nevertheless few public careers traced and commingled with the major, defining-moment issues that characterized Indiana's first four decades in the way that Tipton's did. And because these issues had regional, even national, significance in terms of westward expansion in the early national period, Tipton's influences and experiences transcended Indiana history.

From Tippecanoe to Indian Removal, Tipton's life-long association with native-white relations and the making of Indiana made him a pivotal figure in both state *and* regional histories. Yet it is somewhat inaccurate to say, as William Frederick Collins does in the only other dissertation or scholarly published work on Tipton, that his "entire public career...was related to American Indians." This is only true if one accepts that his "advancement through the militia" is what propelled Tipton from the Battle of Tippecanoe in 1811 to his 1820 election as representative to the General Assembly and the subsequent 1823 appointment as Indian Agent at Fort Wayne. In fact, Tipton's public service in Harrison County preceded Tippecanoe and continued with successive elections and appointments (scarcely considered by Collins) i.e. deputy sheriff in 1812, sheriff in 1816, re-election as sheriff in 1818 which in turn led to additional public commissions. The point is not to diminish the importance of his military advancement to his developing public career, but rather to demonstrate the significance of that public career in and of itself. It was in his role as sheriff, for example, that Tipton was forced to contend publicly with the issue of race and a notorious case of inter-state "manstealing." Moreover, during these years (1816-1822) Tipton's work as a public official in southern Indiana not only prepared him for the larger political roles he would assume later but also placed him at key moments in the state's early history—a knack he displayed until leaving public office in 1839.[4]

In 1816, the same year that Indiana attained statehood, thirty-year-old John Tipton was elected sheriff of Harrison County. In some ways his commission was anticipated if not expected as a result of his local and trans-local visibility. Around 1810 Tipton operated a ferry across the Ohio River from the southern part of the county and later acquired some land

in the area. At the time of his election, he also managed a tavern and hotel out of his home in Corydon, the county seat. This was politically advantageous in that the territorial capital had been moved here in 1813, and Tipton's correspondence increasingly included a number of the major players in Indiana politics. As detailed in the previous chapter, in a period during which the militia connected most white men between the ages of eighteen and forty-five through mustering, campaigns, and skirmishes and battles, Tipton stood out for his endurance and leadership. Certainly, his perseverance at Tippecanoe as a member of Harrison County's Yellow Jackets rifle company caused him to stand well in the eyes of both Territorial Governor William Henry Harrison, who commanded the campaign and owned property in the county, and his comrades who elected him captain after a number of the company's officers were killed in the battle. Additional officer commissions followed: major in 1812; lieutenant colonel in 1813; colonel in 1814; and brigadier general in the Third Brigade, Indiana Militia in 1817. Yet without diminishing his bravery, leadership, or discipline, one must also consider the difficulty in keeping western frontier militia companies staffed, especially in the period after Tippecanoe and through the War of 1812, therefore yielding considerable opportunities for advancement. Tipton complained about the number of vacancies in the regiment himself to his adjutant general in 1816, explaining that the situation stemmed from different causes. Some men had "remooved," while others vacated on account of age or inability. Some, he said, "wished (or pretended to wish)" to resign and in his opinion were not suitable to command. Thus Tipton asked that men from the enclosed list be commissioned "as speedily as posible."[5]

Tipton's popularity among military men, many of whom were also public officials, no doubt enhanced his desire and strengthened his candidacy for public roles, and these clearly

represented his primary occupational goal. Tipton played a leading role in Harrison County government for over a decade, beginning with an appointment as justice of the peace in 1811 which he served until resigning to become deputy sheriff one year later. The county's *Record of the Court of Common Pleas* for 25 January 1812 shows that Tipton lost by a one-vote margin in the election to replace Sheriff Spier Spencer, the captain he had already replaced as a result of his death at Tippecanoe. Not until 1816, however, would he move up by election from deputy to sheriff, but his documented experiences throughout his two terms as such evidence the complexities that surrounded community-building on the heels of westward expansion.[6]

The scholarly literature on the roles that sheriffs and county government played in the American development of the Old Northwest lacks comprehensive analyses despite the considerable potential for insight into the era's social history that their records afford. Historian Malcolm Rohrbough points out that as the American territorial system expanded westward it was accompanied by the establishment of the county system. Indeed Tipton's records demonstrate that the county sheriff had numerous interactions with the public and functioned as an important administrative and financial arm of the county. One hardly recognizes the later near-mythic depiction of the gun-toting western sheriff in the bureaucratic legal responsibilities that consumed Tipton's time. These included tax levies and collections, executions of warrants, delivering of fee bills, advertising of elections and county contracts, and conducting of sheriff's sales for debt collection. Additionally, his personal papers show that his professional world to a large extent consisted of receipts, bills, lists, certificates, deeds, notices, orders, petitions, contracts, claims, depositions, memos, requisitions, vouchers, and more. Given this context and the fact that the bureaucratic and

financial nature of responsibilities were similar to that of Indian Agent, except that in the latter case his constituents would be Native Americans instead of county residents, his experience as sheriff was extremely beneficial in preparing him for the position he would assume in 1823.[7]

When Tipton learned that the recently commissioned sheriff of Harrison County, David Craig, intended to resign in September of 1816, he wrote to Territorial Governor Thomas Posey declaring his interest and promising to execute the bond required for that office. Within a week Posey appointed him to serve "during our pleasure." Because this occurred in the transitional period between territory and statehood, he was later re-commissioned by the new state governor Jonathan Jennings for a two-year term after winning the sheriff's election. Tipton's four thousand dollar bond represented one of the office's major risk-factors in that sheriffs were financially and legally liable for the collection of taxes and fees as well as for mistakes and delinquencies. He faced this situation in one of his first acts as sheriff. On 21 October he posted a notice of a sheriff's sale to be held at the home of John Hurst, Jr., Harrison County's first elected sheriff, and the man who had beat Tipton by one vote in the 1812 sheriff election. Among the items listed for sale to "Satisfy Sundry Executions against Said Hurst" were those that illustrate the kind of farming operation and domestic manufacturing that was underway in early Indiana: "two horses[,] twelve head of Cattle[,] fourteen head of Sheep[,] three Beds[,] bedsteds[,]...one Cupbord[,] one beureau[,]...one folding Table[,] one Loom[,] six Cheers [chairs]...and one year oald Colt."[8]

On the surface the law concerning "sheriffing" was rather unassuming and was only slightly amended in the transition from territory to statehood. In the 1807 act for establishing

the sheriff's office, the sheriff was charged with keeping the peace by restraining offenders to appear in court, quelling "all affrays, routs, riots, and insurrections," pursuing, apprehending, and imprisoning "felons and traitors," executing warrants, writs, etc., and duly attending all authorized courts meeting within the respective county. Other official responsibilities brought Tipton in close proximity to the issues of the day for a developing frontier county such as licensing for the selling of wares, delivering certificates of appointment to road commissioners and surveyors, and attending to elections duties, beginning with the publicizing of coming elections to being present at the vote-talleying. Tipton's papers include several election certificates. His relationship with the courts also provides insight on the kinds of complaints and indictments that were prevalent in the early Indiana society of which he was a part. A study of the records of nearby Warrick County from virtually the same period (1813-1823) shows that the most common legal actions were for debt, trespass, larceny, adultery, divorce, slander, resisting process, assault and battery, and "challenging." The latter apparently refers to dueling which was of some concern to territorial officials. "An Act for the Prevention of Vice and Immorality" from 1807 prohibited challenging anyone by word of mouth or by writing "to fight at sword, rapier, pistol, or other deadly weapon." Upon conviction an offender faced a fine of up to 250 dollars or imprisonment without bail for up to twelve months. A person accepting or delivering a challenge or consenting to be a second in the match was also liable. The problem continued to vex Indiana officials who in 1813 enacted a more stringent dueling law that even required all government officials and attorneys to take an oath disavowing their involvement in the practice and lifted the cap on fines to two thousand dollars. In 1823 Tipton was himself in violation of this law and stood

accused of "challenging" fellow politician Dennis Pennington in a suit; he was ultimately acquitted of the charge.[9]

What made Tipton as sheriff such an important local source of power and authority was the office's jurisdiction over the collection of county and territorial taxes. In an 1813 law regarding the establishment of a permanent revenue system through the collection of taxes on taxable property in the territory, land was the primary source of income and the sheriff was designated the collector. Land, along with ferries, taverns, and even billiard tables were taxed. Other taxable property included horses (also mules) and slaves or servants of color ("Blacks") over twelve years of age. Concerning the latter, it is interesting to note that the territorial law not only legally affirmed the slave status in opposition to the Northwest Ordinance's Article VI prohibition of slavery, but also made no distinction here between slave, servant, or blacks; this, despite the repeal of some proslavery legislation in 1810. Land, on the other hand, was classified by quality to avail differing tax rates: if a greater part of the tract was superior to second rate, then it was first, or the best, rate; if the greater part of the tract was superior to third rate, then it was second rate, and so on.[10]

Each October the county sheriff was obligated to "demand payment" of taxes from the residents. Failure or inability to pay (delinquency) meant that the sheriff, who was fiscally accountable for this amount, was forced to remove "personal property, goods, or chattels" in order to hold a public sale to recover the tax bill. If the resident had no personal property to sell, then the sheriff had to arrange a sale of the land for non-payment of taxes at the door of the courthouse. By each 25 December, the sheriff turned over the tax monies to the Territorial Treasurer in return for a receipt. The receipt was given to the Auditor who released the sheriff from responsibility for that amount through a quietus and allowed him a

nine percent commission on the taxes collected. As demonstrated by Tipton's move against former sheriff Hurst, a sheriff could expect action taken against him for failure to settle his accounts.[11]

The Tipton Papers contain an 1813 tax list as well as the 1816 and 1818 tax levies for Harrison County which are suggestive of Old Northwest societies and of race relations in the transition to statehood. The 1813 tax list is a more descriptive document of the Indiana frontier than the tax levies. It shows, for example, the individual entries on taxable property. Of the 308 entries, less than half (134) were landowners, with the most common landholding pattern being 160 acres of second- or third-rate land and one or two horses. Here, Tipton was taxed on sixty acres of first-rate land and on two horses. A significant number of residents owned no land and paid taxes only on horses; three women were among this group. Several others paid taxes on "negroes." The 1816 tax rates, based upon the aforementioned 1813 revenue act, were as follows:

On each 100 acres of first-rate land	37 ½ cents
On each 100 acres of second-rate land	25 cents
On each 100 acres of third-rate land	12 ½ cents
On each horse, three years old and up	37 ½ cents
On each slave	2 dollars
On each free man of color	3 dollars
On each singleman with no property	50 cents

Horses were highly valued in a society dependent upon them for both draft labor and transportation, and this explains their assessment on par with the value of one hundred acres of first-rate land. In addition to the above, both the widow of Captain Spencer, Elizabeth, and Tipton were taxed as tavern owners. On another level, the tax rates on land jumped in the two years between the tax levies, presumably reflecting the transition to statehood and the need to build up the new state's treasury. The tax rates on one hundred acres of first-,

second-, and third-rate land increased to the following amounts respectively: 50 cents, 43 ¾ cents, and 31 ¼ cents.[12]

This 1816 tax levy was the last one under the territorial status, and as such, the slave category did not appear in the 1818 tax levy, nor did the categories of free man of color and the singleman with no property. Territorial Indiana lawmakers obviously taxed by race. The two dollar tax on slaves can be translated into a tax on the labor their masters gained in "owning" them. But the tax of three dollars on a freeman of color can only be understood as racially motivated and intended to discourage their residence in the territory. Moreover their white counterparts, the single men with no property, were only taxed at fifty cents. Thus, territorial taxing related to race was used primarily as a tool for exclusion since the relatively small number of slaves generated little revenue. In the 1809 and 1810 reports of taxes on Harrison County slaves, the rate of tax was one dollar and the total tax revenue for slaves those years was nine and eight dollars respectively. By comparison the 1810 territorial census enumerated 630 Negroes, along with the 23,890 white residents, in the territory of which a total of 237 were designated as slaves.[13]

In 1817 the citizens of Corydon, Harrison County's seat of government, voted to incorporate their town and thus inaugurated another level of taxes. Two years later the town fixed the following tax rates in dollars on aspects of town life that illustrate the development of a busy, young state capital in the West:

Each 4-wheeled carriage of pleasure	1.50
Each 2-wheeled carriage of pleasure	0.75
Each store	3.00
Each retailer of Spirituous liquors	2.50
Each house of private entertainment	2.50
Each horse	0.50
Every [male] dog...over one to the family	1.00

Every [female] dog...	3.00
A poll tax on each male 21 years of age	0.50

By the end of his second term as sheriff, Tipton had made his mark as an effective tax collector, certainly in comparison to his immediate successors. A January 1824 report on the history of county tax deficits to the state treasury that was published in the Corydon *Indiana Gazette* showed that in four years his highest balance owed was $8.88 whereas in the four years after his departure, Harrison County balances due were $11.54, $51.53, $68.49, and $1,070.52 (which was reduced to $424.56). Several months after this report was published, Tipton challenged these findings in a letter to the newspapers' editors and offered proof against ever being indebted as a collector at all.[14]

Tipton was a confident if not aggressive tax collector who looked only to what the law stated about assessments for his authority, apparently giving little consideration to the ambiguity of race. In fact perhaps because of his own upper South upbringing, he saw no ambiguity nor any injustice in the current law. In a 10 December 1816 letter to Tipton, Davis Floyd, a member of the General Assembly, expressed the concern of a number of legislators about how the county court directed Tipton to move against the property of an African-American named Perry. Perry claimed to have been set free in 1813 through a written statement of his former master, William Stith, which was noted in a Harrison County deed record. Stith, though, had sought and received from the General Court a certificate of removal to take him back across the Ohio River to Kentucky. Perry fled Kentucky and returned to Harrison County, frustrating Stith who then wrote to Perry that he had given him up "freely and entirely." Illustrative of the boundaries in place, Stith reminded Perry that should he think of coming back he should be mindful that he was "not permitted on this side

of the river without being sold." It was on the basis of his claim to be a free man, then, that Perry was taxed the rate of three dollars. When he did not pay, Tipton seized his property.[15]

Floyd approached Tipton in a conciliatory manner, conceding that "You may think me a little officious in intermeddling in matters which do not immediately concern me." He offered that while no one was blaming him for his actions, "clearly the Court have done wrong in directing you to collect the money." Floyd then asked Tipton to release the property and charge him for the amount due. And, giving the nod to an assumed boundary between the races, Floyd concluded his letter with the hope that "you will reflect that the man is a negroe and from Such we are not to expect that politeness which ought to be observed by persons in that Station of life." Tipton's reply of the same date conveyed annoyance at Floyd's intrusion. Tipton wrote that he had "no objection to you or any other Jentleman taking an active part in administering Justice[,] even to the african (if he was oppressed)." But, he argued, "You think the court has Erred[.] I think Different." Tipton resented the interference from members of the legislature and hoped that "they will now Desist and hereafter mind thier own business and not meddle with the Sivil officers of our County as I am Clearly of opinion that Justice will be Done without thire [their] aid to the negroe." While obviously convinced of his authority and his own racial ideas, Tipton appeased Floyd and his political colleagues by releasing Perry's property—after receiving his sheriff's fees and charging Floyd the three dollar tax in question.[16]

Aside from tax collecting, commissions, and his own fees, the sheriff was responsible for the delivery, collection, and payment of fee bills as ordered by the clerk of court. It is in this venue that Tipton's papers and county records offer a view, however partial, of how women in the Old Northwest generally and Harrison County specifically interacted with the

legal system. As already noted women paid taxes on personal property and as tavern owners. Women also appeared frequently as paid trial witnesses or as parties to a suit such as a fee bill from 1818 in which Sarah Furgeson claimed a two-day witness fee in the divorce suit involving John McMichin and Elizabeth McMichin. Another fee bill listed the payment of a $5.32 ½ security from "Elizabeth a Woman of Color." Occasionally Tipton was called upon to intervene in matters of unpaid judgments. In August of 1819, he received a letter from an old friend with failing eyes who sought his assistance on behalf of a "helpless and unfortunate" widow and her young son. Her desperate circumstances required that he get a certificate of the judgment owed her from the clerk's office in order to coerce the payment from a certain county resident. Although this data represents but one county, women evidently interacted regularly at various levels with the local legal system in the early nineteenth-century West.[17]

Perhaps as a way of explaining why Tipton's successors fared poorly by comparison, one county historian has attributed the difficulties they encountered in tax collecting in large part to the economic distress, or, panic, that overshadowed 1819 and the next few years. Yet Tipton's correspondence indicates that he too faced serious financial hard times during his two-term tenure, if not before. This affected not only his duties but also his outside ventures into the agricultural market trade; here, agricultural prices, cash scarcity, and even race were used as economic indicators. Since at least 1812 Tipton's correspondents had remarked on the poor economy, some of it in regards to the militia and the men's lack of pay. On 22 December 1812 Samuel Littell of Vincennes wrote that "Times is hard and every thing extravagantly high...Money is also Scarce not a Dollar for any of the Men and some of them in great need." Indeed the failure to pay the militia became a loud discussion that was voiced

in the Vincennes *Western Sun* throughout much of 1817, and Tipton tried working through several channels to get some of the soldiers their money.[18]

This period saw frequent warrants of arrest over non-payment of debt. Tipton received one such warrant concerning a man named Jacob Rush (or, Rust) who was indebted to another man through a one hundred dollar promissory note. The note had gone unpaid and the holder of the note now feared that Rush would abscond "without leaving sufficiency of property to pay his just debts." Tipton was ordered to take him into custody and bring him to the courthouse. Rush, though, had taken off, and Tipton noted on the warrant that Rush was not found in his bailiwick. Related to debt, the scarcity of cash coupled with the variety of bank notes in circulation promoted fairly widespread counterfeiting. Tipton dealt with this in his own jurisdiction as well when he found numerous counterfeit bank notes in the possession of Isaac Ferree of Corydon. Counterfeiting was all but ubiquitous and mentioned repeatedly in his correspondence of this period. In June of 1819, for example, Tipton received a letter from an acquaintance in Dearborn County who noted that "Crops are promiseing; Money very Scarce;--except Counterfiet and that plenty."[19]

The poor economy notwithstanding, as the preceding letter suggested the area's increasing agricultural productivity offered hope for improvement. A letter from Vincennes ends with "Times are Dull and hard here in the cash way[.] Wheat is good[,] Corn So So [.]" Some like this English farmer in Princeton remained pessimistic about the market in 1819: "Money cannot be gained by cultivation, produce may, perhaps, be sold at some price, but you cannot get your money of the cheats and scum of society who live here." Nevertheless, optimism and Harrison County's southern border at the Ohio River and on the route to the New Orleans market presented Tipton with an entrée into the agricultural trade that year. He

agreed to be the security for a boatload of pork that his two partners purchased in a deal that unfortunately fell through. He was informed about the situation by R. W. Smith who described the depressed market in Port Gibson, Mississippi in terms of the sales of major commodities, including slaves. "Times is very hard here," he wrote, "produce is low and dull sale[,] flower is $7 pur barrel[,] whiskey 53 Cents By the Barrel[,] Horses is very low[,] negrows is dul...I Sold my pork at 15 Cents and my Beef at $16. pur barrel But the[y] Can by as mutch pork as the[y] want at 8 Cents." In an economy that traded in dark flesh, the rate of sale of African Americans embodied an important economic indicator. But Tipton's role in the pork purchase was now a liability. Smith went on to write that if it was true that he was their financial backing, "I think you Had better lookout" as one of the partners was already in jail and the authorities were looking for the other. Tipton was soon sued by the original owner of the boatload of pork, yet he continued to pursue his interest in marketing produce in the agricultural trade through other acquaintances.[20]

The distress of the West demonstrates one of the high costs of westward expansion on its own frontline soldiers—the aspiring landowners. Although a number of causes can be linked to the Panic, the heart of the economic depression was a disastrous combination of tenuous land, credit, banking, and money policies that deprived the West of hard currency and led ultimately to a collapse in farm prices. This spelled a pervasive financial doom for many, especially settlers trying to develop their land. "The present situation of the western people is distressing," wrote the president of the State Bank in Vincennes in 1819; "they cannot get for their produce one dollar of the kind of money that will be received in payment of their debts to the United States." In addition he made the observation that an essential component of the market system with the East was not yet in place. "It is not for want of a

sufficient quantity of produce that the western people do not pay their debts," he went on, "but for want of system in bringing the products of their labor to its market." This call for internal improvements would quickly gain political currency, and Tipton would play a role in the movement in northern Indiana. But during the time at hand he and other sheriffs faced an epidemic of sheriff sales for non-payment and other debt-related actions. In 1819 the sheriff of Vigo County advertised the sale of ninety-seven tracts of farm land and sixty-four lots in both the county and Terre Haute, the vast majority of which were 160-acre parcels. Similarly Benjamin Beckes, a friend and sheriff at Vincennes, informed Tipton in February of 1820 that "Times are [Damned] hard[.] I had upwards of 50 original writs returnable to this court [amounting] upwards of 5000$." The West would begin its recovery with re-conceived policies such as the Land Act of 1820 which, among other changes, ended purchases on credit.[21]

Although the hard economic times following the War of 1812 was a dominant theme in the West, Tipton's papers reveal that his public life and personal interests touched some of the other notable threads that constituted the fabric of western societies. In February of 1818, he was given the appointment of Courthouse Custodian in which he was made accountable for its upkeep and care. In particular, Tipton was responsible for any damage "Sustained of any Societies of People either religious or otherwise Occupying Said House." The reference to religious societies reflected an anxious concern by some authorities about the Methodist revivals that had begun in nearby Madison the year before. John Meek of Madison had written to Tipton the previous September that upon returning home recently he "found all in confusion here in consequence of religion. My Wife & Brother is amongst the converts."[22]

Meek was not only a friend but also a fellow Mason and fraternal brother. Tipton's star with the Masons in the state rose fast and high during this period. For three years beginning in 1818 Tipton was annually elected to important posts of leadership: Senior Grand Warden, Deputy Grand Master, and Grand Master. His early involvement was in Corydon, but he was also active in Logansport where he later moved in connection with his appointment as Indian Agent and where a Lodge was named after him. An Indiana Freemason historian observes that the Order's aspirations of high morality, friendship, and benevolence appealed to many of early Indiana's most prominent men including two governors. Meek and Tipton were also men who maintained an interest in books. Meek served as treasurer of the Madison Library Society while, contrary to one historian's characterization, Tipton maintained his own small lending library and appeared to enjoy reading. The Corydon *Indiana Gazette* ran his advertisement on 30 October 1819 with the heading "Return my Books, and I will lend again." Apparently borrowers of several specific volumes on military history, including the recently published *History of the Late War*, had indulged in a privilege meant only to be temporary.[23]

Tipton's role as sheriff and his inclination toward public life led him to take advantage of opportunities to meet and greet visiting dignitaries. During that summer President James Monroe and General Andrew Jackson toured the West. Tipton was one of the four citizens of the Citizens' Committee of Corydon who formally invited them to a late afternoon public dinner in their honor on 23 June. The President and his party declined the invitation although they did stop and dine in Corydon the day before. Tipton accompanied the group for three days and remarked later that "Their manners were easy and familiar with every person and their equipage quite plain."[24]

But, still, perhaps the most revealing aspect of the developing West across the Ohio River in the early nineteenth century that Tipton's years as sheriff provides is the intersection of race and the legal system. To be sure Indianans had been inconsistent and conflicted in the matter of slavery, servitude, and the Northwest Ordinance. A cursory reading of Article VI of the Ordinance is rather straightforward:

> There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted: *Provided always,* That any person escaping into the same, from whom labor or service is lawfully claimed in any one of the original States, such fugitive may be lawfully reclaimed and conveyed to the person claiming his or her labor or service as aforesaid.

An early debate, however, emerged over the status of those slaves already present in the territory northwest of the Ohio River: did Article VI free those slaves, or was it merely intended to deny any further introduction of slavery? Emma Lou Thornbrough's admirably detailed 1957 study, *The Negro in Indiana*, found no case in which an Indiana territorial court interfered with pre-existing "rights" and, in fact, numerous cases in which judges presumed the legality of slavery. Given that slavery itself was denied in the Ordinance, proslavery forces would have to recast it as something else.[25]

Early Indiana was heavily populated by southern migrants who, like Tipton, moved north across the Ohio from the upper South. While some clearly migrated to distance themselves from the institution and social structure, others desired to bring all of their property, including human, with them. Proslavery forces held the upper hand in territorial politics. Once the territory attained the second stage of government in 1804 and elected a legislature, they succeeded in passing legislation designed to circumvent Article VI. Proslavery legislation actually began the year before with "A Law concerning servants," to

which the legislature added several more acts including the transparent "An Act concerning the introduction of Negroes and Mulattoes into This Territory" in 1805 and again in 1807. This act essentially authorized slavery in the guise of indentured servitude. It stipulated that anyone owning or purchasing slaves outside the territory could bring them to Indiana and bind them into service for a term of years determined by the master. Such indentures were recorded with the clerks of Common Pleas courts.[26]

The black indenture system entailed emancipating an enslaved person and then endeavoring to get him or her to sign an indenture. A particularly detailed Harrison County indenture made between an African American woman named Amy and a master named Isaiah Boone illustrates the system. The same day that Amy was emancipated, she signed an indenture to serve Boone and his heirs for the term of seventy-five years. She was to "obey all lawful commands...and not depart anytime from the service of the said Boone, or his heirs without permission first had and obtained." In return, the Boones agreed to "furnish and allow to the said woman Amy...good and sufficient clothing, and diet and all things necessary for the situation." The resemblance to slavery is obvious. Other southern Indiana counties participated in the system, such as nearby Clark County whose records contain thirty-two indentures from the period 1805 to 1810.[27]

Although judges tended to support the existence of slavery, territorial citizens held polarized views on the topic. They sent forth numerous petitions beginning as early as 1800 attempting to both register and gain support for their side. On 10 October 1807 Clark County residents drafted a "counter petition" opposing the legislative resolutions calling for a suspension of Article VI in the territory, which represented another attempt at circumvention. Their memorial decried that "holding those in slavery whom it hath pleased the Divine

Creator to create free, seems to us to be repugnant to the inestimable principles of a republican Government." This sentiment represented the increasing upswing of the political strength of the antislavery faction which repealed the indentured servitude act in 1810 (although it had no effect on existing indentures), and legally abolished the institution in all of its guises in the new state's constitution in 1816.[28]

Perhaps predictably, neither antislavery rhetoric nor the legal prohibition against slavery and indentured servitude did anything to erase the social boundaries between whites and blacks in Indiana. Tipton's own feelings on the matter can only be surmised. Records and correspondence indicate that he kept a "black boy" who traveled with him, whom he was asked to leave behind in 1820 on one of his commissioned projects for the state. Tipton brought him anyway. But southern Indiana continued to be a landscape of racial intersection and confrontations with bondage, given that its Ohio River border was situated across from slave state Kentucky. Harrison County residents had historically expressed decidedly mixed opinions about encouraging and allowing a population of African Americans to develop in their midst. Although many Indianans were outwardly antislavery in politics, they were personally opposed to the presence of African Americans. Of great concern was the practice of slaveholders bringing their slaves to Indiana and emancipating them, sometimes in large numbers. Residents sent Governor Posey a memorial, sometime between 1813 and 1816, against one Kentucky slave master who had recently emancipated forty-seven of his slaves in the county, with rumors that sixty or seventy more would be brought over. The memorialists wanted nothing to do with African Americans, slave or free, revealing their racial prejudices in their characterizations of them. "Our corn Houses, Kitchens, Smoke Houses...may no doubt be robbed and our wives, children and daughters may and no doubt will be insulted

and abused by those Africans," they stated. They were anxious about their "property, wives and daughters" and refused to be "saddled" with the newly freed people. Another recorded instance occurred in 1815 when Paul Michum (also spelled Mitchem) emancipated eleven slaves in the county. After his death the next year, his widow Susannah freed nine more of their slaves.[29]

Increasingly after statehood, Indiana became a place to where enslaved people sought their escape from bondage. Whether as a citizen perusing Corydon's *Indiana Gazette* and coming across the notices and advertisements for runaway slaves or as sheriff detaining fugitives, Tipton confronted the inconsistencies of racial politics that existed in a free state bordering a slave state. In one of his last acts as sheriff in September of 1820, Tipton inserted an ad in the local newspaper about a fugitive male slave whom he had deposited in jail. Two months prior, Lemuel had run away from his master, Joseph Shaw, in Jackson County, Tennessee, and stole across the river on a summer's day. Upon learning that Shaw was Lemuel's master, Tipton wrote to him. He advised him that Indiana's statute law did not recognize slavery, and since he had no evidence before him that Lemuel owed any service in Tennessee, Shaw should therefore "Se the neecessity of Comeing on immediately." Tipton concluded the note by telling Shaw that he would keep Lemuel until the first of October at which time he would "turn him at liberty again" if no one came for him. Shaw came as requested and paid Tipton ten dollars "for taking up, and other Trouble with Said negro," along with another dollar to cover the cost of the advertisement.[30]

Tipton's indifference to the plight of enslaved Americans is exemplified by his handling of a very public case of cross-state "manstealing" (kidnapping) involving a slave woman named Susan, an acquaintance of his named Robert Stephens, and a public exchange

of letters between the governors of two states. Stephens' father bought Susan in 1792 from a man named Kinkade who operated a ferry between Virginia and Pennsylvania. In 1815 or 1816 Susan escaped into Indiana and sued the elder Stephens for her freedom by virtue of having lived in Pennsylvania, a free state. On 26 October 1816 the General Court issued a writ compelling Stephens to appear in answer to the charge of unlawfully confining and restraining Susan of her freedom. Stephens argued that her bill of sale was explicit that her service was for life. The following May, the case came before the Indiana Supreme Court which then referred it to the Harrison County Circuit Court for trial. In August of 1818 the jury found in favor of the elder Stephens. Although Susan's attorney, Charles Dewey, requested and received a new trial, the case was ultimately dismissed two years later.[31]

Evidence suggests that Susan made repeated bids for freedom and was actually kidnapped on more than one occasion; it is also evident that Tipton was to some degree complicit in the younger Stephens' efforts to retrieve Susan. Stephens learned that she was hiding out in Harrison County at the residence of a Colonel Lane during the legal proceedings, and on 17 May 1818 he wrote to Tipton. Lane may have been Daniel C. Lane, the state treasurer and former associate judge of the county known to act favorably toward African Americans. Stephens told Tipton that he would be in the vicinity of Corydon the next week and wanted to know "whether our negro is yet at Col. Lanes [and] if so whether She sleeps so situated that she can be come at without alarming the family." He was especially curious to ascertain if Lane "will not be my friend" in the matter and allow him to take Susan without making an alarm himself. Tipton's reply then is unknown, but Stephens succeeded in kidnapping Susan in the dead of night a few weeks later. Regardless of their racial prejudices, Indianans were uncomfortable with kidnapping and certainly with the

violation of their laws, and on 11 July 1818 Tipton was handed a warrant for his friend's arrest. Stephens was charged with "forcebly and against the will of a Certain Susann[,] a Woman of Coulour[,] arrest[ing] her with a design of taking her out of the State...Contrary to the Laws of the said State."[32]

Susan's dramatic experiences and obvious determination to be free north of the Ohio River generated newsprint and official state-level correspondence. Approximately six months after being dragged back to Kentucky, Susan made news again when, in January of 1819, she fled a boat as it descended the Ohio near the mouth of the Tennessee River and made her way back to Harrison County. The Corydon *Indiana Gazette* reported that her trial for freedom would be held at the next term of court—"if she is not again kidnapped before that time." The following November the state's first governor, Jonathan Jennings, issued a new warrant for the arrest of Stephens and his two accomplices in Susan's kidnapping who had all been indicted on manstealing charges in the meantime. Jennings also appointed Tipton as the state's agent to proceed forthwith to Kentucky to bring these men back to Harrison County for trial. Tipton found himself in an awkward position.[33]

This case troubled Jennings on several levels, and he laid it before the General Assembly in a Special Message on 15 January 1820. Susan's case was provocative on its own merits, but the location of the state capital right there in Corydon made it—and the issue of fugitive or kidnapped slaves—unavoidable to the legislators. It also exemplified the dilemma between bordering states when the politics of racial boundaries diverged into opposing camps. Jennings informed the Assembly that Tipton had gone to Kentucky to make the formal demand for those listed on the warrant as fugitives from justice of Indiana. Kentucky's Acting Governor Gabriel Slaughter declined to interfere, however, on the

grounds that the demand did not fall within the provisions of the constitution and the laws. For his part Slaughter expressed regret at the unfortunate situation facing them that arose from the "conflicting policy of different states."[34]

Jennings persisted and sent another letter insisting that Stephens and his accomplices be turned over. He reiterated his state's position on those committing "outrages" against their penal laws and who are allowed to flee "after insulting the sovereignty of our state." The exchange of letters continued and was published in the Vincennes *Western Sun*, but to no avail for Jennings. Stephens, who happened to be a member of the Kentucky legislature, garnered the support of not only the governor's office but also his fellow legislators. Both states' legislative bodies passed resolutions that the matter be forwarded to the President of the United States, which was done in the case of Indiana. A record of a presidential reply has not been found.[35]

As Jennings was exchanging letters with Slaughter, Tipton received another letter from Stephens. The tone was ingratiating in the beginning and indicated that Tipton conducted a friendly rather than an authoritative approach to him. Stephens beseeched him to use his influence "to put an end to the matter." Yet, his tone later conveyed an unveiled warning of the consequences that would befall should Jennings renew his demand. In that case, Stephens urged, "I beg of you not to be the messenger." Moreover, he went on, "should any man for whom you have a high regard be deputed for the purpose[,] warn him that he will occupy dangerous ground." If cornered, he concluded, "I will have to resort to the law of nature…I fear even in immagination to look forward to that event." The kind of event that Stephens envisioned never materialized, and despite the superfluous amount of public

discussion that surrounded Susan's case, the tension subsided. After the case was continued over several terms, in June of 1823 it was dismissed.[36]

At this juncture in his career, Tipton's attention was drawn away from sheriffing and the immediacy of race toward the continued reconfiguring of the Indiana landscape to reflect the American advance. In late December of 1819 and then in early January 1820 he received two commissioner appointments: one to relocate the county seat of Owen County, and one to select the site for the state's new seat of government, what would later become Indianapolis. The boundaries that would now preoccupy Tipton as a result of these commissions, and one other in 1821, would be of a geo-political nature instead of racial-political one. These years would also signify the emergence of Tipton as a maturing "political man" who would twice win elections to represent his district in the General Assembly.[37]

While county sheriff was an undeniably important source of local political authority, during this period Tipton constantly sought a larger playing field. His correspondents included a number of the fledgling state's aspiring men, many of whom were also on the rise. They exchanged personal and political gossip, as well as ruminations on life, leadership, governance, and power. Considering his lack of formal schooling, these letters contain the most influential aspect of Tipton's education in politics. Indiana Senator Waller Taylor, who also fought at Tippecanoe, wrote frequently to Tipton and freely offered him both opinion and reflection. Taylor was disgusted by some recent political maneuvering on the part of two fellow legislators and responded to it. "Popularity that is derived from art, stratagem and cunning," he told Tipton, "is not worth having, for unless a public man possesses independence and is upright in his Conduct, he never can preserve the confidence of the people." He believed himself to be above doing "a mean thing," but if others were less

scrupulous than he then let them pursue a different course; "if they succeed by it at my expence," he wrote, "I had rather they should do so than imitate their Conduct." John Zenor, who was an officer in Tipton's Fifth Regiment of the Indiana Militia, wrote to deny the rumor that he had voted against Tipton in the 1816 sheriff's election. On the other hand, he reasoned, "I think it a Good princible of a Good Citizen to Soport the man ho [who] doth the most merrit the attintion and Sufridges of the p[e]ople and ho [who] is the best Ediquet to do the Requisit Dutys." Fellow Mason Jonathan Woodbury's letters discussed the "rules of rectitude and justice" with Tipton. He encouraged him to remember that "Whilst we walk by the plumb and act on the square of justice, it augments the love of man, to man; it sets man above the low and base turns which the vulgar pursue, in vain for happiness."[38]

Realizing that he could not serve more than two terms as sheriff, Tipton attempted to secure higher and more lasting appointments. Certainly, his militia friends entreated him to remain an active candidate for the military elections such as that of regimental commanding officer in 1817 so that, as one explained, "our Militia may be well Officered." Tipton won this election and was commissioned as Brigadier General on 23 May 1817. But he was unsuccessful in obtaining a land office appointment. Senator Waller Taylor informed him in January of 1819 that with regards to the forthcoming land office receivership in the Arkansas Territory, he was already obligated to recommend another for that position. And although he pointed out that the recently acquired lands from Native American groups in Indiana would make it necessary to open up land offices locally, his chances were "gloomy" in getting a receivership because of the anticipated high number of applicants. A later letter revealed that these offices drew from fifty to sixty applicants each. Tipton sought the same from Congressman and future Indiana Governor William Hendricks who reiterated Taylor's view

a year later that his chances for such in Indiana were not good, and so had thus recommended him for an appointment west of the Mississippi. Despite the efforts of high-placed friends, Tipton did not get a land office receivership. But this may have been fortuitous in that his eventual appointment as federal Indian Agent in 1823 would give him that larger playing field and expand his reputation enough to be considered for a vacant Senate seat in 1831.[39]

For the present, however, Tipton worked with whatever possibilities for advancement that he had in front of him. As the correspondence concerning land offices suggests, the business of westward expansion, land disposal, and boundary-making was booming, despite from the period's economic depression. Tipton's next three commissions illustrate westward expansion as a process, showing the gradual state and federal conversion of "acquired" Native American lands into newly organized American places. At the end of 1819 Tipton learned that he had been chosen to act as one of a group of five commissioners representing five different counties to "fix," or locate, the seat of justice for Owens County. This entailed journeying to and traveling throughout the county, meeting and listening to the inhabitants as they advised and gave their opinions as to the best site, and remaining so far as possible impartial to the final selection of the site. The location of a county seat marked an important step in the county's development, bestowing upon it the appearance of legitimacy in relationship to the rest of the state as well as a sense of how far it had come since the early days of the first white settlers. Fixing the county seat could also become a contested, complicated, or shady decision given the positive impact on land value to those owning land closest to the site. In fact, this was actually the second attempt to select a site for the seat of Owens county.[40]

In this errand for Owen County, Tipton had hoped to be accompanied by his good friend Joseph Bartholomew from Clark County when he set out in early February. Acquainted with the hardships of early nineteenth-century travel anytime but especially in the winter, Bartholomew fumbled for excuses. These are not only peace times, he rationalized to Tipton, but the snow was very deep in that direction, up to two feet. Thus the traveling would be "very disagreeable," and they would be hindered in seeing as much of the country as they needed to make this decision. Bartholomew was nonetheless quite familiar with the county and advised him of what he believed to be the only two possible sites for the seat. He also cautioned Tipton: "do not forgit to secure to the county a portion of the land on the opposite bank of the [White] river." Tipton was not deterred either by weather or travel conditions and departed Corydon on the afternoon of 3 February 1820.[41]

As he did during the Tippecanoe campaign, Tipton kept a detailed daily journal with abbreviated descriptions of his movements and actions, travel conditions, and the people he interacted with along the way. His entries followed a pattern beginning with noting his time of setting out, what if anything he paid for breakfast and other meals, the event(s) of the day, and with whom he stayed "for the Kt [night]." He recorded his expenses carefully since he expected to be reimbursed by the county. As with the other journals that he kept, its value is multidimensional in terms of documentation, prices (economic), county and state history, as well as social and political history. It is especially relevant to understanding the difficulties stemming from a lack of internal improvements that affected not only the ability to travel but, as was growing increasingly obvious, the means to get the settlers' produce to market. For example, Tipton described how on the third day of the journey they came to Salt Creek. The ice, he noted, was thick, and because of the water's rise they could not get the horses onto the

ice. He was then forced to use an axe to cut a channel wide enough to let the horses swim while he walked along the edge holding onto the bridles. In the process, he "got a Sever[e] fall on the ice." The journal indicates that they had to "swim" a number of creeks and streams this way.[42]

Tipton never failed to record the notable human interactions that also say something about frontier western societies. On Monday 7 February, the group arrived at the home of one Elijah Chambers, the designated meeting place of the commissioners. Here they were to be duly sworn to uphold their duty by a justice of the peace who was, according to Tipton, "So much intoxicated that I had to rite the form of the oath." Being incapable of administering the oath without assistance, the drunk justice relied upon the Owen County sheriff who had to read it in order for him to repeat it to the commissioners, all the while being supported by the arm to remain in an upright position. The circumstances wore thin on one of the commissioners who was overheard to swear at which the intoxicated justice insisted that the sheriff take action. Finally, the men set out to make their assessments of the county.[43]

The next day the commissioners began their interviews with the citizens who desired to be a part of this process and were "anctius for us to view all parts of their [county]." What followed was a succession of requests to view land that people were willing to "donate" to the county for the site. This required Tipton's party to do extensive traveling and to read through donation proposals. Some of the requests read like business proposals, offering to donate land if it was selected as the site of the county seat *but* wanting reserves such as ferry rights and lots. One such proposal asked for "the privilege of cultivating what ever part of my farm for this year that may be included" in the donation, along with a five-year tax relief.

Proposals often also included letters of support for the prospective donor. In the end, the commissioners chose to accept a combined donation of 132 acres, part of which came from the son of his friend Joseph Bartholomew on the east side of the river. On Saturday 12 February they made their report to the citizens whom Tipton noted gave him the honor of naming their new town. He called it "Spencer[,] after my frend Georg Spencer who fell in the Battle of Tippicannoe." Before leaving, Tipton turned in a bill for thirty-nine dollars to the county.[44]

Two months later Tipton was again preparing to undertake a journey to establish a marker upon the Indiana landscape, this one of great significance to the four-year-old state. He and his friend Bartholomew were two of the commissioners appointed by the legislature to choose a site for a new permanent seat of government from within the so-called "New Purchase" of recently acquired lands from the Native Americans through the 1818 Treaty of St. Mary's. The treaty ceded most of the central portion of the state to the government, however it stipulated that the remaining Delawares could take up to three years in removing from their former lands. But with regards to the trip at hand, this time Bartholomew was more enthusiastic about travel prospects and commented that in May the waters would be down, or, if not, at least warm, the weeds not high enough to hinder movement, and food sources plenty for the horses. In a letter sent one month prior to departing, Bartholomew joked with Tipton about his intention to carry the tent, offering that he himself would carry the coffee kettle so that "I may not be intirely dependent." He expressed concern over the care of the horses and the danger of being "left afoot." And as for the cooking, Bartholomew prodded Tipton about his abilities; "I know you was formerly a very good cook," he teased, "and if you have forgoten I can learn you."[45]

On 17 May 1820 Tipton set out from Corydon with Governor Jennings and, he recorded, a Black boy named Bill. They were loaded with "plenty of Baken[,] coffy &c" and a tent. This journal for the venture into the newly acquired lands reads more like the one he kept throughout the Tippecanoe campaign in which the wilderness was an omnipresent character. Additionally, Tipton, who was now thirty-four years old, was unusually reflective about times past while also acutely aware of the larger state and regional symbolism in terms of re-making the landscape to reflect the Euro-American dominance that their journey represented.[46]

By the third day, Tipton's party was beyond the white settled areas, and that night they stretched their tent near a pond. Tipton realized that it had been the first time he had "stretched or slep" in one since the frontier campaigns of 1814. The next day they came to a spot where he recalled making bark canoes to carry a wounded man in the summer of 1813. And later, he found a tree on which he had carved his name and the date that same summer. On the morning of 22 May the party stopped to bathe, shave, and put on clean clothes as they expected to reach the home of William Connor that afternoon which was where the commissioners were to gather and be sworn in. Connor's place was on the West fork of the White River and was surrounded by about 250 acres of prairie. Tipton noted that a number of "Indian Huts" were clustered near the house. Following the oath-taking, he and another were appointed to draw up a document of rules and regulations concerning the path their "Conducting of Business" would follow. The momentousness of the occasion was not lost on the commissioners. Before moving on, Tipton considered the terrain ahead and paid one dollar for a pair of moccasins.[47]

Much of the journal consists of observations of the land's beauty, fertility, and the capability of its natural resources to sustain the growth of a projected thriving capital city on the rise. Tipton talked of land that was dry, rich, beautiful, of good soil, and waters that contained "plenty of fine large fish." The lay of the land and its proximity to navigable waterways so vital to travel and transport was considered as well. In one instance Tipton remarked about one site's negative potential due to a problematic bend in the river that would make "a verry difficult pass for Boats of Burthen." Water sources were likewise evaluated for their sufficiency in power to turn mills or in being good mill streams. Timber growth and variety was another important element to the commissioners. Tipton made frequent such references, explaining that they had passed over one place because timber "fit for building &c" was "verry scarse." Clay and its use in brick-making was also noted where present. In one area they believed that the land's quality was such that "every quarter Section is worth twice the Govert price." Thus the commissioners believed that the land they were surveying possessed everything deemed necessary to build a place that would speak well of Indiana and its citizens.[48]

Of course this vision was Euro-centric, exclusive, and boundary-laden, rather than shared, cooperative, or open with the native people. The very nature of the commissioners' geo-political errand to stake a claim in the newly acquired Native American lands to a lasting marker that would symbolize the state's authority was emblematic of the larger regional transformation underway. Tipton, having fought Indian warriors at Tippecanoe and in various frontier campaigns throughout the War of 1812 era like most of his male contemporaries, was perceptive to what these changes represented. After leaving Connor's place, Tipton spent the night in an Indian village. The next morning he ate at the table of a

Frenchman who lived among the natives, several of whom were inebriated as they ate with them. The scene caused him to pause and reflect about the "[altered] times Sinc[e] 1813." Then, he wrote, he was here "hunting the Indians with whom we now eat[,] Drink[,] and Sleep." He pondered that "they have sold thier land for a Trifle and [are] prepareing to leave the Country where the[y] have laid thier fathers and relatives;" and, understanding his role in their dislocation, he conceded that their former land was that same place "in which we are now hunting a site for the Seat of Govnt of our State."[49]

On 7 June the commissioners came together and agreed to a resolution on the selection and location of the site for the new state capital. Having fulfilled their responsibility, they made preparations to break camp the next morning. Just before 7 p.m., Tipton noticed a small ferry flatboat with a canoe tied alongside that was carrying two families and their household goods. To him it signified a new beginning and he recorded that it was "the first Boat landed that ever was Seen at the seat of Government." Beyond his apparent sense of meaningful purpose about this trip, Tipton was nonetheless disappointed in one respect. Upon arriving home and concluding his journal he realized that his commissioner's pay for the twenty-seven-day duty would only be fifty-eight dollars, less than half of what he would have made had he worked the whole time as sheriff. It was, he said, "a very poor compensation."[50]

Tipton had returned home in June to a mild political frenzy about his own career prospects. Knowing he was not eligible for another term as sheriff, the very day that he set out on the recent excursion for the state he placed an ad with the *Indiana Gazette* announcing his candidacy for the district's legislative Representative. His manner in approaching the electorate in newsprint was similar to the simple, independent, straightforward style he

manifested in his journals. Tipton claimed to be "a candidate unsolicited;" and, being "unbiassed by political men and aloof from parties," he pledged to serve the People, and not a party or party-men." In his self-effacing style, he promised to serve with fidelity if elected, "or be the last to murmur," if not. If his correspondence is any indication, his candidacy created a buzz of excitement in the county which helped him the election on 7 August 1820. In the intervening eight months from the time of his election to his next appointment as the state's boundary commissioner, Tipton found his legislative duties nearly overshadowed by his work with the development of freemasonry in his role as Grand Master. His activities included handling requests for dispensations for new lodges, the installation of officers, and visiting lodges throughout the state. That fall Tipton traveled to the northern part of the state to attend to the Masons' needs and to look at some land. In route he stayed with his mother whom he had not seen in more than a year.[51]

Having secured county seats and participated in determining the state's permanent seat of government, Tipton was commissioned in April of 1821 to fix the last geo-political boundary that would finalize the existence of Indiana. Unlike the contested gray area that surrounded racial boundaries and Article VI of the Northwest Ordinance, the graduated stages of political development that facilitated the marking and bounding of the state came to fruition rather smoothly after statehood. Clearly, considering Tipton's observations of the retreating Native American presence in the New Purchase, race played a part in the making over of Indiana and the creation of its boundaries and its markers as well. But how these groups came, to use Cayton's construct, to organize and understand themselves in relation to each other was arrived at differently than between whites and blacks; namely, the contest between whites and natives had less to do with determining racial status than it did with land

and cultural space. Euro-Americans used the law to mediate both relationships to their own satisfaction in terms of statute laws and treaties, but the course of native-white relations through the territorial period had very often been guided and punctuated by violence, as discussed in the previous chapter. Thus with regards to race and boundaries, the Northwest Ordinance manifested an uneven application in the emerging Midwest. Tipton would revisit these issues as boundary commissioner.[52]

Late in the evening of 15 May Tipton, again accompanied by Bill ("my Black Buoy"), left Corydon for Vincennes where he would meet his Illinois boundary counterpart, Samuel McClintoc. After hiring a surveyor to run the states' boundary line (for $4.50 per mile) and two Harrison County men to carry the chain (at one dollar per day each), they took the first of many compass variations and set out north along the Wabash River. His entries were more complex, precise, and coded with abbreviations to ensure accuracy in the markings that would signify the state line. The commissioners' official instructions dictated the format that required, for example, that where the line ran through timber, each sight tree had to be marked with three notches on each side. Nearby trees on both sides of the line had to be "blazed" so as to show which side the true line ran. The end of every mile was to be designated with a post six inches in diameter and set fifteen inches deep. On a tree close by, they were to mark the words "State Line." Where they encountered prairie instead of timber, as they would, they were to build mounds of earth at least four feet high and four feet at the base at the end of each mile. Tipton was also to identify kinds of timber, diameter, and course and distance they were from the posts as well as whether the waterways they crossed were navigable for transportation.[53]

The Wabash at Vincennes was the journey's starting point because up to that juncture the river served adequately as the boundary line which then proceeded due north. As it was, however, the northerly course of the line made repeated crossings over the winding river, awkwardly bringing portions of each state into the other. The Indiana Enabling Act sought to correct this. Judging from Tipton's journal, this two and a half month commission was the most strenuous and trying assignment he had yet endured, apart from the Indian campaigns. They were plagued by incessant rain, "muscheeters" ("our common ennimy"), lost horses, and a crew member who quit. As they traveled north the land became their biggest challenge. Increasingly he commented about the very tall prairie grasses, and that there was "no timber to be seen" or water to be found. The latter posed a dual hardship some evenings when they needed to "dig for water and gather all the Dry weeds of acres of ground to make [a] fire to Broil our Baken." On at least one occasion they had to strain the water before they could use it.[54]

At other times they contended with more wet and swampy prairie than they could manage safely. Trying to run the line through low wet prairie and "a most dreadfull swamp" seriously hampered their mission when they could not gain high ground. In the worst instance, Tipton wrote that "after wadeing in this swamp four hours & [a] half[,] many time[s] to our waist and having allmost killd our horses and Drowned ourselve[s][,] we made good our way Back to the plaice where we first entered the swamp." The same fate had nearly befallen their packhorse contingent. They returned to camp and made a large fire, hoping that the surveyor's crew would find them. Numerous unsuccessful attempts were made to find high passable ground on which to proceed. A couple of days later the surveyor and hand, who were "barefootd & allmost naked having been absent 2 days without blankits

and but little to eat," found the camp and brought the cheerful news that high ground was up ahead.[55]

A valuable aspect of Tipton's journal is its depiction of a young Chicago. On 30 June Tipton's party came upon Fort Dearborn, standing on the western shore of Lake Michigan. The fort was about fifty yards square with "comfortable Barracks and Rooms for soldiers & officers." Ever attuned to the land and its productive capacity, Tipton observed that the garrison "cultivates an excellent [garden]" containing "a fine large field of good wheat which is Just Begining to head." He saw the bones of those attached to the fort who were killed in an Indian attack in 1812 when it was being evacuated. Chicago itself was nothing more than a village of nine or ten houses and "families[,] mostly French Trader[,] without any kind of civil government." And from what he saw of the surrounding area, he surmised that "the whole country seems to be [in] grate want of Timber & what few groves we have seen is low scrubby Trees." Before leaving the next day, Tipton procured pork and flour from the fort for the continuation of the trip.[56]

But perhaps the most important insight that Tipton offers is in the matter of local Indian-white relations during a period that contemporaries recognized as transitional. By this time cession treaties in the Midwest were beginning to contain removal clauses, as in the 1818 Treaty of St. Mary's, and it was understood that the government would relocate Indian nations not only beyond the state boundary, but, more and more, also past the regional boundary represented by the Mississippi River. When Tipton's party ran and surveyed the state boundary line, most of northern third of Indiana was land claimed by Native Americans. Tipton understood the cultural implications of changing times and shifting boundaries, but he also knew that they were traversing through an Indian place. His entries periodically noted

that they followed Indian paths as well as the Indian names of the creeks and other waterways they encountered; as such, he employed the Pottawattomi name Tioakakee for the Kankakee River, which originated with another of the region's cultural groups, the French. Tipton's journal depicted various peaceful if not conscientious interactions with natives of different tribal nations, especially the Potawattomies, some Kickapoo, and the "Chippways" near Lake Michigan. They appeared largely as unnamed characters who provided assistance and friendship in many forms and at key moments i.e. giving directions, helping to move the group's horses and baggage across the waterways, pointing out suitable places for encampment with grazing areas for the horses, invitations to lodge with them, small-scale trade for food (a kettle of their strawberries for a kettle of Tipton's flour) or the ability to purchase food and moccasins, and offering a paid transport service via canoe for the surveyor's party. During one stopover on their return route, a "fine looking" Potawattomie chief urged them to rest within his large village which was located sixty miles southeast of Chicago. When they declined, he and other tribesmen nevertheless visited Tipton's encampment and smoked with them until late one evening.[57]

Tipton's party enjoyed a reflective and subdued Fourth of July, contemplating their freedom and independence as they steered a course for the Tippecanoe River and the once-celebrated Prophetstown. For Tipton this return to the vicinity of the Battle of Tippecanoe was like paying homage to a modern-day battle for freedom and independence ten years ago. Then, the Americans made a successful stand for regional dominance against the Native Americans who had been gathering at Prophetstown. The former Indian town exuded "little appearance of having once been a large Town [now with] only one house of hued logs." After pausing there, Tipton then headed to the former battlefield. But as his party got within

a quarter of a mile he noticed human bones and the bones of horses exposed on the ground, "Bleeching together[,] whither our men or Indian" was not known. Coming upon eight graves that appeared to have been opened up, he wrote: "my feeling is easier conceived than described." Another party, that of Henry P. Benton, the Deputy Surveyor of Public Lands in Indian, had come upon "the fatal spot" the previous year. They, too found the ground strewed with human bones together with those of horses, "Broken camp Kettles, waggon Rigging, &c." Like Tipton, Benton was at an emotional loss for words upon seeing the "pits into which the americans killed were thrown." What troubled Tipton most of all was the fact that "no marble monument make the spot where the heroes lie who fell for thier country;" yet, he consoled himself, "they will live in [the] memmory of the friends of Liberty." He had never been able to separate himself from the battle and its symbolic clash for control of the region. As a result of this visit he would later purchase the land as part of a larger tract, and in 1836 he donated the site near present-day Lafayette back to Indiana where there is now a marble monument.[58]

The Indiana-Illinois boundary commissioners and their crew completed their work and arrived back in Vincennes on 15 July. Tipton returned home to Corydon on 30 July to find that he had been vilified in the press while gone. As he had done prior to setting out on his commission to locate the permanent seat of the state's capital, Tipton had announced his candidacy for re-election to the legislature. His critics and political enemies had a field day leveling charges of impropriety concerning his collection of sheriff's fees (i.e. overcharging, charging for unallowable fees) and also disparaging his course of action in the General Assembly. With regards to the latter, Tipton was accused of influencing the location of Bartholomew County's boundaries and the selection of its seat of justice so as to have his

land chosen for the site. He was also charged with introducing the law that required the running of the state line between Indiana and Illinois instead of entreating Congress to do so at the federal government's expense.[59]

Tipton responded to the charges likewise in the press in a careful presentation that included a personal statement accompanied by the supporting testimony of others. He refuted the serious charges outright, dismissing the others as "so notoriously false or frivolous" as to be unnecessary to answer at the present. Tipton's final appeal to his constituents as they considered the upcoming election suggested the acquired savvy of a maturing politician, mindful of the public good. "If my claims to your good opinion are to be sacrificed by those charges against me," he stated, "I ought to have been put down long since." Moreover, he went on, "it cannot be denied, as Sheriff of the county, that I made use of every lawful means to save the property of individuals. I have lived among you in peace and in war—in both of which, I have endeavored to discharge my duty as a good citizen." Tipton survived his critics to receive an overwhelming majority of the votes for the legislative election less than two weeks later.[60]

Tipton continued to aspire to an appointment of more consequence which he finally received in 1823 as federal Indian agent. Yet one can hardly imagine that the road to that destination could bypass his years as a Harrison County public official. Here he acquired a rudimentary political education and conducted his business in the shadow of the state capital—and when it was moved, he was fundamental to that decision as well. Equally important, it was Tipton's role as public official, not militia man, that contrived to connect him with some of the most fundamental and controversial issues of the day, many of which revolved around race and boundaries. Tipton's years as Harrison County public official

enable us to understand how early Indianans attempted to define themselves and the place they were creating in the West, and his experiences demonstrate the controversies and consequences contained therein.

NOTES—CHAPTER THREE

[1] Andrew R. L. Cayton, "Race, Democracy, and the Multiple Meanings of the Indiana Frontier," in Darrel E. Bigham, ed., *The Indiana Territory, 1800-2000: A Bicentennial Perspective* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 2001), 48-9.

[2] William Henry Harrison, "Proclamation, 4 August 1804," Vincennes, *Indiana Gazette,* 21 August 1804, [Indiana Territorial Legislature] to the President of the United States [Thomas Jefferson], 19 August 1805, and Thomas Jefferson to the [Indiana Territorial Legislature], 28 December 1805, can all be found in the very useful document collection in Herbert H. Hawkins, comp., *Indiana's Road to Statehood: A Documentary Record* (Indianapolis: Indiana Sesquicentennial Commission, 1964), 37-8, 44-46; a reprint of the Ordinances of 1785 and 1787 can also be found in ibid., 9-23; by the end of the General Assembly of 1820-21 and the first 5 years of statehood, 24 counties had been formed, and the next five years evidenced a similar pattern which is documented in George Pence and Nellie C. Armstrong, *Indiana Boundaries: Territory, State, and County* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1933), see especially 146-201; ideological considerations and conflict concerning the role of the West to the Republic are discussed in Andrew R. L. Cayton, *The Frontier Republic: Ideology and Politics in the Ohio Country, 1780-1825* (Kent: Kent State University Press, 1986), see chapters 2 and 3 for context.

[3] Pence and Armstrong, *Indiana Boundaries*, 28; Paul Finkelman, "Evading the Ordinance: The Persistence of Bondage in Indiana and Illinois," *Journal of the Early Republic* 9 (Spring 1989): 22; see also Paul Finkelman, "Slavery and the Northwest Ordinance: A Study in Ambiguity," *Journal of the Early Republic* 6 (Winter 1986): 343-70.

[4] William Frederick Collins, "John Tipton and the Indians of the Old Northwest" (Ph.D. diss., Purdue University, 1997), iii; many of the Tipton papers were published in three volumes as Nellie Armstrong Robertson and Dorothy Riker, eds., *The John Tipton Papers* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1942), (references in this chapter all refer to volume 1; hereafter cited as *John Tipton*); the commissions noted here are in ibid., vol. 1, 94, 126-27, 149-50.

[5] Many of the details for this section are referenced in Chapter One; see also Paul Gates' introductory essay in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 5-6; the commissions noted here can be found in Box 1, Folders 3, 5, and 9 in the Tipton Papers, Indiana State Library, Indianapolis (hereafter cited as Tipton Papers); John Tipton to Allan D. Thom, 1 June 1816, is reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 116-17; for background to local resistance to participating in the militia see Mark Pitcavage, "'Burthened in Defence of our Rights': Opposition to Military Service in Ohio During the War of 1812," 104 *Ohio History* (Summer-Autumn 1995): 142-62.

[6] See note 4 for commission references; *Record of the Court of Common Pleas,* 25 January 1812, Harrison County Courthouse, Corydon, Indiana; see also Stella Josephine Hisey, "Harrison County 1808-1825" (master's thesis, Indiana University, 1936), chapter 3.

[7] Malcolm J. Rohrbough, *The Trans-Appalachian Frontier: People, Societies, and Institutions, 1775-1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), chapter 5; the "paper world" described here is evidenced throughout Box 1, Tipton Papers and in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton,* chapter 2.

[8] Tipton to Thomas Posey, 10 September 1816, Thomas Posey to Tipton: Commission as Sheriff, 16 September 1816, Tipton: Bond as Sheriff of Harrison County, 16 September 1816, Jonathan Jennings to Tipton: Commission as Sheriff, 30 December 1816, and Tipton: Notice of Sheriff's Sale, 21 October 1816 are all reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 119-20, 123-24, 126-27; the sheriff's office was an important one, particularly with regards to the collection of taxes. Because it was appointive during the territorial period and thus susceptible to the governor's whim, unsuccessful efforts were made, notably in 1810 and 1811, to make this an elective office, which it was by statehood. See "Review of Legislation," in Louis B. Ewbank and Dorothy L. Riker, eds., *The Laws of Indiana Territory, 1809-1816* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1934), 27-28; the joint resolution and memorial concerning the election of sheriffs from 1810 and 1811 are reprinted in ibid., 772, 788.

[9] "An act for the establishing of the Office of Sheriff, and for the appointment of Sheriffs (1807)" in Francis S. Philbrick, ed., *The Laws of Indiana Territory, 1801-1809* (Springfield: Trustees of the Illinois State Historical Library, 1930), 233-34; "An Act regulating the General Elections of the Indiana Territory (1811)," "An Act to reduce into one the several acts establishing a permanent Revenue (1813), and "An Act supplementary to...the opening and repairing Public Roads and Highways (1815) are reprinted in Ewbank and Riker, *Laws of Indiana*

Territory, 232-34, 323, 615-16; "An Act for the prevention of Vice and Immorality (1807)" in Philbrick, *Laws of Indiana Territory*, 372-73; "An Act more effectually to prevent duelling (1813)" in Ewbank and Riker, *Laws of the Indiana Territory*, 442-45; William L. Barker, "Warrick County and the Northwest Territory," *Indiana Magazine of History* 24 (June 1928): 122; Tipton's suit in which he is a defendant on the charge of challenging appears in *Harrison County Circuit Court, Order Book, 1820-25*, 127, 204, 224, 268, 313, 391, 399, 444, 445.

[10] "An Act to reduce" in Ewbank and Riker, *Laws of Indiana Territory*, 309-14; for the political debate over the issue of slavery at this point in territorial Indiana see Finkelman, "Evading the Ordinance," 38-40.

[11] "An Act to reduce" in Ewbank and Riker, *Laws of Indiana Territory*, 317-21; an amusing account of one territorial county's difficulties in finding a durable and successful tax collector is George W. Purcell, "Collecting Taxes in Indiana Territory, 1797-1802," *Indiana Magazine of History* 40 (December 1944): 353-63.

[12] 1813 Harrison County Tax List Book, Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 5 (my interpretation here is tentative until more data can be scrutinized); Tax Levy for Harrison County, September 1816 and Harrison County Tax Levy, 13 May 1818 are reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 121-23, 144-45.

[13] ibid.; *Record of Court of Common Pleas*, 25 April 1810 and *Record of Common Pleas*, 26 April 1811 are at the Harrison County Courthouse, Corydon; Hisey, "Harrison County," 74; the 1810 Census figures are noted in Emma Lou Thornbrough, *The Negro in Indiana: A Study of a Minority* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1957), 22.

[14] *Record of Incorporation*, Office of [Harrison] County Clerk, Corydon; Corydon *Indiana Gazette*, 20 March 1819; ibid., 9 June 1824; portions of the previous three references are reprinted in Hisey, "Harrison County," 83-85; Tipton to The Editors of the Indiana Gaz[ette], 9 June 1824, Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 364-65.

[15] Davis Floyd to John Tipton, 10 December 1816, Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 8; William Stith to Perry, 23 September 1813 and William Stith to Perry and Jesse, date unknown, are in *Deed Record* A, Harrison County, 10 and are also reprinted in Hisey, "Harrison County," 76.

[16] Floyd to Tipton; Tipton to Floyd, 10 December 1816, Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 8; both letters are reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 124-26; a discussion of the Perry case and of Floyd's background appears in ibid., 125 n19 and n20.

[17] The noted fee bills are in Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 10; George Pope to John Tipton, 4 August 1819, is in ibid., Folder 11 and is reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 164-66; a study of early Indiana women that emphasizes their interaction with the legal system is Dorothea Kline McCullough, "'By Cash and Eggs:' Gender in Washington County During Indiana's Pioneer Period" (Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 2002).

[18] Hisey, "Harrison County," 84; Samuel Littell to John Tipton, 22 December 1812, Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 4; the militia pay discussion is in Vincennes *Western Sun*, 15 February, 15 and 29 March, 12 April, 24 May, 19 and 26 July, 23 and 30 August, and 6, 13, and 20 September 1817.

[19] Warrant for Arrest of Jacob Rush of Harrison County, 29 August 1819, Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 11; "List of Counterfeit Bank Notes...," 3 June 1818, Ibid., Folder 10; Jonathan Woodbury to John Tipton, 13 June 1819, ibid., Folder 11.

[20] Benjamin V. Beckes to John Tipton, 27 June 1819, ibid.; Randle W. Smith to John Tipton, 23 February 1819, ibid.; Jonathan Woodbury to Tipton, 11 April 1819, ibid; the preceding letters are also reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 160-61, 154-55, and 157-58 respectively (p. 154 n80 notes the suit against Tipton et al); the English farmer is quoted in Mitchell, "Indiana's Growth," 385.

[21] John Opie, *The Law of the Land: Two Hundred Years of American Farmland Policy* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1994), 40-42; Waldo F. Mitchell, "Indiana's Growth 1812-1820," *Indiana Magazine of History* 10 (December 1914): 385-92 (quoted material is on page 385); Benjamin V. Beckes to Tipton, 8 February 1820, Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 12 and is reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 184-85; for additional background though not heavily researched, see William O. Lynch, "An Early Crisis in Indiana History," *Indiana Magazine of History* 43 (June 1947): 105-24.

[22] Appointment as Courthouse Custodian, 11 February 1818, Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 143-44; John Meek to John Tipton, 6 September 1817, ibid., 140; Madison *Indiana Republican*, 19 July and 16 August 1817.

[23] An example of the correspondence pertaining to the Masons is Tipton to Daniel Grass, 21 January 1820, in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 175; see also Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 12 for Mason-related items; Daniel McDonald, *A History of Freemasonry in Indiana: From 1806 to 1898* (Indianapolis: The Grand Lodge, 1898), 10-11, 65-73, 331; "Return my Books, and I will lend again," Corydon *Indiana Gazette*, 30 October 1819; a copy of the previous is also found in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 170; the historian who mis-

characterizes Tipton's reading is Paul Wallace Gates who, in the introduction to the published papers, wrote that "There is no evidence that he ever took much enjoyment in reading, or, in fact, ever carried it very far save to follow the political newspapers," in ibid., 4; in fact, in a letter to his son Spear dated 24 January 1833, Tipton again refers to "my library," in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 2, 790 (this point is developed more fully in another chapter).

[24] Citizens' Committee of Corydon to James Monroe and Andrew Jackson, 22 June 1819, and Tipton to Samuel Connor (extract), 29 June 1819 are reprinted in ibid., 162.

[25] "The Northwest Ordinance, 13 July 1787," in Commager, *Documents*,132; Thornbrough, *The Negro in Indiana*, 6-7.

[26] "A law concerning Servants [1803]," "An Act concerning the introduction of Negroes and Mulattoes into this territory, [1805]," and "An Act concerning the introduction of Negroes and Mullattoes ino this territory, [1807]" are in Philbrick, *Laws of Indiana Territory*, 42-46, 135-39, 523-26; Thornbrough, *The Negro in Indiana*, chapter 1; Finkelman, "Evading the Ordinance," 21-40.

[27] Indenture between Amy and Isaiah Boone, 8 May 1812, *Deed Book A*, 25, Harrison County Courthouse, Corydon is also reprinted in Hisey, "Harrison County," 75; the references to the Clark County indentures, along with some from Knox County, are made in Thornbrough, *The Negro in Indiana,* 10.

[28] "Counter Petition of Clark County," [10 October 1807], reprinted in Jacob Piatt Dunn, *Slavery Petitions and Papers* (Indianapolis: Bowen-Merrill Co., 1894), 76-78; "An Act to repeal entitled 'An act for the introduction of negroes...[1810],'" in Ewbank and Riker, *Laws of Indiana Territory*, 138-39; Thornbrough, *The Negro in Indiana*, chapter 1.

[29] Joseph Bartholomew to Tipton, 17 April 1820, Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 13 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 193; the request to leave the boy home is in relation to the trip undertaken to select a site for Indiana's new capital; Bill for Lodging (includes reference to Tipton and his "black boy"), 16 November 1825, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 19; the undated Harrison County memorial is reprinted in Thornbrough, *The Negro in Indiana*, 20; Paul Michum, Deed of Emancipation, 22 September 1815, *Deed Book B*, and Susannah Michum, Deed of Emancipation, 1816, *Deed Book* A, Harrison County Courthouse, Corydon.

[30] Slave Advertisement, Corydon *Indiana Gazette*, 17 and 24 September 1820; Tipton to Joseph Shaw, 6 September 1820, and Receipt from Joseph Shaw, 29 September 1820, are in Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 14 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton,* 227; see also Tipton to Robert B. Currey, 6 September 1820, in ibid., 226.

[31] My discussion of this aspect of Susan's bid for freedom largely follows the explanation given in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 146 n63; the original papers relative to the case, *Susan v. Richard Stephens*, are in Harrison County Circuit Court, Judgments, File Box S and Harrison County Circuit Court, Order Book, 1817-1820, at Harrison County Courthouse, Corydon.

[32] Robert Stephens to Tipton, 17 May 1818, and Warrant for Arrest of Robert Stephens/ 11 July 1818, are in Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 10 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 146-47.

[33] Corydon *Indiana Gazette*, 23 January 1819 and is also reprinted in Hisey, "Harrison County," 79; Warrant for Arrest of Robert Stephens, James Thompson, and Jesse Young, 27 November 1819, Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 11 and is also reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 171.

[34] Jonathan Jennings, Special Message: Kentucky Kidnappers of Indiana Negro, 15 January 1820, with inclosures, in Logan Esarey, ed., *Messages and Papers of Jonathan Jennings, Ratliff Boon, and William Hendricks*, vol. III 1816-1825 (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Commission, 1924), 98-109.

[35] ibid.; Vincennes *Western Sun*, 26 February and 4 March 1820; Jonathan Jennings, Special Message: Refusal of Kentucky to Return Fugitives, 4 December 1820, with inclosure, in Esarey, Jonathan Jennings, 134-37; in light of Jennings persistence in this high profile, problematic case, Esarey's characterization of him that he "took no decisive stand" on the important issues of the time seems inaccurate and overstated, see ibid., 28.

[36] Robert Stephens to Tipton, 7 January 1820, Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 12 and is reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 173-74; see also Richard Stephens to Tipton, 26 July 1820, ibid., 221-22; the disposition of Susan's case is referenced in ibid., 146 n63.

[37] The commissioners charged with locating the new site for Indiana's seat of government were appointed by an act of 11 January 1820; see *Laws of Indiana, 1819-1820*, p. 18-20.

[38] Nina Kathleen Reid, "Sketches of Early Indiana Senators—Waller Taylor, 1816-1825," *Indiana Magazine of History* 9 (June 1913): 92-93; Waller Taylor to Tipton, 13 February 1817, John Zenor to Tipton, [?] 1816, and

Jonathan Woodbury, 13 June 1819 are in Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 8, 9, and 11 respectively; these are also reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 127-29, 157-58.

[39] Waller Taylor to Tipton, 9 January 1819, William Hendricks to Tipton, 4 March 1820, and Waller Taylor to Tipton, 11 March 1820 are in Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folders 12 and 13; these are also reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 151-52, 186-88, 188-89; a good treatment on the role of the land office in westward expansion is Malcolm J. Rohrbough, *The Land Office Business: The Settlement and Administration of American Public Lands, 1789-1837* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968).

[40] The 29 December 1819 act naming the five commissioners is found in *Laws of Indiana, 1819-1820*, 12; additional information about the men selected is found in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 179, n34; the first attempt to select a site fell through because of a faulty land title, as mentioned in ibid; Tipton had also participated in the relocation of the county seat in Warrick County in 1818 for which he was asked to attest to his friend Ratliff Boon's disinterestedness in the matter given that the county seat's town was subsequently named for the latter; see ibid., 190-91, 193.

[41] Joseph Bartholomew to Tipton, 27 January 1820, Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 12, and is reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 175-78.

[42] This journal is found in Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 12 and is reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 179-84 (quoted material is on page 180).

[43] Ibid., 181.

[44] Ibid., 181, 183, 184; see also "Report of the Commissioners to Locate the County Seat of Owen County," 12 February 1820, in ibid., 185-86; donation offers can be found in Folder 12 of the Tipton Papers, but see, for example, John Dunn to John Tipton, 12 February 1820, in ibid.

[45] Charles C. Royce, *Indian Land Cessions in the United States* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900; reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1971), 692-95, plate cxxvi ; Joseph Bartholomew to Tipton, 27 January 1820, and Joseph Bartholomew to Tipton, 17 April 1820, in Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folders 12 and 13 respectively, and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton,* 175-78, 193.

[46] Tipton's journal can be accessed in several ways. The manuscript is in the Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 13; it is also reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 195-21, in *Indiana Magazine of History* 1 (1905): 9-15,

74-79, and in the Indianapolis *News*, 14 April 1879. In the latter, the editor altered the manuscript by correcting the grammatical deficiencies.

[47] Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 196, 197-98, 199; "Journal of the Board of Commissioners...," 22 May to 7 June 1820, ibid., 211-15.

[48] These references are scattered throughout the journal in ibid.

[49] Quoted material is in ibid., 200.

[50] Ibid., 209, 210.

[51] Tipton Candidacy for the Legislature, Corydon *Indiana Gazette,* 17 May 1820; this ad is also reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 194-95; one of the letters of political support is Allan D. Thom to Tipton, 12 July 1820, ibid., 218-19; for correspondence relevant to his freemasonry activities during this time see Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 14; the journal of his trip to northern Indiana is also found in ibid as well as in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 229-32.

[52] Appointment as Boundary Commissioner, 3 April 1821, ibid., 241.

[53] Tipton's journal is reprinted in ibid., 244-80; *Laws of Indiana, 1820-21*, 38-39.

[54] Journal, Indiana-Illinois Boundary, Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 255.

[55] Ibid., 261.

[56] Ibid., 266, 267, 268, 269.

[57] These references are found throughout the journal.

[58] Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 7 July entry, 272, 274-75 n66; Henry P. Benton's account is reprinted in Dorothy Riker, "Two Accounts of the Upper Wabash Country, 1819-20,"*Indiana Magazine of History* 37 (December 1941): 384-95 (quoted material is on page 390).

[59] The boundary commissioners' report to the Indiana General Assembly is reprinted in ibid., 280-81; Candidacy for the Legislature, Corydon *Indiana Gazette*, 21 May 1821, ibid., 280; the statements of critics and supporters that were published in the *Gazette* in Tipton's absence occurred between 12 July and 2 August, 1821.

[60] Tipton's two responses—the initial, followed by one more detailed—are in ibid., 2 and 3 August 1821; the preceding are both reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, 281-92; the voting results showing that

Tipton received 821 votes and his nearest challenger received 592 were published in the *Gazette* and reprinted in Ibid., 291 n79.

CHAPTER FOUR

Agents of Influence:
The Limits of Indian Policy in the Early Midwest, 1823-1828

"But considering the situation of the Indians, and the anxiety of the government, not only to do Justice, but to do more than Justice by them, and to avoid even the appearance of injuring them..." --Lewis Cass to Tipton regarding treaty provisions, 22 October 1823[1]

"[T]his is a thankless troublesome business." --letter, Tipton to Lewis Cass, 27 May 1830[2]

Surveyors Joseph Allen and Henry Benton had a tough job. Following the 1818 Treaty of St. Mary's between the U.S. and the Miami and Potawatomi nations, Allen and Benton were hired to survey and mark the land set aside for several Indian reserves including the Big Miami Reserve which was to be located south of the upper Wabash River in north-central Indiana. Allen's party set out in September of 1819 and traced the Wabash from the east as they marked the boundaries of the reserves. Along the way they negotiated a "great many Swamps and wet Prairies," small and large Indian villages, and a particularly dangerous rattlesnake-infested area situated at the forks of the Wabash. The local Indians avoided this place, believing that the "great Spiret" had sent the snakes to guard it and to keep them from building a town. Instead they buried their dead there. As his party began running the line for the larger reserve, Allen could see that the Miami were highly dissatisfied. The treaties had failed to attach to their reserve a valuable salt spring that they accounted as being the best on this side of the Ohio and one they had expected to gain by right. Upon realizing that the surveyors were running the line contrary to their desire for the salt spring, they ran them off repeatedly. Allen's party was forced to abandon the effort by the end of November.[3]

Henry Benton and Allen resumed surveying the treaty reserves the next February and were initially heartened by the greeting of one of the Miami chiefs who expressed "a great deal of Joy on seeing us." However, by early April Benton's party was likewise threatened by Indian hostility magnified by whiskey consumption, and they learned of a plan to "massacre" them in revenge for the shooting of a local native by an American in 1819. When an obviously agitated Indian came to where the surveyors were staying, and was soon joined by others, Benton's party heeded instinct and took off in their canoes. The Indians gave chase but then abandoned it. Having neither provisions nor blankets, the surveyors returned to their camp only to be told by a Frenchman to keep running. After a few days the surveyors regrouped and resumed their task. A little wary of another attack, this time Allen approached two Potawatomi chiefs and several warriors to gain their consent to allow the survey for their reserves, and this was granted. The Kickapoos, on the contrary, were not agreeable to the next survey and made it clear that they were not to proceed. Stymied in their work, the surveyors decided to head home.[4]

Allen and Benton experienced firsthand that the upper Wabash country was as yet a highly contested space in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Neither formal treaties nor federal policy mandates guaranteed how natives and whites would relate to each other, or even whether agents of the government including surveyors would succeed in their jobs. Yet the fact that Allen and Benton were hindered in their work suggests the strength of Native American influence in the Old Northwest in the form of resistance and group autonomy. In this sense the power of the federal government is less significant or germane to understanding native-white relations than the complex of influences that shaped the course of Indian policy in the early Midwest which is the focus of this chapter. Manifestations of

Indian resistance and self-determination were just part of the complexities that would greet and antagonize John Tipton as Indian Agent at the Fort Wayne agency.

After repeated attempts to secure a significant federal appointment, thirty-six year old Tipton was appointed as the federal Indian Agent at Fort Wayne by Secretary of War John C. Calhoun in March of 1823. The offer came on the heels of more than a decade of public service in southern Indiana in a progressively developing political career in roles ranging from justice of the peace (1811) to two-term county sheriff (1816-1820) to two-term representative in the Assembly (1820-1822) and several important state commissions. His political presence was enhanced by an active and influential military career, having been commissioned a major general the year before he arrived at Fort Wayne. Indeed his correspondence with government officials during this time shows that he continued to be evaluated as a "good officer" even while in this non-military capacity. Tipton had encountered and interacted with Native Americans on numerous occasions, most frequently in connection with military campaigns, but he specifically benefited from his experiences in policing and in the tax-related accounting that he was called on to perform as county sheriff. These skills were vital tools to the Indian Agent, and Tipton's use of them only reinforced his convictions about whose world the Old Northwest was becoming.[5]

Tipton left his Harrison County home in May of 1823 to assume his new post soon to become, according to fur trade scholar Bert Anson, "the most important individual in the affairs of the northern region" of the state. The Fort Wayne Agency was situated at the junction of the St. Joseph's and St. Mary's rivers, at the eastern edge of Indiana's northern "Indian Country" among Indian villages, abandoned hunting camps, trading posts, forests, wet lands, and rivers. It administered to about 2,400 of the resident Miami, Eel River, and

Potawatomi tribal members and was neighbor to the vicinity's white population of about three hundred, seventy-five of whom (or, one-fourth) were men over the age of twenty-one years; presumably, the remaining three-fourths of the white population was made up of men younger than twenty-one years, women, and children illustrating a relatively youthful white western frontier. Tipton's agency occupied a frontier zone in the midst of cultural and economic change. It linked remnants of the recent past's military ethos, persistent fur trade activities, a native culture under stress and disruption, and an increasingly dominant Euro-American culture that esteemed personal industry, productive agriculture, "improved" land—and federal money. (See Appendix C) The military fort dated back to 1794, serving as a government trading factory between 1802 and 1814. It survived an Indian attack on the attached settlement during the War of 1812 and thereafter continued its association with the declining fur trade. And in 1819 the fort's garrison was dismissed.[6]

The convergence of federal Indian policy and westward expansion on the West's middle border were visible at Fort Wayne. After the war, the village of Fort Wayne consisted of about thirty dwellings and a large number of French-Canadian and French-Indian traders. Within the confines of the sixty-yards-square fort and its log-hewn structures, connected by a double row of picket fences, were the Indian Agent's offices and a Baptist Indian school that catered to about forty young Native American scholars. (See Appendix D) Aggressive westward expansion policies had prompted major irreversible changes for the region and its native peoples through a series of treaties. The most relevant of these included the Fort Wayne Treaty (1809), the Treaty of the Rapids (or, Maumee) (1817), the Treaty of St. Mary's (or, New Purchase) (1818), and the Treaty of Chicago (1821). More would transpire during Tipton's term. These treaties resulted in valuable and advantageous land

cessions in northern Indiana to the federal government in return for annuities for the Indians. Fort Wayne, then, became an important hub for annuity payments and distributions. Illustrative of the corruptible lure and power of federal money is the 1824 Miami annuity payments, the first over which Tipton presided. This annuity amounted to $18,400 in silver and 190 bushels of contracted salt. Unfortunately, this distinction attracted large numbers of unscrupulous whites to Fort Wayne, alongside some otherwise enterprising whites as well as small number of African Americans, all of whom hoped to cash-in on the Indian annuity business one way or another.[7]

The principle residents notwithstanding, Euro-Americans understood this to be an Indian place only in the sense of it being in a state of transition; to them, the march of American commerce and material progress accompanying westward expansion would not be halted. Although historians avoid analyses laced with inevitability, white contemporaries may in fact have accepted it, given the strength and influence of their cultural prejudices and prosperity-driven imaginations. A military officer who had become acquainted with the area during earlier military campaigns called it "a fine prospect" for Euro-Americans and "a champaign country," replete with prairies, "inexhaustible grazing," "vast forests of valuable timber," and exceedingly rich soil. Another officer read the landscape for its possibilities in opening up a commercial waterway and believed that the country was "admirably calculated for the convenience of inland navigation." Robert McAfee's influential 1816 *History of the Late War in the Western Country*, a book Tipton owned as of 1819, rooted Fort Wayne's future prosperity in the building of a canal that would connect the Wabash and Maumee rivers.[8]

Captain James Riley, a surveyor and an apparent acquaintance of Tipton's, echoed these sentiments in an 1819 letter from Fort Wayne in which he commented that the talk of work on New York's "Grand Canal" and the prospects of linking it to the western country "electrifies the citizenry." A traveler to Fort Wayne in 1821 was similarly entranced and wrote that "[t]his part of the country possesses great commercial advantages, and when it becomes settled, will be a place of great business." The "business" he alluded to was the promise of agricultural commerce that was evident in the area's rich soil as well as in the luxurious grass and herbage for stock raising. He too imagined that prosperity would arrive via a canal system. Thus, Tipton entered a landscape overrun by ongoing contests of authority and resistance alongside competing visions about the major economic activities that should dominate it. Few natives or whites believed that the former's hold upon the region was anything more than tenuous by the 1820s, a situation created and fostered by what historian Laurence Hauptman has termed a "conspiracy of interests."[9]

The conversion of acquired Indian lands into American-organized places was already underway when Tipton arrived. This was a process with which he was personally familiar and in which he took part on a number of levels. The Fort Wayne land office had opened up on 8 May 1822, with the first public land sales occurring just months after he arrived at Fort Wayne. Tipton, who became an inveterate life-long speculator, purchased 180 acres along the Wabash River. Land speculating was appealing because of the relative ease of making a profit on anticipations about a future market i.e. the opening up of former Indian lands for sale followed by a rushing in of settler-farmers eager to buy. As discussed elsewhere, Tipton was an opportunistic speculator like many of his generation and was quite fortunate in some of his purchases. One such transaction concerned a twenty-five acre parcel of land for which

he paid $31.81 and then sold for $1,200 fourteen years later. In other land dealings, he organized land at the county level after being appointed the first county agent of the newly-formed Allen County where he now resided. This entailed converting the sales of government-donated land into county funds to be used for the citizens' needs. In this way Tipton facilitated the construction of a jail. Just as he had done in Harrison County, Tipton made himself a prominent Allen County figure in a variety of public capacities, including his continued association with the Masons and functioning as the "worshipful master" of Fort Wayne's Masonic Lodge.[10]

In all of this Tipton embodied the spirit and the force of westward expansion and American efforts to organize the Old Northwest. As Indian Agent he represented the long arm of federal Indian policy while also mediating local Native American claims and interests along with settlers' claims against them. Rapid westward expansion had created a tense landscape in motion where persistent social, economic, and environmental changes were obvious and ongoing. As Allen and Benton had experienced, this situation contributed numerous influences to the responsibilities facing Tipton, some deleterious in and of themselves, some arising from the pressure of intrusive Euro-American culture. The most pernicious influence was undoubtedly that of whiskey. Yet while whiskey was destroying the Native American culture from within, Euro-American agriculture and its promoters asserted an increasing level of external pressure that was similarly threatening. During a treaty council in Chicago in 1821, Potawatomi Chief Metea exemplified these threats in protesting that in the whites' haste to create farms from Indian lands, "the plowshare is driven through our tents before we have time to carry out our goods and seek another habitation."[11]

Whiskey and agrarianism pervaded the landscape of the emerging Old Northwest states during the early national period and both significantly influenced if not altogether shaped the region's native-white relations. In this context whiskey's historical influence is freely acknowledged by scholars; however, agrarianism, as opposed to "the frontier," remains an understated influence. While the fur trade was of material interest to the U.S. government, its relationship to federal Indian policy had changed and diminished in 1822 when Congress ended the government factory system, the year before Tipton's appointment. Henceforth the Indian Agent's main concern with the private traders was in licensing them, recording their locations, and enforcing the prohibitions against illegal trading and trading whiskey. As his papers make plain whiskey prohibitions were ineffectual and widely violated, although Fort Wayne Agency violators risked a hard run-in with Tipton. Agrarian adherents, particularly the rising interest in creating a commercial agricultural system, proved to be an irrepressible cultural-economic force on a scale of equal or perhaps even greater consequence to the region's native people than whiskey. Agrarianism informed while it simultaneously undercut stated federal Indian policy objectives in the emerging Midwest by ultimately motivating local support and agitation for Indian removal. The power of federal money in the form of annuities and Native Americans' use of it constituted a third important yet underrated influence in the conduct of Indian policy in the early Midwest. Just as boundaries mattered in the structuring of race and space, a complicated interplay of influences figured more prominently in the conduct of federal Indian policy than is usually credited by scholars.

Moreover, Indian Agents like John Tipton represented an overt conflict of interests, revealing a major flaw in federal Indian policy. While his papers demonstrate his genuine

commitment to distancing Indians from alcohol and in promoting the education of their children, he nonetheless championed internal improvements and the further extinguishment of Indian land titles for the cause of commercial development which he knew to be dependent upon convincing them to give up their lands. Like others, Tipton did not appear to question the way that the wind blew on the issue of expansion. As he had done at Tippecanoe and in selecting the site for the new state's capital, Tipton again stood at the threshold of a transformative era rooted in one group's establishment of hegemony over another and had a significant hand in it.

Two years prior to his arrival, Tipton's predecessor, John Hays, depicted the remote public buildings at the fort as being in "a perfect decaying state." Tipton would not have argued. He found the public well in need of cleaning-out and repairing. His quarters were "very uncomfortable," and the roofing was in such a poor state that neither the bed nor documents could be kept dry. Ever attuned to improvement, Tipton immediately initiated repairs on his and the sub-agent's rooms, explaining to his superior, Michigan Territory Governor Lewis Cass, that failing to do so would render the buildings a loss to the government. If need be he would pay the cost from his own pocket. Any thought that he had been granted a plum post quickly vanished. In the end Tipton chose to live with local merchant Alexander Ewing, who boarded workmen and others at the rate of $100 per year, until he married again in 1825. Nevertheless Tipton pledged his "highest ambition" in meriting the government's confidence in him in a letter to Secretary of War Calhoun several months later.[12]

While Tipton would be supervised from afar by Governor Cass, he was governed in his daily conduct by the laws and policies related to the Indian trade and the Civilization program. The areas for which he was immediately responsible involved licensing, policing Indians' access to "ardent spirits," the promotion of agriculture and husbandry, and contracting for and settling the accounts of the native groups for whom he was responsible. The 1802 Trade and Intercourse Act served as the legal basis outlining native-white relations during Tipton's tenure and for the next three decades. Among the stipulations relevant to the Indian Agent, the act required that traders be licensed and bonded or risk the forfeiture of all merchandise found in their possession along with the possibility of a fine and imprisonment. Although implicitly stated, the President would use the Indian Agent to "promote civilization among the friendly Indian tribes" by having him furnish them "with useful domestic animals, and implements of husbandry, and with goods or money." Finally, the act intended to restrict Indians' access to alcohol and authorized measures "to prevent or restrain the vending or distribution of spirituous liquors among all or any of the said Indian tribes."[13]

The Trade and Intercourse Act was amended on 6 May 1822, at the same time that Congress abolished government trading houses, or factories, which meant that the Indian trade would now transact through licensed private U.S. citizens or companies. Indian Agents and other officials were urged to step up their policing of traders suspected of transporting ardent spirits into Indian country and, if confirmed, to seize their goods which were then split between the informer and the government. And, mirroring the increasingly bureaucratic financial accounting associated with Indian agencies and with native-white relations in general, the amendatory act required that Indian Agents settle their accounts annually and forward the detailed statements to the War Department. Secretary of War Calhoun informed

the Superintendents of Indian Affairs that the law's provisions, especially the latter, would be "strictly enforced" as it was deemed essential "that the Indian Department be put in the best possible condition." In the same way that county sheriffs were personally liable for the taxes they were bound to collect, Tipton learned that Indian Agents were likewise responsible for balancing their accounts or face the label of "debtor on the books of the Treasury" as he did in 1825. Additionally, through the 1819 Civilization Fund Act, which provided for an annual appropriation for the "civilization" education of Native Americans, Tipton would also facilitate their agricultural instruction and the teaching of reading, writing, and arithmetic to their children at the agency.[14]

Hays' resignation letter to Secretary of War Calhoun is revealing of the fundamental importance of agriculture to Indian policy objectives and to native-white relations in general. Indeed to the official, Native Americans' imitation of white agrarianism was the measure of successful policy implementation, and Hays reflected that he had achieved this with the agency's resident Miami and Eel River tribes. His stated reason for resigning was the great distance of the agency—some five hundred miles—from his family whom he had not seen for nearly a year and which had become a hardship to him. Yet he boasted of having been able to inspire the tribes to "Cultivate the Earth," and noted that they had used their annuities to have fields planted and houses made for them. At Turtle Town, an Eel River village fifteen miles from Fort Wayne, the Indians had built ten log houses and cultivated two considerable fields that they enclosed in the white farming style. At another village, this one on the Wabash River thirty miles distant, nine log houses now stood and a field requiring eight thousand fence rails to enclose it had been cultivated. Hays characterized White Raccoon's village as particularly impressive because in addition they were raising twenty

head of cattle, some hogs and chickens, making butter, and growing enough corn to accommodate travelers. "I expect ere long," he wrote, "many will follow their example, and be Industrious."[15]

In reality these changes with respect to openly embracing Euro-American agriculture had less to do with acculturation than with manipulation on both sides. Hays relayed that as Agent he had drawn a line with the Indians about presents, making it clear that the only items he would give to them, with few exceptions, would be "the necessary Impliments for Agriculture." He admitted that this did not set well with them initially, yet "it is seldom now, they ask for anything[,] at times, a plug of Tobbaccoe, or a loaf Bread." Hays, however, apparently did not recognize or acknowledge the degree to which the region's Native Americans were actually resisting assimilation into white agrarianism. Tipton would also handle numerous requests from Indian groups to use their annuities to pay whites to perform the agricultural labor and set up the farms expected of them. On a 6 April 1824 document he filed as "Request of Indian Chiefs for Work," Tipton was requested by Miami chiefs Le Gros, Osage, and Little Huron of Mississinewa Town to let a contract for providing rails to fence the lands belonging to seven of the native people. Sounding like businessmen, the chiefs specified that Tipton not accept a contract that paid more than three dollars per hundred rails, "the same as we paid last year," and that "those seven Lots and all the other improved ground...[be] plowed and planted with corn." They also wanted the work well done. William Suttenfield received the contract for this job and agreed with Tipton to "have those Seven lots together with all the land now enclosed at said places claired[,] plowed[,] and planted with corn *in a neat farmer like manner.*"[16]

Numerous similar requests, including several from Miami chiefs Charlow Constant and Le Gros, can be found in Tipton's papers. Because they recorded the cost of such "commodities" as the human labor involved in breaking up the land for planting i.e. seven dollars per acre in 1830 they invite an analysis of their relationship to the quickly developing agricultural economy of the early Midwest. More immediately, they clearly demonstrated that in paying others to do the work Native Americans resisted making personal commitments to white agrarianism as a way of life, despite Hays' interpretation of their activities. Much of this activity on some level appeared to be "for show" and was representative of what agricultural historian R. Douglas Hurt points out was a national Indian policy that failed to expressly develop an agricultural program. To take it a step further, the issue of annuities and the empowerment of Native Americans to make contracts involving those annuities defeated the government's premise of converting them into committed, as in market-oriented, agriculturists.[17]

In this, Tipton expressed uncertainty about policy, or at least how to go about realizing the objectives, although in many instances questions did not keep him from acting on his own initiative. Occasionally he seemed to sacrifice one objective for another. On 31 December 1824 he explained to Calhoun that from the beginning, "I have done all in my power to aid what I understood to be the views of the Pres[ident] and yourself in mangeing Indian affairs." To stem the tide of exploitation and alcoholism he had recommended to the Miami that they "cultivate thier land and pay out their money for labour instead of whisky." They approved and applied upwards of three thousand dollars of one year's annuity to pay for building houses, fencing, and plowing. Many of them were now well supplied in corn. Tipton was careful to emphasize to Cass that most of the work was contracted by him at the

Miamis' request. "[N]ot one dollar," he insisted, "was paid without the chiefs knowing to whome and for what it was given." Certainly, as evidenced by the aforementioned labor requests, the agency Indians dictated specifically articulated contracts conforming to their expectations, with and without an interpreter.[18]

Given their propensity for contracting others to perform agricultural labor for them, it is initially puzzling that they would similarly approach Tipton for "plows, hoes, saws[,] and other implements of husbandry." To what extent the agency Indians employed these tools in the same manner and for the same purpose as their Euro-American counterparts is undetermined. It is likely that these were perceived in the context of presents, which had become enmeshed in native-white relations. In fact Cass approved Tipton's giving of these items as "presents" in terms of categorized funding, accompanied by a warning that some "had better be made by your blacksmith" to hold the line on expenditures. So, while Tipton believed he was closing off the Indians' access to whiskey by encouraging them to appropriate their money for agricultural labor instead, he was actually forestalling any true acculturation to a white agrarian lifestyle; yet this very element would be used as a litmus test of their "civilization" and of Indian policy's success.[19]

By far, the single most important responsibility that the Indian Agent performed revolved around managing and fulfilling the treaty provisions and annuity payments for the agency Indians. This involved quarterly fiscal accounting and reporting to Washington, contracting for annuity goods and other items, distributing annuity provisions, settling claims against those annuities, and keeping the whiskey vendors at bay. In controlling a vital stream of federal monies into the upper Wabash country, Tipton enjoyed the growing authority and rising political strength that he had sought since becoming county sheriff. He held

considerable local and trans-local power as a result of presiding over numerous contracts that were "let" to fulfill treaty provisions, such as supplying the salt annuity. Yet the position was fraught with conflicts and gray areas, and he wrote numerous letters to Cass for clarification of policies. Tipton frequently wrestled with trying to manage both his agency and his native constituents while being beholden to treaty stipulations, unclear policy, and limited funding. But his constant consultation of the laws and treaties essential to his administering the agency made him adept and something of an expert at both and he encouraged the same of the sub-Agents. Tipton's expertise and officious style enabled him to be quickly tapped as a commissioner for a number of treaties. Tipton also contended with scrutiny and criticism for some of his decisions and waded through a series of stressful and malicious charges during his tenure at the agency. His papers demonstrate that Indian Agents were constrained to be businessmen first in that Indian policy was conducted primarily with an eye for the bottom line.[20]

As such, a cost analysis was an added variable used in evaluating Indian policy, even when the native people did not always attach the same meaning to the white-ascribed values although this was changing. Moreover, interactions between natives and whites and between natives of different tribal nations were often reduced to quantifications. Resolutions took the form of receipted reimbursements. In one instance of many, Robert Hood billed the government $21.75 for his effort in hunting and reclaiming a horse belonging to an unnamed Miami that had been stolen by a white man. In another, at issue was a Shawnee woman's four-year-old grayish-white mare that had been taken by a Miami after it strayed from a hunting party near Fort Recovery. The Shawnee woman had been forced to give goods valued at fourteen dollars in order to "git her own creature a gain." But the following year,

the horse-stealing Miami paid a fellow tribesman to take the horse back and then re-claimed it.[21]

By the time that this had been brought to Tipton's attention the mare had been killed somehow by a tree limb, and the Shawnee woman desired compensation from the Miami in the amount of forty dollars. Because the Miami were within the purview of his agency, it fell to Tipton to seek an adjustment of the tribal differences through various means, including calling an intertribal council at the fort which he sought in this case and others. In another case, Tipton presented a claim to another Indian Agent on behalf of a Miami woman against the Shawnees for a stolen horse. The loss was offset when they offered her "100 Ear bobs[,] 2 shirts, 1 Rifle, 1 saddle new, 1 cotton shirt and many other articles not remembered," some of which a Miami man had sold to them for whiskey. In many cases, however, grievances were settled with federal money. Tipton detailed his management of intertribal conflicts in the following way. "[I]f one nation demands of me to settle with another for injury done," he told a sub-Agent, "I tell them to find and deliver me the murderor and I will try him in our way[;] they fear hanging so much that it always has succeeded." If this approach would fail, however, Tipton would call for a council with the chiefs in which he would remind them that the government will "interpose its authority" to prevent retaliations.[22]

One perversion of the annuity system into "blood money" is exemplified in a series of letters in 1825 between Tipton and Richard Graham, an Indian Agent to the Delaware, Shawnee, and Kickapoo tribes. On behalf of Delaware Chief William Anderson, Graham requested Tipton to compel the Miami to make a financial restitution for the murders of six Delawares. Only in this way would the offended tribe consider "the bones of their Brothers covered." The concept of restitution was certainly not new to native culture; however,

annuity payments and federal money introduced a new dimension to an old tradition. They asked for five hundred dollars for each victim, to be paid to them out of the Miami annuity. The Miami responded by authorizing the President to deduct the singular sum of five hundred dollars, not the three thousand dollar total amount that the Delawares wanted. The Delawares were not appeased, but the Miami refused to capitulate further. Alcohol often played a role in these clashes. Just before the 1824 annuity payment, an inebriated Miami belonging to White Raccoon's band killed an Ottawa man. After word got back to Ottawa villages in Ohio, a large party moved toward Fort Wayne with a demand for five thousand dollars cash which was changed to the same amount in merchandise. Eventually the parties agreed to allow the Ottawa band to acquire these items from a local merchandiser and to let the payment be deducted from the 1825 Miami annuity. Some cases obviated a resolution through the courts. When a certain Miami killed a Potawatomi, and the Potawatomis sought justice through Tipton, the Miami offered five thousand dollars for the murderer's release and a final settlement. In this circumstance, however, Cass advised Tipton to play this out in a civil court since the murder transpired "within the jurisdiction of our Courts."[23]

During this same year Alexander Wolcott, Jr., an Indian Agent headquartered in Chicago, responded to Tipton about a similar situation in which "Our Indians" had agreed to pay off a complaint. Wolcott was deeply concerned about what the nature of these interactions portended about future human relations in the region. "It is a great pity that some means could not be resorted to," he said, "to put a stop to the mutual depredations of neighboring tribes, particularly among the Potawatomi & Miami, who are very much in the habit of stealing from each other." He worried that the level of hostility was "daily increasing between the two nations, and may perhaps soon terminate in an open rupture when

the property & indeed the life of many whites who live around & among them will be in some degree endangered." Federal money, then, represented more than just annuities or a medium of exchange. It was also a means through which groups related to each other in Indiana's Indian Country and could, as the above examples indicate, be viewed as a barometer of the level of tension existing within those same relations and obviously influenced the conduct of Indian policy.[24]

Tipton began managing his agency in 1823 with an operating budget of four thousand dollars per year. Out of this, he was allotted twelve hundred for his salary, five hundred for the sub-agent, three hundred for Indian presents, and two thousand for contingencies. The budget fell short of what Tipton believed that he actually needed to effectively run the agency. The next year, he wrote to Cass of his difficulty in keeping "the expens much if any below $4000" in light of sundry unanticipated and unavoidable presents and provisions that he was periodically called upon to extend to agency Indians. But, he concluded, "if your Excellency will direct [me] to what sum I must confine myself[,] I never will go one cent above it." Tipton occasionally had to explain his spending which elicited some annoyance on his part considering what was already required of him. He prefaced one detailed explanation to Cass by acknowledging that he had received his letter "complaining that the expenditures of the Agency exceeds the amount allowed for the present year." Hoping to avoid repeat criticism, there "[h]aveing been so much complained of about" the amount he authorized for transporting the previous annuity, he asked Cass for more instructions. Tipton was also plagued by abstracts returned to him for failing to be "in conformity with the Treasury forms," no doubt compounding his irritation. His bureaucratic frustrations were not unique among Indian Agents. Indian policy scholar Francis Paul Prucha finds that

accounting procedures gave Indian Department officials "more trouble" than did the immediate dealings with the Indians. Tipton's experiences as Agent suggest that he may not have entirely agreed with Prucha about the comparison with Indian dealings, but he certainly exhibited little patience with the accounting inconsistencies. Fellow Indian Agent Henry R. Schoolcraft became likewise exasperated with the hassle of government accounting, commenting in 1828 that "there is a screw loose in the public machinery somewhere."[25]

Meeting the needs of his Indian constituents and fulfilling treaty provisions that expanded as more treaties were concluded significantly increased Tipton's budget over time. His proposed 1830 budget showed expenses totaling nearly nine thousand dollars, or more than double his original budget seven years earlier. His salary and that of the sub-agent (plus a second sub-agent) remained the same, while the amounts for presents and contingencies dropped to two hundred and two hundred and fifty dollars respectively. The 1830 budget offers more detail and insight about the agency's activities and reflects the agent's role in administering several recent treaty provisions. It called for:

interpreters	$900
1 gunsmith, 2 blacksmiths, & 3 assistants	1740
2 millers	700
salt, iron, steel, & tobacco	1757
10 laborers provided by treaties	600
farm implements provided by treaty	50
transportation & distribution of annuities	250
provisions for Indians	300

As noted, the provisions for laborers and farm implements stemmed from the conclusion of cession treaties with the Potawatomis and Miami in 1826 (the Mississinewa treaties) and with the Eel River Miami (or, Thorntown party) band in 1828. In each of these, Tipton served as an appointed treaty commissioner even while acting as Indian Agent thereby

raising questions about whose interests were paramount to him in that setting: the Native Americans he administered or the federal government. However, neither he nor Secretary of War James Barbour entertained any doubts. In a 9 January 1828 letter, Barbour relayed that the President directed Tipton to "take such measures...most likely to realize the object" which was to get the Thorntown band to cede their reservation to the U.S. government in return for goods and other provisions. Tipton accomplished this with the 1828 treaty with the Thorntown party. Regardless, in each of these treaties the Indian parties stipulated that along with annuities, they wanted laborers to build houses, and to fence and clear their lands. They also received wagons, oxen, cattle, hogs, and a mill to grind their corn.[26]

Tipton's responsibility for hiring laborers in fulfillment of treaty obligations was an extension of the contracting aspect of his job, an area which could be as aggravating as it was time consuming. It also indicated a burgeoning regional commerce. The business of contracting for the agency, and the pitfalls associated with it, was revealed in an open letter Tipton wrote to the "Many Citizens of Indiana" in August of 1828 in answer to "certain interrogatories" made of him and Governor Cass. To Indianans' question of the amount of money, goods, and horses that was furnished at the 1826 Mississinewa treaties, he replied: "about 63,000 dollars." They were also curious about the level of patronage extended to the citizens of the Michigan Territory and Ohio in furnishing supplies for that treaty, over those of Indiana. Tipton understood that his contracting actions were being scrutinized by the general public. He assured Indianans that when he had been appointed, he was informed by members of Congress that "Indiana expected from me her share of patronage, from this, the only distributing office within her limits." And he pursued this course.[27]

Regarding the recent treaty goods, the commissioners insisted that suppliers were not to exceed sixty percent of the cost found in Eastern cities. But, Tipton conceded, "this was left to the judgment of men acquainted with commercial affairs to determine." Thus, he could not speak to the specific profits that those men earned although he offered documentation about the appraisals for public inspection. It was also true that the bulk of the goods were purchased from Ohio and Michigan residents, and only a portion came from those living in the Fort Wayne area. He observed to his readers, however, that he had published requests for contract bids for the lowest offer in supplying ten thousand dollars worth of livestock, wagons, and labor in Indianapolis. Indeed Tipton maintained itemized lists of these proposed bids. The ones proposing to furnish cattle and hogs indicate that the livestock industry in the early Midwest was on fairly firm economic footing at this time. The fifty bids proposing to furnish cattle were offering to supply on average fifty head, ranging in price from $8.43 to $15 per head with transportation costs and delivery to the specified tribal villages folded in. Similarly, the forty-six bids to supply hogs also averaged fifty head in quantity, ranging from $2.37 to $6 per head.[28]

Tipton hoped that his published explanation dispelled any suspicions about secrecy in the Indian Department. Clearly, though, Indianans expected federal Indian Agents like Tipton to spread as much patronage in their state as possible. For his part, he tried to remember his old friends in particular, undoubtedly with an eye toward advancing his political ambitions. "I cannot serve all at once," he wrote to one friend in 1825 about an appointment, "but will serve them as fast as I can. [Y]ou know my will is allways above my ability to serve my friends."[29]

Altogether Tipton contracted, billed, and accounted for a multiplicity of items related to the running of the agency, the documentation of which provides an insightful glimpse into predominant economic activities as well as the manner of life. The center of these financial transactions was the payment of tribal annuities. Each year, usually late summer, the Indian agent would inform the tribes that they could come to the fort on a designated date to receive their annuities. As Tipton's predecessor learned, though, timing mattered to the agency Indians. When he had tried to call them together in the spring so as turn over the agency to Tipton sooner, they ignored him. He complained to Tipton that "it is Imposible to bring those people together when you wish it[;] they will always take their own time, which here after you will percieve." Yet William Keating, a member of an expedition party led by Stephen Long that had stopped at Fort Wayne during this time remarked that the Indians did not show up then because the chiefs had insisted that they would attend to their seasonal farming activities first.[30]

When they did commence, the payment of monetary (or, silver) annuities assumed their own distinct format, as opposed to the salt annuity which was simply delivered. Several accounts described that payment was made to the chiefs of the separate tribal bands, who would call their own group together and begin tossing out dollars to each member until the sum was gone. Customarily the very influential chiefs might be given up to forty or fifty dollars more than the others. It is unclear whether native women directly received these dollars as depicted above, but, according to Keating's account of the 1824 annuity payment, the "father of a family" was given an equal share for each household member regardless of age or gender. Tipton's memorandum of the 1825 Miami annuity distribution noted the annuity payment process and supports the contention that all agency Indians received a share

of the annuities. The memo listed the Miami bands within the Fort Wayne agency followed by a corresponding set of numbers: the total number of members, the number of family heads, a combined number of women and children, and the total amount of payment to be divided amongst them. Of the ten bands listed all but two were given an amount that, when divided equally, came out to eleven dollars and change each. Yet it should be pointed out that individual amounts would actually be smaller since, as Tipton wrote on his memo, the total amount for each band still needed to be measured against claims charged to them before a final division could be made.[31]

Claims embodied short-term debts that were taken on by agency Indians, usually for merchandise or staple food items, who agreed to having that amount debited against the next annuity payment. As noted above the Indian Agent deducted this amount from the annuity payment first, before dividing it up and paying it out to the tribal bands. In this practice, an unscrupulous Indian Agent could look very much like the notorious furnishing merchant of the sharecropper South especially if he cultivated strong ties with the merchants and traders who sold the items to Indians on credit. In fact, Potawatomi historian R. David Edmunds asserts briefly that Tipton "encouraged" this indebtedness relationship. This is a misleading contention. There is nothing in Tipton's papers of a personal or professional nature, or a specific reference by Edmunds, that would implicate him as either conspiring or desiring to encumber agency Indians with debt as a means to defraud them. As discussed earlier he did "encourage" their contracting of agricultural labor to be payable at the next annuity. But the convincingly-stated motivation in that case was to channel their money away from whiskey, an arrangement the chiefs consented to and evidently favored, not the least because they grieved over alcoholism's destructive effects on their young men especially. More than this,

however, is that Tipton understood that keeping whiskey and whiskey purveyors away from the agency Indians was what he had been hired to do and was required of him by law. He was not indebting them to defraud, but encumbering them to "civilize" and save through agriculture, or so he believed. On the other hand the intentions of the Fort Wayne traders and merchants in extending "easy" credit were probably less noble.[32]

Throughout the year, especially around annuity payment time, Tipton was presented with claims against agency tribal nations as well as the government; whether they had merit and legitimacy was his responsibility and discretion to determine. Claims varied. Metea and Twazie, two Potawatomi chiefs, signed a certificate of indebtedness to one Thomas Robb who was connected with the Ewing trading family. The chiefs agreed to allow Tipton to pay Robb two hundred dollars a year out of successive annuities. More typical were the following types of claims: one from merchandiser Walker and Davis against a Miami named Mother Raccoon for a five dollar three-point blanket and a two dollar pair of leggings; one authorizing two dollars worth of pork for Mother Charley, also a Miami; and another for seven dollars charged to Sally Langwah for a barrel of flour. A number of claims against Indian annuities arose from accusations that agency Indians stole from neighboring non-Indians. John Chevalier made an $182.75 claim on the Potawatomi annuity for Mitaors Village over sundry items including coats, pantaloons, shoes, men's "hose," "Fine linen shirts," vests, black silk handkerchiefs, hair brushes, and an ivory box that he said were taken from him several years earlier by men from that village. Because it involved criminal activity, this claim began as a series of depositions in the circuit court before being forwarded to Governor Cass who told Tipton to investigate the matter. After doing so, Tipton allowed one hundred dollars of the claim to stand.[33]

Tipton was judicious if not decidedly heavy-handed when it came to dealing with a claim from a suspected whiskey dealer, as Jonathan Beals found out. The Beals deposition stated that a party of Potawatomi descended upon his home and soon-to-be trading post on the Wabash River, drove out the occupants by force, and absconded by canoe with hams, flour, buckskins, muskrat skins, a butcher knife, jewelry—and twelve gallons of whiskey. Upon examination, Tipton determined that Beals had been setting up a whiskey operation just across the river from an Indian village and was said to have allowed the Potawatomi to take the items although he supposedly told them to pay for the items. He rejected Beals' claim. In doing so he was proceeding per War Department guidelines which gave him wide discretion and influence. While handling Beals' claim, Tipton had been consulting with Thomas McKenney, the head of the Office of Indian Affairs, about a series of Miami depredations that had occurred between 1819 and 1823 involving Flat Belly, White Raccoon, and Seek band members against several settlers. At stake were stolen or shot (and in some cases eaten) hogs, a mare, a cow, a breeding sow, along with eighty loaves of bread taken from a bark hut. McKenney advised Tipton that a claim's legitimacy "turns altogether upon the *credibility* of the Witnesses." As such this claim appeared to stand on merit. Tipton needed only to weigh two variables: whether the witnesses gave a reasonable value to the items being claimed, and whether they were entitled to any credit at all. In other words it was his call, and he resolutely rejected or reduced claims against Indian annuities as he deemed appropriate.[34]

As was true of the records related to settling annuity claims, the abstracts of disbursements and expenditures captured the agency's operations and hint at the ways in which people interacted with each other. The general abstract listed all of the pay vouchers

used in a twelve month period by quarter, with corresponding entries as to whom was paid, the nature of the disbursement, the date paid, and the amount. In the general abstract for 1 September 1824 to 1 September 1825, the non-salary expenditures included 547 1/2 bushels of coal, carpenter work, stationery, postage, advertisements for contract letting, the cost to make twenty-one boxes in which to pack the annuity specie, transporting those boxes from Cincinnati to the agency, the making of two coffins for two Indians that died there, sixty-three pounds of tobacco, plus plows, beef, and flour. Interestingly, non-Indian women appear infrequently in fragmentary and vague transactions such as Mrs. Amariah Foster who was paid "for work done." The general abstract items, though, differed little from the previous year's abstract except in one area. Perhaps reflecting Tipton's desire to increase the agency's agricultural production as soon as he took over, it specified the purchase of a yoke of oxen "for the use of the Indian Department at this agency" and "articles of husbandry" that were not designated as presents for the Indians. The oxen and desire for agricultural improvement at the agency would soon become a burr in his heels after an erroneous charge of misuse of public property. The sketch of the agency depicted in Appendix D showed the large area that was set aside as the Indian agent's garden.[35]

Accounting for the presents and provisions given to the agency Indians is similarly revealing. Categorically, presents represented a major expenditure and tended to fall within the range of agricultural implements, clothing, other tools, and tobacco. For example, the 1825 abstract of presents itemized "ploughs," hoes, and horse collars along with augers, chisels, cross cut saws, and saddles. Next to these items are yards of cloth, calico, and ribbon as well as shawls and blankets. The provisions allotted for the Indians are suggestive about both diet and the agricultural economy. The 1825 abstract of provisions shows that Tipton

purchased vast amounts of bread and beef and some pork along with smaller amounts of salt beef, corn, and flour. These were routinely issued to the Potawatomi and Miami bands to accommodate their needs during the annuity payment event. By 1831 and for an unknown reason, Tipton was employing a series of coupons, grouped by tribal band, that were good for a varying number of loaves of bread and pounds of beef.[36]

Of particular interest to Tipton, his superiors, and the U.S. government was the yearly abstract of trading licenses and the trader licensing system that it represented. In the trader licensing system traders were granted restricted trading privileges in the adjoining Indian Country. This served as a constant reminder that two groups of people operated within a space that one group possessed and the other group wanted to access for its trade resources. Here he leaned heavily upon his former sheriffing and policing experiences. The tension was similar to what surveyors Allen and Benton had encountered just a few years earlier as they tried to walk and bound the perimeters of the two worlds. Given their interests, the traders would come to clash with their settler-farmer counterparts who also came to covet the Indian Country as more of them re-located close by for its agricultural resources and commercial potential. During this period and for self-interested reasons, Tipton increasingly allied himself with the settlers and often spoke for them on internal improvement issues which in turn influenced further dispossession of Indian lands. His role in building up the country and surrounding region again demonstrated a pronounced conflict of interest as well as certain limits in how Indian policy was conducted. This was obvious as early as March of 1824 when Tipton began including his views on regional development in letters to Cass. Sandwiched between two paragraphs devoted to agency matters he told Cass that "[t]he legislature and people of this State want more land," and he hoped that if Cass was appointed

commissioner he would buy it for them. But for now, managing the traders took precedence.[37]

It was Tipton's job to keep track of the traders within his agency. His yearly accounting included listing those who had been granted licenses, their designated place of trade, the duration of the license (usually one year), the amount of capital employed, and the amount of bond requested which was typically double the amount of capital. In 1825 the amount of capital in these trading establishments ranged from five hundred to two thousand dollars. According to Prucha the bond statement ensured the "faithful observance of the regulations governing the trade," while the forceful threat that any illegal goods would be confiscated and forfeited kept traders on their toes. It did not, however, effectively prohibit illegal activity considering the expansiveness and remoteness of the area. The formal instructions to traders as well as Tipton's formidable stand against providing the native people with alcohol were very direct, despite his own well-established drinking habits that were not unlike those of his peers. Traders were confined to trade in their licensed areas, and their transactions with the Indians were to be fair and friendly. They were not to attend any councils held by Indians or offer any "talk or speech" to them accompanied by Wampum. Traders—licensed or unlicensed—were absolutely forbidden to bring any "spirituous liquors of any kind" to the Indian Country, or "give, sell, or otherwise dispose of any" to the native people. In the event that they were discovered doing so, the Indians themselves were authorized to seize and claim their goods, and traders had no recourse against them or the government. The traders were told to explain this authorization to the Indians they encountered. They were also expected to use their influence "to inculcate upon the minds of

the Indians, the necessity of living in peace and harmony with the government" and its citizens.[38]

As evidenced by Tipton acting outside of known policy in encouraging agency Indians to use their annuities to pay for agricultural improvements (instead of whiskey), and by the fluctuating boundary lines that changed with each treaty, a degree of uncertainty and confusing gray areas prevailed upon the Indian agent. This situation contributed to Indian policy's overall unfinished quality through the Removal period and suggests that a great limitation lay in the sense that policy did not evolve fast enough or with enough substantive conviction to accommodate the force of westward expansion and the interests of the nation's native peoples. Given that westward expansion was at its heart driven by agricultural expansion scholars would do well to follow historian R. Douglas Hurt's path and more deliberately recreate and probe the agricultural world that served as the period's backdrop. It was a fundamental context for decision-making in most aspects of American society, particularly on the western landscape but also in terms of national policy-making. Thus the contours of the agricultural world are crucial to understanding the limits, failures, and competing influences of westward expansion including those surrounding federal Indian policy. The element of uncertainty in expansion's quickly changing landscape caused conscientious and self-convicted Indian Agents like Tipton to either constantly seek clarification and information, or compelled them to act in an *ad hoc* fashion. Tipton commonly pursued both avenues, and the questions he raised about policy and inconsistencies speak to some of the broader social issues as well.

Trader licensing was frequently problematic for Tipton and was one of the occasions that caused him to stop and contemplate policy implications about native-white relations. In

the course of determining the number of necessary trading places among the Miami and granting licenses in September of 1824, for example, Tipton grappled with the status of "half bloods" who traded. He wrote Secretary of War Calhoun that a question now "presents itself on which I need instruction." Jean Baptiste Richardville was a half-blood Miami Chief, the son of a French trader and a sister of Miami Chief Little Turtle, who wanted a license to trade at the mouth of the Mississinewa River. Tipton noted that he had for some time been engaged in trading and held "a most decided influence over his people." Among other things Tipton wondered whether it was proper to license him, or "to consider him an Indian and permit him to trade without a licen[se]." If he licensed Richardville, he postulated, he would then be held liable for whiskey violations. But, he rationalized, "if he trades as an Indian[,] he can vend liquor, which has the most pernicious effect on the Indians[;] and if Indians and half Breeds are permitted to trade unrestrained[,] thier Country will be filled with venders of whiskey and murder and all kinds of crime committed amongst them with impunity."[39]

The War Department forwarded Tipton's letter back to Cass's office for official reply. Cass gave a thoughtful response, and one that indicated what federal Indian policymakers were ultimately looking for in "their Indian children." Here, too, as was addressed in the previous chapter, was a baseline cultural distinction in the matter of race that delineated how whites related to and viewed Indians versus how they related to and viewed African Americans. Cass wrote: "It is impossible to mark the difference between whites and Indians, so as to determine where the political rights of the one cease and of the others begin. It is a mixed question, depending for its solution, not so much on the relative quantity of Indian or white blood in the veins of the person, as upon his education, habits or pursuits." In the first part Cass conceded that Indians have "political rights," a belief which probably

stemmed from a tradition of treating with them which promoted an assumption of rights by virtue of the treaty relationship. But this kind of relationship never existed between whites and African Americans and little thought was given to the latter's political rights or their ability to acquire the "education, habits or pursuits" of whites during this era. Using this rationale, because Richardville gave the appearance of behaving as a white man Cass advised Tipton to grant him a license. Appearances, then, were of intrinsic importance to the development of race relations during the early nineteenth century, and cast a considerable influence on federal Indian policy.[40]

Indian Agents did not hesitate to work out policy questions or legal interpretations between themselves as seen in the correspondence between Tipton and Alexander Wolcott. In September of 1824 Wolcott wrote to Tipton about a change in the law that now made it the duty of Indian Agents to establish the sites for trading posts within their agencies. He believed that "a mutual understanding & concert" should exist among the agents "particularly those whose Agencies are contiguous," as theirs were. The new law's intent, "I presume," was to "fix the traders at certain places" so as to closely observe their operations and to end the "roving system of trade" which only encouraged illegal activities. Tipton, in fact, reprimanded at least one renegade trader for pursuing the "roveing sistum" and warned him of the sure penalty that would befall him. Yet, to continue with Wolcott, the agency Indians had to be given careful consideration in the placement of these posts. "[I]t must be remembered," Wolcott cautioned, "that our climate is a severe one, & to curtail the posts so much that the Indians would be obliged to go four days journey in winter to trade would be cruelty to them." He intended to organize his agency's trade system so that the Indians would all be within fifty miles of a trading post.[41]

As the two agents contrived to draw up their lists of trading posts, Wolcott emphasized that he was "not at all captious, Sir, about boundaries or the establishment of posts." Boundaries between whites were not terribly consequential in Indian Country. His "great object" was only to see that Indian policy was "conducted in the best manner possible & the trade kept strictly under the Superintendance of the Agents." When this was done, he contended, "boundaries between agencies are matters of great indifference" where communication and cooperation flourished. The list that Tipton eventually submitted to Cass contained nine trading posts within his agency. In the process Tipton learned that while he received instruction and format from Cass as his superior, peers like Wolcott informed him about how Indian Agents actually performed as such, in part because they could exchange ideas and transmit observations about local conditions. In other words Cass relayed official policy, but the agents were often forced to adapt it to their own remote and changing circumstances. Compounding this, again, was a lack of clarity not only in policy but also in the law governing the Indian trade.[42]

That same fall, Tipton and Wolcott worked through another trading issue, this one concerning trade monopolies. After reading a note from Tipton, Wolcott responded that "I find you take a very different view of the law of the last [Congressional] session from myself." From his perspective, the law merely directed that Indian Agents create the trading posts where the trade was to be carried on, but it was not designed to assign any post exclusively to one trader as Tipton seemed to think. This would foster monopolies by "destroying all competition," Wolcott pointed out. Worse than this, he maintained, "exactly in the proportion that that system prevails the Indian will suffer." He conjectured that "[t]he object of the law must have been directly the reverse of that[;] It must have intended by

placing the traders together to procure to the Indians all the benefits of an open, active competition" while it brought them under the watchful eye of the Indian Agent. Indeed Cass understood the law in this way as well and mildly scolded Tipton, saying that "[t]his exclusive principle is not found in the laws nor the regulations." The number of licensed traders," he wrote, "should be limited only by a fair view of the advantages which are to result to the government and to the Indians." For his part, Tipton was probably thinking less about "advantages" than about the issue of controlling the flow of alcohol into his agency. But the dialogue about meaning, intention, boundaries, and consequences to the Indians between himself, Wolcott, and Cass revealed that even the gray areas influenced the mechanics of Indian policy. When the gray areas concerned "spirituous liquids," they tended to get him into trouble.[43]

Tipton, if anything, was bold and liked order. In the same way that he moved against a former sheriff and a free African American for debt while acting as county sheriff, looking only to what the law prescribed for him to do, Tipton did not fail to take on any trade or whiskey violators, even the American Fur Company (AFC). Almost from the beginning of his appointment in 1823 he had been asked to settle disputes between the Kickapoo Indians and settlers living along the Wabash River that were reportedly continually instigated by two AFC agents named (John) Henry Davis and William Wallace. Davis was trading on the Wabash, on land of which the Indian title had been extinguished, and Wallace traded between Lake Michigan and Fort Harrison, traveling the Tippecanoe and Wabash Rivers. Tipton had information that both AFC agents encouraged the Indians to "kill and destroy the property of those white people who settle near them which they have frequently done." Tiring of the depredations, the frontier settlers prepared to attack the Indians but were

persuaded to take the problem to Tipton to resolve. Although he did not voice it then, he suspected the traders were also bringing alcohol into his agency. He asked Cass if he was authorized to remove them from Indiana since he knew that he had not licensed them.[44]

The following January Tipton heard directly from William B. Astor, AFC President and for the next fifteen months the weight of his fight against illegal trading operations would cause him mounting anxiety. Astor spoke highly of Wallace and blamed the competitive nature of trading for the current problem. He professed that it was "nothing new to learn that his intelligence and enterprise have given umbrage to his competitors in trade, who more than once during the agency of your predecessor were base enough to circulate reports to his prejudice." Astor insisted that Wallace was being victimized by "the jealousy of his mean rivals in trade," and he looked to Tipton for a just inquiry. Tipton did not reply to Astor and let the matter drop until September when he informed Cass that he finally seized goods and whiskey belonging to AFC agents Wallace and Davis upon proof that they were selling these "without respect to law or regulations." They had also furnished agency Indians with whiskey in exchange for horses. He justified his move against the AFC, rationalizing that "it is well to make an example of some but it is to be lamented that this case will fall so heavey on the company." He estimated the worth of the goods seized to be about three or four thousand dollars, and in reality the inventory of the seized goods comprised an impressive list of material goods. Listed were all manner of "point" blankets, shirting and sheeting, black silk handkerchiefs, blue calico fabric, shawls, gilt buttons, broaches, earbobs, needles, dressing combs, tin cups and pans, scissors, hoes, tomahawks, scalping knives (including some that were brass-inlaid), powder, playing cards, barley corn, hulled corn,

peas, tea, chocolate, peppermint, nutmeg, salt, sugar, whiskey, tobacco, pack saddles, bridles and more. Astor's irritation was understandable.[45]

In another incident, somewhat amusing in context, Tipton sent out two men to ascertain whether yet another group of traders was trading without a license. He learned inadvertently through Astor that these men were also AFC agents. When the traders saw the Agency officials approaching, they darted across the boundary line onto public land and dumped their goods with one of them. Another claimed to be ignorant of the law. Cass was unconvinced that the AFC sanctioned such violations, although he supported Tipton's seizure of goods *if* the facts were correct. Astor complained to Secretary of War Calhoun in October of 1824, and in a follow-up letter told him that he had no doubt that Tipton had "been more actuated by a desire to injure our Company, than to discharge his duty to the public faithfully."[46]

Tipton strongly disagreed and reaffirmed his justifications for the seizure to Calhoun, laying the blame squarely at the feet of AFC agents who broke the law by bringing ardent spirits into the Indian Country. This was the true cause of his move against the company. Sounding like the duty-bound General that he was he said: "I have allways ben a frend to enterprizes as well [as] of that compa[n]y as my other fellow Citizens," he asserted, "but whatever we may feel as individuels we must do our duty as officers. I have done nothing more." Tipton truly did admire enterprising men, taking part in many such endeavors himself. His correspondence concerning the AFC dispute displayed his discomfort at attacking the company but also his disdain for its tactics. To Calhoun he stated his regret that "Mr. Astor is so widely in error" as to his motives. "I never had a wish to injure the [AFC] but always felt anxious that it should prosper, [and] was bound to do my duty,

notwithstanding the fearful odds of talent and influence that the [AFC] will array against me." Tipton cynically derided Astor's "penetrating judgements" of him and how he should perform his duty as Indian Agent, sarcastically remarking that he was "indebted to him for informing me that I should have taken depositions of the improper conduct of his Clerks last year."[47]

By the end of 1824 Tipton's usual fortitude was crumbling amidst a second charge of impropriety. He sought encouragement from Cass to ease the "anxiety of my mind under the present circumstances." He was worried first about "the extent of injury that the enraged Fur Co[.] will be able to do me," and second about a series of charges preferred against him by a local successful merchant and justice of the peace named William Hood. Tipton expressed a "grate anxiety to convince you that I am badly treated in this affair," although he conceded that he may have "erred from an error of Judgement." Nevertheless he maintained that "I do know I have never wronged the Goverment nor the Indians." Hood's list of thirteen rather serious accusations included: misuse of public monies and property, overpaying a transportation contract that benefited friendly acquaintances, making other inappropriate contracts involving political opponents, interfering with elections, shortchanging Indian annuities for his own personal gain, and using public property to improve his own farm, all of which were to the detriment of the United States. Tipton minced no words about Hood, whom he labeled a pimp, spy, and a deterrent to his work at the agency. Hood was embittered against him, Tipton explained to Calhoun, because of a lost election and because his brother Robert had also run afoul of him (and later, the town of Fort Wayne) by, among other things, taking whiskey into the Indian Country.[48]

Tipton forwarded supporting depositions and offered Cass and Calhoun specific, convincing proof that at worst he erred in appearances. Regarding the charge of improving his farm with public property, for example, he said "so much is true, but I think no crime." The basis for this charge was in the use of three oxen. Quite simply, the government had three oxen at the agency and he had three. "The six compose a team," he explained, "and have worked for the [Indian] Department or for me (but most for the former)[,] and this year the plowing to raise corn and oats for the Department was all done with my horses." Further, he contended that the public property was in a much better situation than when he arrived, underscoring again his proclivity to improve the condition of his environment. He had fenced the reserved land and cultivated grain for the public team's consumption and more, such that "not one cent [has been] expended for corn[,] oats[,] or hay." He dismissed Hood's other charges as being "clierly contradicted" by fact and part of a four- or six-person opposition that "depend[s] on the influence of the American fur company to hurl me from office." Along with the "disgrace and mortifycation" he was enduring at their expense, he feared being financially ruined if found guilty.[49]

As he had when he came under attack from political rivals in Harrison County, Tipton emerged from these controversies relatively unscathed, if not embarrassed by what he perceived as another attempt at character assassination. Trouble would re-surface with the Hood brothers. But in facing up to his opponents with conviction he held the support of powerful politicians who spoke on his behalf. One of them, Indiana Senator James Noble, reassured him to "[b]e contented, and rely on your innocence and friends," and Cass affirmed his opinion that Tipton was a "zealous, faithful officer." Indeed he was. To sub-Agent Ramsay Potts who seemed to be reluctant if not derelict in his job to ferret out whiskey

sellers on the Kankakee River, he scolded that "if the officers of the Indian Department shrink from their duty...they are unworthy [of] the trust reposed in them." In reply to a request from the Reverend Isaac McCoy of the Carey Mission in the Michigan Territory for assistance in dealing with yet another whiskey purveyor among the Potawatomi, Tipton said that he took "grate pleasure at all times" in meting out "the punishment thier crime deserves." He then castigated "our former Agents [who] seem to have neglected, or *winked* at such violations of the laws." In January of 1825 an Indiana district court jury refused to wink, finding the AFC guilty of the charges and causing the goods to be forfeited. Tipton walked away from the case and the company pursued it all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court where the judgment was reversed in 1829. Tipton remained ill at ease about Hood's allegations until the next month when, with little explanation, on 2 February Hood wrote to Calhoun that he was withdrawing his charges against Tipton saying that he now believed he had been misinformed about them.[50]

In April, when the clouds of controversy had dissipated, Cass congratulated Tipton, but suggested that he strive to avoid the appearance of "intentional error." "It is a safe rule for a public officer," he cautioned, "never to do an act, which he would not be willing should be disclosed to the whole world." Buoyed by political support, the initial court victory against the AFC, and Hood's reversal Tipton resumed his strident campaign against illegal trading and the presence of ardent spirits within his agency. In 1827 he again authorized a significant seizure of goods that, unbeknownst to him at first, belonged to two important Fort Wayne traders with whom he had ties, William and George Ewing. The seizure turned on the allowable practice of Indian agents to license traders who operated outside of their own agency. This repeatedly frustrated Tipton, and he told Cass of his dislike at not being kept

informed and the resulting awkward "difficultys" with essential allies like the Ewing brothers. Not just alcohol and illegal trading then, but the gray areas, too, continued to dog Tipton.[51]

In between policing, payments, and policy interpretation, Tipton negotiated the challenges of the season forthrightly, adroitly—and with the sound of approaching settler-farmers and commerce in his ears. An early thorny problem had centered on resolving Miami chiefs' expectations about the 1818 Treaty of St. Mary's with regards to mills and laborers, with the differing viewpoint of what the government saw as its obligation. The treaty provided for a gristmill, a sawmill, a gunsmith, and a blacksmith. By the fall of 1823 the Miami chiefs had grown weary of the government's lackluster effort to make good on the treaty. The milldam was poorly constructed and neither laborer had yet been engaged by the government for them. Tipton confirmed the condition of the milldam which rendered the mills useless and estimated to Cass that it would take 500 dollars to repair. He also informed him that the chiefs were not willing to "receive" the mills under these circumstances. Upon learning that Cass could not support an expenditure of this amount, Tipton proceeded as he had before on other matters that he considered vital or that called for an improvement such as the structural repairs on dilapidated agency buildings: he acted without authorization to the point of funding the work himself if necessary. His justification was the same; that is, to not do so would result in a loss. On a certain level Cass understood Tipton's approach toward the agency Indians. "We must commiserate their situation," he wrote, "and make due allowances for their feelings." In the end Tipton's actions appeased the Miamis' sense of what they were entitled to and were also met with the appropriate support of his superiors.[52]

Occasionally the War Department required Tipton and the other Indian agents to provide detailed information about their agencies. His regular interactions with the agency's native peoples gave him a unique perspective and valuable first-hand knowledge about them and their spatial relationships. In 1824 McKenney requested a sketch that included tribal names, location, and population as well as the number of whites, the best route between the agency and Washington, and the lay and "healthfulness" of the land itself. Sometimes Tipton facilitated in-depth access to agency Indians as he did for Indian Department clerk Charles Trowbridge who was sent by Cass the same year to study native customs and languages. Cass told Tipton that he was "deeply interested in the successful accomplishment of Mr. Trowbridge's mission" and was said to have been motivated by an urge to counter what he saw as grossly romanticized depictions of Native Americans promoted by writers James Fenimore Cooper, John Heckewelder and others. Miami Chief Le Gros was especially cooperative with Trowbridge and was given a set of three-point blankets, twelve yards of calico, three and one-half yards of cloth, and one shawl in return for his information. Tipton, too, acquired a respectable expertise of his own in formal and informal native-white relations that he gleaned through years of military campaigns, agency interactions, and living as he did, at the edge of their existence. This outlook would fortify, influence, and characterize his thinking and acting on Indian issues when he was elected to finish out a senatorial term vacated by the death of James Noble in 1831.[53]

By 1825 the opening up of central Indiana to settlers signaled that Tipton and federal Indian policy faced a growing contingency in maintaining Indian lands against an encroaching force of ambitious agriculturists whose goals coincided with Tipton's own, but were at odds with the Indians for whom he was agent. In 1823 the government had

established a land office at Crawfordsville, approximately one hundred sixty miles southwest of Fort Wayne, to manage the public sale of former Indian lands from the "New Purchase" of 1818. In 1825 the swiftness of the tide of Euro-American emigration into Indiana can be judged by the fact that in that year the Crawfordsville land office sold the most land of all of the country's land offices. The hunger for farm land led to mistakes and illegal purchases that went against agency Indians who had been granted reserves through treaty rights. In June of that year Tipton contacted Williamson Dunn, the Crawfordsville land office register, after learning that a portion or all of a reserve for Mary Wells, a niece of Little Turtle, had been sold to settlers. Dunn confirmed that the sale had been made inadvertently and asked Tipton to encourage Wells to accept a purchase price. The transaction involving 190 acres had occurred the previous December, and a mill was already constructed on the site. Dunn and the new land holders wanted "this business amicably settled."[54]

As Tipton certainly knew, the Indians' hold upon their shrinking land base was slippery at best amidst the press of white settlement and pressure from the internal improvement movement. A November 1824 letter to Cass again revealed his position as something of a contradiction of terms when he encouraged him to consider that "[t]he people of this state are anxious for an extinguishment of Indian title to the Tract of Country through which the line of the proposed Canal will pass and some reservations which are surrounded by our settlement." In fact, Tipton proposed to Cass that if he would double or triple the allowance for presents it would go a long way in "preparing" the Indians to being amenable to further land cessions in the coming year's anticipated treaty. Commercial prospects notwithstanding it was still Tipton's job to ensure that what immediate rights existed, such as

what Wells possessed in the reserve, were protected or compensated, and he did. But reasons for supporting Indian removal were neither subtle nor lacking.[55]

To a man who preferred order and an unfettered approach to performing his job regardless of his own outside interests, the complex set of influences that assailed Tipton proved troublesome, as he complained in a letter to Cass, and fueled his desire to seek a change of venue for the agency. Agency Indians grew frustrated by these things as well. In early 1825 Miami chiefs Richardville and La Gros began insisting the Tipton set up a trip to Washington to meet with the new president, John Quincy Adams. Cass was not enthusiastic about the chiefs' visit and warned Tipton that such journeys to Washington lessened "the influence of the local officers" in the War Department. Tipton countered that the chiefs' "anxiety" was "occasioned by the reports so frequently circulated amongst them that the president wishes to remoove all the Indians beyond the Mississippi." He repeated this in a subsequent letter to McKenney, who yielded and authorized the visit. By September, Potawatomi Chief Chebass and others of his nation who were dissatisfied with unfilled treaty promises wanted to travel with the Miami, too. Tipton's party set out several months hence on 3 January 1826, stopping along the way to buy appropriate attire for Washington's political society.[56]

The trip to Washington was only mildly successful, resulting in little more than an exchange of positions between the traveling Indians and the U.S. government. Le Gros formally addressed Secretary of War James Barbour on 27 January 1826 seeking compliance and pointing out the failure of the government to fulfill the terms of the Treaty of St. Mary's with regards to the blacksmith and gunsmith. Instead of the gunsmith, the Miami wanted to be provided with "a good trusty Miller...as that position will be central to the nation." Le

Gros brought additional grievances to Barbour namely trading and especially the inattention that white depredations against their property and horses arouse. He argued that "[w]e do not stand on equal footing with our white Brothers," noting that not a year goes by that his nation is asked to pay from 500 to 1000 dollars to satisfy such claims that whites made against them. "[O]n our part, we have never yet received pay for one stolen horse."[57]

Unfortunately, Le Gros and his party were not taken altogether seriously. While Barbour promised to see that a suitable miller was engaged for the Miami, Le Gros's other concerns were glossed over. The depredations were "regretted," relayed McKenney on behalf of Barbour, but they were aptly under the jurisdiction of their agent. As for the compensation they sought for their stolen horses, proper procedure had not been followed and payment could not be made. In the matter of imposing traders, the Indians were expected to defend themselves. "[Y]ou must look well to your dealings with them," McKenney advised Le Gros, "and keep your people sober, and as far as possible keep yourselves from being cheated." The government did not offer much in the way of support or increased restraint against the traders, nor was it convinced that Le Gros's party had calculated wisely their need for this trip. McKenney chastised the group stating that "[y]our Father does not consider your business of such a nature as to have made it necessary for you to come on. It could all have been done thro' your agent or by letter." Le Gros was learning, as Tipton had done on a different level, that where policy dominated the dialogue even interpersonal matters had to conform to the "Father's" format.[58]

The remainder of 1826 was as eventful as his appointment had been from the beginning. In May Tipton was one of three men appointed as commissioners to treat with the Miami and Potawatomi, "and any other Tribes claiming lands in the state of Indiana," for an

exchange of land, "acre for acre," west of the Mississippi. The treaty council was to be concluded no later than the first of November. As the year was drawing to a close, Tipton knew that he was fighting a losing battle against the predatory influences at the agency not just against the Indians, but also against him. He became more insistent with Cass that he be allowed to relocate it in the Indian Country. "I am more than ever anxious to have this Agency removed," he confided to his superior, "and must beg it as a favour that you will aid me with your friendly advice[,] and if you think best assist me." Tipton dispaired about the environment he daily experienced and his reasons went beyond his job and himself. He wrote: "Nothing keeps me in this office now, but to enable me to Educate my children. 4 years will compleet that and unless I can get away from this village I cannot, will not, remain in the office that long." As if to deepen Tipton's unhappiness at Fort Wayne Robert Hood, brother to William, preferred a series of charges against him to Secretary of War Barbour at this time. The charges were about as flimsy as the man making them, and Tipton was fairly easily able to dispense with them to McKenney and Barbour although from his detailed rejoinders he clearly felt under attack. Hood possessed no credibility, having the reputation of a horse-thief and of being one of a band of three undesirables around the agency. Tipton stated that if two honorable men can be found there who would say that Hood is "entitled to strong claims of truth and [veracity] I will give up all claim to office, or existance." Neither course of action would be necessary because by now Tipton had won the loyalty of his superiors.[59]

In a letter dated 7 February 1827, Tipton made his first formal petition to McKenney seeking official sanction to remove the agency into Indian Country, at a site along the Wabash River that would become present-day Logansport. This thirteen-month campaign

would reign-in more enemies and critics, particularly the traders, merchants, and other opportunists who reaped large profits in the annuity-related transactions when they took place at the fort. Tipton's seven-point argument was a testament to the base element that dominated the Fort Wayne environ and infected everyone associated with it, and they reveal the surprising degree to which families and women were notably present and active at the Agency. The reasons that the transfer was necessary and justified were that: 1) the agency Indians "whose business I superintend" mainly live from fifteen to 140 miles from the fort; 2) the Agency sat on 40 acres of land inhabited by 50 to 100 families of which seven out of ten make their livelihood off of the Indian trade, "and all of the traders sell whisky;" 3) when the Indians come to the Agency to have work done by treaty-provided blacksmith on a daily basis, they frequent the shops where they get drunk and then fleeced of their clothes; 4) few merchants were stocking the salt that he was required by treaty to provide; 5) because the town traders were "constantly coaxing" the Indians to buy their goods on credit, the former were in the habit of launching lawsuits against the latter. "[I]n one case this winter," Tipton informed McKenney, "I was compelled to enter myself bail to save one of the chiefs from being committed to Jail for goods bought principly by his young men;" 6) whenever word got out in town that an Indian family was encamped nearby, one or more traders would show up and often cheated them out of their property; and 7) because "many persons here" buy the Indians' clothes, blankets, kettles, and hatchets, upwards of 50 lawsuits could actually be initiated against them for violating the Intercourse Law. Just in the past week, Tipton recounted, "a female, wife of a civil officer of this County shewed her friend a shawl that she had bought from a drunk squaw for seven apples and 12 1/2 cents, about 25 cents, for the article that had cost the squaw $3.50 cts."[60]

In Tipton's justifications above as well as his attached reasoned plan we see the power of the three dominant interrelated forces of influence that confronted and impeded the course of federal Indian policy and simultaneously altered native-white, even intertribal, relations in the early American Midwest—whiskey, agrarianism, and federal money. Of these, whiskey and federal money i.e. what lured those masquerading as traders and merchants whom Tipton characterized as "misrable white persons that live by this dishonourable traffick" constituted the most immediate rationale for moving the Agency; the prospects of building up the region through agriculture was a "hook" in winning support. He suggested the Agency be transferred to the Indian Country about sixty or seventy miles distant from Fort Wayne and nearly equidistant from both the Miami and Potawatomi nations, on a piece of land one or two miles square. This would allow the Indians to visit their Agent or blacksmith to get "their plows, traps &c mended" without being molested or accosted by undesirables. He also pointed out that should the recent Mississenwa treaty be ratified as it was likely to be, the Wabash Valley would settle rapidly, and his presence as Agent would thus be "indespensible" there to manage the difficulties that will arise between settlers and Indians.[61]

Tipton's proposal generated heated discussions within the state and in Washington, but on 14 March 1828 Secretary of Barbour approved the removal of the agency. From 1823 until this time, Tipton had played a significant role in guiding the reshaping of the region along American lines, in a job that he called thankless and troublesome. Through Tipton we come to understand how federal Indian policy failed on a number of levels, not the least of which was its rife contradictions that were clearly evident in the Indian Agent position. He was as much of an adherent of the laws and policies pertaining to the Indian trade as he was a

proponent of regional development through the agricultural settlement of lands whose Indian title had been—or soon would be at his encouragement—extinguished. And for all of the rhetoric and efforts at impressing upon the native peoples within the agency the importance of becoming agriculturists in the manner of their white brothers and sisters, ultimately it did not matter. Indian policy was out of sync with westward expansion, and the land needs of the advancing settler-farmers trumped those of the Native Americans, the remainder of whom in less than twenty years would be removed west of the Mississippi River. Tipton had worked tirelessly to save them from whiskey and immoral traders, but in reality he sacrificed their interests to the cause of westward expansion and was himself an obvious agent of influence.

NOTES—CHAPTER FOUR

[1] Lewis Cass to John Tipton, 22 October 1823, John Tipton Papers at the Indiana State Library, Indianapolis (hereafter cited as Tipton Papers), Box 2, Folder 20 and reprinted in Nellie Armstrong Robertson and Dorothy Riker, eds., *The John Tipton Papers*, vol. 1 (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1942), 321-22 (hereafter cited as *John Tipton,* vol. 1 or 2).

[2] Tipton to Cass, 27 May 1830, Ibid., vol. 2, 275-76.

[3] Dorothy Riker, "Two Accounts of the Upper Wabash Country, 1819-20," *Indiana Magazine of History*, 37 (December 1941): 384-87; for a discussion on the inclusion of reserves in treaties with Indians of the Old Northwest, see Francis Paul Prucha, *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians*, Abridged ed. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986), 87-90; see also Stewart Rafert, *The Miami Indians of Indiana: A Persistent People, 1654-1994* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1996), chapters 3 and 4.

[4] Ibid., 387-95.

[5] John C. Calhoun to Tipton, Appointment as Indian Agent, 28 March 1823, Daniel Grass [and Indiana Legislators] to the United States Senate: Petition (in support of Tipton's appointment), 1 December 1823, and James Monroe to Tipton, Commission as Indian Agent, 22 December 1823 are in Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 20; the Calhoun letter is also reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1 (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1942), 300-01; Tipton was required to be bonded in the sum of twenty thousand dollars. His first submission was defective, but later corrected and copies of both can be found in the Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 20; Jonathan Jennings to John Tipton, Commission as Major General, 25 January 1822, Box 2 Folder 19, Tipton Papers and is reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 293; in the only other dissertation written on Tipton, William Frederick Collins incorrectly asserts that this federal appointment "launched Tipton's political and business career," when, as was demonstrated in the previous chapter, Tipton was already well on his way, politically, and had in fact dabbled in a number of business ventures, typically related to agricultural trade and marketing; see William Frederick Collins, "John Tipton and the Indians of the Old Northwest" (Ph.D. diss., Purdue University, 1997), 94.

[6] Tipton to Thomas L. McKenney, 13 November 1824, Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 407-08

(plus related map shown in Appendix C); Bert Anson, "The Fur Traders in Northern Indiana, 1796-1850" (Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1953), 87; Collins, "John Tipton," 94-96; for more general history about Fort Wayne's past, see Bert J. Griswold, *Pictorial History of Fort Wayne, Indiana*, 2 vols., (Chicago: Robert O. Law Company, ??), the admirably-researched Paul Woehrmann, *At the Headwaters of the Maumee: A History of the Forts of Fort Wayne* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1971), and Wallace A. Brice, *History of Fort Wayne: From the Earliest Known Accounts...* (Fort Wayne, IN: D. W. Jones & Son, 1868).

[7] The terms of the Fort Wayne Treaty (1809), Treaty of the Rapids (1817), and the Treaty of St. Mary's (1818) are described in Charles C. Royce, *Indian Land Cessions in the United States* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900; reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1971) ???; Annuity Receipt, 27 August 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 23 and is reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 378-79; see also Tipton to Calhoun, 5 September 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 24; in his role as Allen County agent discussed below Tipton submitted an account to the county's board of justices dated 3 January 1825 in which he noted that "Ben a coulored man" had made a partial payment on some land, as he had also done in 1824, as reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 433-34; related to this, when Indiana artist George Winter painted white captive Frances Slocum and her two daughters who lived as Miamis on the Mississinewa River in 1839, he noted an African American laborer who had assimilated into Miami culture, had married a Miami woman, and spoke the language with fluency, as described in Rafert, *The Miami Indians*, 103-07.

[8] The officers' remarks are quoted in Samuel R. Brown, *The Western Gazetteer; or Emigrant's Directory...* (Auburn, New York: H.C. Southwick, 1817), excerpted in Harlow Lindley, *Indiana As Seen By Early Travelers* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Commission, 1916), 142-44; Tipton's ownership of McAfee's book is discussed in the context of his personal library in the previous chapter, page 18.

[9] Captain James Riley to the Editor of the *Philadelphia Union*, 24 November 1819, Corydon, *Indiana Gazette*, 2 March 1820 is reprinted in Ibid., 241-43; Thomas Scattergood Teas' *Journal of a Tour to Fort Wayne and the Adjacent Country, in the Year 1821* is excepted in Ibid., see 247-52; Tipton recorded staying with a Captain R outside of Fort Wayne, presumed by his papers' editors to be Riley, in his journal of a trip to Washington that he made in early 1826 (see note 52 below); Laurence M. Hauptman, *Conspiracy of Interests: Iroquois Dispossession and the Rise of New York State* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1999.

[10] Malcolm J. Rohrbough, *The Land Office Business: The Settlement and Administration of American Public Lands, 1789-1837* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968); Collins, "John Tipton," 97-98; Tipton's activities as Allen County's agent are recorded in *Allen County Commissioners' Records, A, 1824-1828*, Indiana State Library, Indianapolis; a few of these documents have been reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 403-06 (concerning the building of the jail), 433-34.

[11] For a discussion about the government's use of policy to campaign against Native Americans' access to "ardent spirits," see Prucha, *The Great Father*, 40-41; Chief Metea's comments are quoted in R. David Edmunds, *The Potawatomis: Keepers of the Fire* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1978), 220.

[12] John Hays to John C. Calhoun, 8 July 1821, copy from War Department, Secretary of War, Letters Received, in Miscellaneous Folder, Tipton Papers; Tipton to John C. Calhoun, 30 August 1823, and Tipton to Lewis Cass, 1 September 1823, are found in Tipton Papers, Box 2 Folder 20 and are reprinted in *John Tipton,* vol. 1, 319-20 respectively; receipted bills for the repairs Tipton initiated on the agency's public quarters i.e. making and putting on 2500 shingles, carpentry, adding window glass, as well as the purchase of lime and cow's hair used for that purpose are in Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folders 20 and 21; repair work was ongoing as evidenced by the receipted bill for $8.75, dated 31 August 1825, for a laborer to make and hang a door on the sub-agent's quarters and other repairs in Ibid., Box 3, Folder 29; an example of Tipton's boarding expenditures with Ewing are found as Alexander Ewing to Tipton: Account, February to September 1824, Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 345-46; see also Nellie A. Robertson, "John Hays and the Fort Wayne Indian Agency," *Indiana Magazine of History* 39 (September 1943): 221- 36.

[13] Calhoun to Tipton, 28 March 1823, Ibid., and is reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 300-01; An Act to regulate trade and intercourse with the Indians tribes..., 30 March 1802, is reprinted in Francis Paul Prucha, ed., *Documents of United States Indian Policy*, 2nd ed., Expanded (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990), 17-21; see also An Act directing the manner of appointing Indian Agents...," 16 April 1816 in Ibid., 30; Prucha, *The Great Father*, chapters 2 and 3.

[14] An Act to amend an act, entitled "An act to regulate trade...," 6 May 1822, An Act to abolish the United States' trading establishment with the Indian tribes, 6 May 1822, and An Act making provision for the civilization of the Indian tribes..., 3 March 1819 are reprinted in Prucha, *Documents of Indian Policy,* 34-35

and 33 respectively; Calhoun to Cass, 18 March 1823 and Thomas McKenney, Office of Indian Affairs, to Tipton, 13 April 1824 (re: the need for the "strictest attention to economy...[and] promptitude") are in Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folders 20 and 22; William Lee to Tipton, 17 May 1825 and Tipton to Cass, 3 August 1825 are in Ibid., Box 3, Folders 28 and 29 respectively and in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 1, 459-61 and 480 respectively (quote is on page 480); upon his arrival, Tipton received a "warrant" in the amount of $183 from a government auditor "on account of the Appropriation for the Civilization of Indians," in William Lee to Tipton, 17 May 1823, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 20 and in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 307-08; see also R. Douglas Hurt, *Indian Agriculture in America: Prehistory to the Present* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1987), chapters 6 and 7 and Prucha, *The Great Father*, 35-40; an early though lasting articulation of the government's Civilization agenda for Native Americans is found in Gen. Knox, Secretary of War, to the President of the United States, 23 May 1789, in *American State Papers*, Indian Affairs, (Washington, D. C.: Gales and Seaton, 1832), 53-54; see also Anthony F. C. Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians: The Tragic Fate of the First Americans* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999), chapter 6, and Joseph A. Parsons, Jr., "Civilizing the Indians of the Old Northwest, 1800-1810," *Indiana Magazine of History* 56 (September 1960): 195-216.

[15] John Hays to John C. Calhoun, 24 February 1823, War Department, Secretary of War, Letters Received and is also reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 296-300.

[16] Ibid., 297; Le Gros, Osage, and Little Huron to Tipton, 6 April 1824, and William Suttenfield et al to Tipton: Bond for Contract, 10 April 1824 (emphasis added) are in Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 22; see also Metosania, Osage, et al to Tipton 7 April 1824, in Ibid.; for a discussion on the role of annuities and presents see Prucha, *The Great Father*, 60-63.

[17] Charlow Constant to Tipton, 13 April 1824, and Employment Agreement between Tipton, Seek's Party of Miamis, and François Comparet and Alexis Coquillard, 10 May 1824 are in Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 22; Miami Chief [Le Gros]'s receipt to Cyrus Taber, dated June 1825 for "makeing[,] halling[,] and laying in fence two thousand rails...groubing[,] plowing[,] and planting with corn...cliering off[,] plowing and planting with corn..." and a number of similar statements of account of Potawatomi requests for agricultural labor are in Ibid., Box 3, Folder 28 and Folder 69 respectively; Hurt, *Indian Agriculture*, 105.

[18] Tipton to Calhoun, 31 December 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 25 and is reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 430-32.

[19] Tipton to Cass, 4 January 1825 and Cass to Tipton, 20 January 1825 are in Ibid., 434, 438-39; the role of presents in federal Indian policy during this period is described in Prucha, *The Great Father*, 60-63.

[20] The bureaucracy surrounding the Indian Agent's job is evident throughout the Tipton Papers, but see, for example, Box 2, folders 18 and 19, or Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, chapter 4; Tipton to Ramsay D. Potts [sub-Agent], 8 February 1827, Ibid., 653.

[21] Robert Hood to the U.S., Receipted Bill, 12 March 1824, and Tipton Memorandum, 15 August 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folders 21 and 23.

[22] John Johnston to Tipton, 16 July 1825, Ibid., Box 3, Folder 29 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 1, 473-74; Tipton to Ramsay Potts, 8 February 1827, Ibid., 653.

[23] Richard Graham to Tipton, 11 June 1825, Tipton Papers, Box 3, Folder 28; Miami Chiefs to President John Quincy Adams, 29 July 1825, Ibid., Folder 29; Graham to Tipton, 1 September 1825, Ibid., Folder 30: Graham to Tipton [with enclosures], 3 October 1825, Ibid., Folder 31; all of the preceding can also be found in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 1, 469-70, 477-78, 485-86, 500-01; Nawash to Tipton (Receipt), 11 October 1824, Ibid., 397 n24; Tipton to Cass, 3 October 1825 and Cass to Tipton, 12 October 1825, Ibid., 501-02, 503-05.

[24] Alexander Wolcott, Jr., to Tipton, 11 October 1825, Tipton Papers, Box 3, Folder 31 and Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 1, 502-03; see also background on Wolcott in Ibid., 268-69 n64.

[25] Calhoun to Tipton, 28 March 1823 and Cass to Hays, 17 April 1823 are in Tipton Papers, Box 2 Folder 20 and are reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 300-01, 302; Tipton to Cass, 31 August 1824, Ibid., 380; Tipton to Cass, 20 December 1824, Ibid., 424-25; Tipton to Cass, 4 January 1825, Ibid., 434; Cass to Tipton, 16 October 1824, Ibid., 399-401 (see the "PS") and in Tipton Papers, Box 2 Folder 24; Cass to Tipton, 4 April 1825, Cass to Tipton, 12 October 1825, and Cass to Tipton 8 June 1825 Ibid., Box 3, Folders 27, 28, and 31 respectively; Prucha, *The Great Father*, 61 (Schoolcraft's quote appears here as well).

[26] Tipton's proposed 1830 budget is outlined in Tipton to Cass, 16 September 1829, Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 2, 195-96; an example of how Tipton kept track of presents as expenditures is Memorandum of

Present to Squirel, a Miami, 12 July 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 22 and Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 1, 369 (the item was a hoe). The U.S. treated with the Potawatomi and Miami nation in 1826 at the mouth of the Mississinewa River on 16 October and 23 October respectively, and with the Thorntown party in 1828; the formal treaties for all of these are found in Charles J. Kappler, *Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties* vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1904), 273-81, 286-87. On these occasions, Tipton acted as one of the three treaty commissioners whose report is included in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 1, 598-606; see also Tipton to Cass, 30 October 1826, in ibid., 610-11; see also James Barbour to Tipton, 9 January 1828, Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 2, 6; Tipton to Thomas McKenney, 1 March 1828, and Cass to Tipton, 3 July 1828 in ibid., 23 and 65-66 respectively; Tipton's 1827 plan and description of the 16 feet by 32 feet brick houses to be built for the Miami Chiefs by prospective contractors is found in *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 738-39.

[27] Tipton to Many Citizens of Indiana, [Indianapolis] *Indiana Journal*, 28 August 1828; Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 2, 81-84.

[28] Ibid.; Instructions to Bidders, 26 June 1827, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 739; see also an example of how Tipton advertised for contract proposals, as well as the abstracts of proposals for building houses, and for furnishing cattle, hogs, and wagons that are all reprinted in Ibid., 725, 743-49; Abstract of Payments to Appraisers of Goods, 4 August 1827, Ibid., 759.

[29] Ibid., Tipton to Jacob Arganbright, 26 November 1825, Tipton Papers, Box 3, Folder 31 and in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 1, 508-09.

[30] Hays to Tipton, 19 May 1823, Ibid., 308-09; the Stephen Long expedition member who recorded the group's Fort Wayne stay was William Keating, and the reference is noted in Ibid., n15.

[31] Annuity payment descriptions are pulled from references in Ibid., 309 n15 and 392 n12; Tipton, Memorandum of Miami Annuity Distribution, 29 July 1825, Ibid., 475 (see also n94).

[32] R. David Edmunds, *The Potawatomis: Keepers of the Fire* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1978), 258.

[33] Metea and Toisa to Thomas Robb: Certificate of Indebtedness, 5 November 1823, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 20; Receipt against Miami annuity on behalf of Mother Charley, 30 May 1830 and Receipt on behalf of

Sally Langwah are in Ibid., Box 7, Folder 64 and Box 3, Folder 27 respectively; John B. Chevalier to Potawatomi: Claim, 26 August 1824, and Mother Raccoon to Walker and Davis: Receipt, 8 November 1825 are in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 1, 376-79, 508.

[34] Jonathan Beals to Potawatomi: Claim, 9 August 1825, and Thomas L. McKenney to Tipton, 16 August 1825 (emphasis in original) are in Tipton Papers, Box 3, Folder 29 and are reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 1, 481-84; for the paperwork pertaining to the claims against the noted Miami bands made by Joseph and John Troutner as well as James and Abraham Cannon see Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 20.

[35] All manner of the agency's accounting forms are in the Tipton Papers. In this case the 1824 and 1825 abstracts are conveniently reproduced in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 1, 382-89, 487-96; Mrs. Amariah Foster is noted on a bill presented to Tipton from Alexander McAlester dated 22 September 1824, in Tipton Papers, Box 1, Folder 24.

[36] Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 492-93, 495; many bread and beef coupons still exist and are found in Tipton Papers, Box 8, Folder 75.

[37] Tipton to Cass, 22 March 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2 Folder 22 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 1, 348-49.

[38] Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 494; Prucha, *The Great Father*, 31-34; Tipton to Comparet and Coquillard, Instructions For Trading, 1 September 1824 is in Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 24 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 390-91; prior to devising the instructions, Tipton was stymied in knowing what action to take on a French violator during his second year and wrote to Cass about finding "no instruction on file here by which I can be governed," in Tipton to Cass, 11 July 1824, Ibid., 368-69; see also Thomas L. McKenney to Cass, 5 June 1824 for clarification of trading restrictions in Ibid., 363; Cass's influence in Tipton's instructions to traders had its roots in post war anxiety about British-Indian relations in the Old Northwest which is explained in W. Sheridan Warrick, "The American Indian Policy in the Upper Old Northwest Following the War of 1812," *Ethnohistory* 3 (Spring 1956): 115-17.

[39] Tipton to Calhoun, 5 September 1824, (copy) Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 24 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton,* vol. 1, 391-92.

[40] Cass to Tipton, 14 October 1824 and Cass to Tipton, 16 October 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 24 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton,* vol. 1, 398-401.

[41] Wolcott to Tipton, 1 September 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 15 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 1, 381-82; Tipton to Joseph Bertrand, 2 January 1826, Ibid., 510.

[42] Wolcott to Tipton, 19 November 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 25 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 1, 409-11; Cass to Tipton, 2 June 1825 (with enclosure of list of trading posts under Cass's superintendancy), Tipton Papers, Box 3, Folder 28 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 465-67.

[43] Wolcott to Tipton, 19 September 1824 and Cass to Tipton, 16 October 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 24 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton* vol. 1, 394-95, 399-401.

[44] Tipton to Cass, 31 October 1823 Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 323-25;

[45] William B. Astor to Tipton, 24 January 1824, and Tipton to Cass 28 September 1824, Ibid., 336-37, 395-95; Astor to Calhoun, 29 October 1824, and Tipton to Calhoun, 21 December 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folders 24, 25, and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 401-02, 425-26; the inventory of seized AFC goods is also reprinted in Ibid., 667-73.

[46] Cass to Tipton, 16 October 1824, Astor to Calhoun, 29 October 1824, Astor to Calhoun, 13 November 1824, and Tipton to Calhoun, 21 December 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folders 24, 25, and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 399-401, 401-02, 407, 425-26.

[47] Tipton to Calhoun, 20 November 1824, and Tipton to Calhoun, 21 December 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 25 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 411-12, 425-26;

[48] Tipton to Cass, 25 December 1824 (2 letters, same date), and Tipton to Calhoun, 31 December 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 25 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 429-32; William N. Hood to Cass, 27 November 1824, Ibid., 412-16 (see also footnote, page 415).

[49] Tipton to Cass, 25 December 1824 (2 letters, same date); Tipton to Calhoun, 31 December 1824; the supporting depositions are reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 419, 420-24.

[50] Cass to Tipton, 6 January 1825, and James Noble to Tipton, 21 January 1825, Tipton Papers, Box 3, Folder 26 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 434-35, 439; Isaac McCoy to Tipton, 23 March

1825, and Tipton to McCoy, 11 April 1825 and 7 June 1825 (emphasis in original) (both typescript; originals are in the Isaac McCoy Papers in the Kansas State Historical Society), Tipton Papers, Box 3, Folder 27 (2nd letter to McCoy in Folder 28), and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John* Tipton, vol. 1, 449-50, 454, 467-68; for additional information pertaining to the AFC's legal challenge see: United States District Court of Indiana, *Order Book, 1817-31*, pages 239, 240, 241, 242, 244-45, 370-71; Richard Peters, comp., *Reports of the Cases Argued and Adjudged in the Supreme Court of the Unites States, January Term, 1829*, 3rd ed., (New York: Banks Law Pub. Co., 1883), 358-69; Vincennes *Western Sun,* 5 February 1825 and Indianapolis *Gazette*, 25 January 1825; and, see also Robert A. Trennert, *Indian Traders on the Middle Border: The House of Ewing, 1827-54* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1981); Hood to Calhoun, 14 February 1825, Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 444; Tipton to Ramsay Potts, 15 December 1826, Ibid., 627-28.

[51] Cass to Tipton, 21 April 1825, Tipton Papers, Box 3, Folder 27 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 454-55; Tipton to Cass, 10 October 1827, Ibid., 796-98.

[52] Cass to Tipton, 22 October 1823, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 20 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 321-22; Tipton to Cass, 22 March 1824 (copy), Cass to Tipton, 7 April 1824, Cass to Tipton, 18 May 1824, Cass to Tipton, 10 July 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 22 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 348-49, 352, 359, 367-68; Tipton to Cass, 19 October 1823, Tipton to Cass, 3 May 1824, and Tipton to Cass, 30 June 1824 are reprinted in Ibid., 320-21, 357-58, 366; see also Collins, *John Tipton*, 109-10.

[53] McKenney to Indian Agents (circular), 19 June 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 22 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 365 (Tipton's reply is on page 408-09, and his detailed sketch is inserted therein and shown in this chapter's Figure 2), Cass to Tipton, 11 December 1824, and Tipton to Cass, 25 December 1824, Tipton Papers, Box 2, Folder 25 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton,* vol. 1, 416-18, 429-30; Cass to Tipton, 6 January 1825, and Walker and Davis: Receipted Bill, 25 February 1825, Tipton Papers, Box 3, Folder 26 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 435-36, 444-45; see also the explanatory footnotes in Ibid., 417, 342, 445 as well as the reprinted abstracts showing the Trowbridge expenditures on pages 488 and 489.

[54] *American State Papers: Public Lands*, vol. 3, 533-34, Index; *American State Papers: Finance*, vol. 4, 13, 15, 381, 385; Tipton to Williamson Dun, 15 June 1825, and Dunn to Tipton, 1 July 1825, Tipton Papers, Box 3, Folder 29 and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 470-72; see also pertinent explanatory footnotes on pages 362 and 471.

[55] Tipton to Cass, 13 November 1824, Ibid., 407-08; W.W. Douglass to Tipton, 10 November 1828, Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton,* vol. 2, 116; Rohrbough, *Land Office Business*.

[56] Tipton to Cass, 27 May 1830, Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 2, 275-76; Tipton to Cass, 5 February 1825, Ibid., vol. 1, 442-43; Cass to Tipton, 14 February 1825, Tipton to McKenney, 10 September 1825, McKenney to Tipton, 29 September 1825, and Cass to Tipton, 12 October 1825, Tipton Papers, Box 3, Folders 27, 30 (middle 2 letters), 31, and reprinted in Robertson and Riker, *John Tipton*, vol. 1, 443, 498, 500, 503-05; Tipton to Cass, 7 September 1825, Ibid., 497-98; Tipton's journal of the trip to Washington, 3 January-24 February 1825 is reprinted in Ibid., 510-15.

[57] Tipton's journal, Ibid., 513; Le Gros to James Barbour (speech), 27 January 1826, Ibid., 517-18; an example of requests for Tipton to recover the cost of a horse stolen by an Indian from a white man—the kind of situation that Le Gros described to Barbour—is found in Samuel Milroy to Tipton, 24 February 1826, Ibid., 521-22.

[58] McKenney to Le Gros, 2 February 1826, Ibid., 519-20.

[59] Barbour to Cass, [Governor] James B. Ray, and Tipton, 24 May 1826, Ibid., 536-37; Tipton to Cass, 27 November 1826, Ibid., 622-23; Robert Hood to Barbour, 29 December 1826, Tipton to McKenney, 3 February 1827, Tipton to Cass, 18 February 1827, Tipton to Barbour, 24 February 1827, are reprinted in Ibid., 631-33, 648-50; 657-59, 661-64.

[60] Tipton to McKenney, 7 February 1827, Ibid., 651-53.

[61] Ibid.; see also n16 on page 651, Ibid.; a series of documents related to removing the Agency is contained in Ibid., vol. 2, chapter 1 and more formally found in U.S. *Senate Documents*, 20 Congress, 1 session 5: no. 189.

CHAPTER FIVE

Family Men, Gender Roles, and Manhood in Tipton's West, 1825-1839

> It is indeed a dread responsibility which we fathers have.
> --William Wirt to male friend, 15 February 1814[1]
>
> [Y]our present happiness, future peace[,] respectability[,] and lasting honour depend mainly on the choice of a companion and conduct afterward. I had only at stake the deep and abideing solicitude of a parent for his son, of that you cannot now Judge.
> --Tipton to son Spear on the latter's marriage, 20 February 1834[2]

Writing to a younger male relative in September of 1829, with the introspection and moralizing that was his custom, forty-three-year-old John Tipton reflected on the crossroads of his public and private lives. "[M]y head is grown gray in the service of my country," he wrote. "I am not rich but have enough to support Matilda and the children and to leave a competancy." The turmoil, bustle, and "censures" of public service, however, wearied him and caused him to long for retirement. His experiences, he said, admonished him every day that he lived "of the necessity of taking time, *between public life* and *death* for *sober thinking*." Indeed Tipton's public and private correspondence engaged in nothing if not the sober and anxious thinking of early nineteenth-century westerners, who constantly reflected on their personal lives and family relationships within the sea of change that accompanied the building up of the country. From this point he would have ten more years remaining of his life to contemplate, although the time between the end of his public life and physical mortality would ultimately be very brief.[3]

If Tipton's correspondence is any indication, western middle-class men of the Early National period possessed, valued, promoted, and were quite dependent upon affectionate family relations. In one example, Tipton encouraged his marriage-minded son in 1834 to

remember that "your present happiness, future peace[,] respectability[,] and lasting honour depend mainly on the choice of a companion and conduct afterward." By and large westerners would have agreed with Virginian William Wirt's enthusiasm for the domestic ideal and his contention that "Happiness is nowhere but in private life" with one's "beloved family." Considering the harshness of pioneering and the fragility of families in the developing West—vulnerable as they were to the vicissitudes of frontier life, warfare, isolation, health, constant labor, and more—western men might have been even more vocal in their support. Marriage and family represented a personally and economically desirable, socially affirming status sought by both men and women. As such, gender norms of masculinity and femininity and identity would be bound up in society's ideological perceptions of the husband, wife, and parent roles. In other words manhood, or the life cycle of a man, included an enduring tour of duty as husband and father. Given the military ethos of the early nineteenth-century West and as evidenced in Tipton's papers, the reference to duty may be more accurate than not in describing a persistent theme in how men perceived their world, and how they constructed and honored their relationships. But whereas women took on a new identity upon marriage, the transformative event for men was fatherhood. William Wirt again personified this outlook. "I begin to feel like somebody in this world," he wrote to a friend in 1809; "My son is beginning to read, and my daughter writes her name very smartly; and it gives me I can tell you, no small consequence in my own eyes, to be the parent of two such children."[4]

On a number of levels, the content of Tipton's correspondence throughout the first three decades of the nineteenth century at times affirms and at other times calls into question and suggests different meanings from, the growing scholarly literature on Early National

families, gender roles, and, especially, manhood. Ironically, women's history with its emphasis on understanding women as relational beings has given us a new way to look at men who, if they were not as varied in their relationships, were just as emotionally bound to their family and friends as women were during this period. E. Anthony Rotundo, in his important work on nineteenth-century manhood and fatherhood, discerned this as well. "Nearly everything we know about human behavior in the past concerns men," he asserts, "and yet it is equally – and ironically – true that we know far more about womanhood and the female role than we know about masculinity or the man's role." Until relatively recently, the private, relational side of men's lives (including masculinity, manhood, fatherhood, and men's friendships) was given less analytical weight than that of women which has led to the inaccurate portrayal of men as disinterested husbands and fathers. The obscurity, and, arguably, the misrepresentation, stems in part from the pervasive influence of two developments: the separate spheres ideology, which essentially removes men not only from the private realm but also from the private, intimate self, and women's historian Carroll Smith-Rosenberg's 1975 article, "The Female World of Love and Ritual: Relations Between Women in Nineteenth-Century America" which has been referenced in many major gender and family studies ever since.[5]

That nineteenth-century men and women occupied different spaces and walked different paths from each other, particularly after Industrialization and market capitalism drew men away from the domestic sphere to work in the public, is widely accepted. Smith-Rosenberg, however, goes further to argue that "rigid gender-role differentiation within the family and within society as a whole" led to "the emotional segregation of women and men," which in turn encouraged women to create intensely intimate friendships and supportive

networks. True, men like Tipton derived camaraderie and "supportive networks" through fraternal organizations such as the Masons and through their militia commitments. What makes this a problematic paradigm, however, is the degree of gender exclusiveness, separation, and essentialism that Smith-Rosenberg contends underpinned these "sexually segregated worlds;" it begs the questions: were men really strangers—as opposed to companions—to the women and children of their households? (the earlier referenced comment from Tipton to his son regarding the choice of a *companion* suggests otherwise); and, did men not also have a significant emotional stake in their families? Tipton's correspondence shows that in reality and to the contrary, western men of the first half of the nineteenth century were highly involved in their personal relationships.[6]

Scholars of the nineteenth-century American family have frequently employed the ideological construct of separate, gender-based "worlds" in their depiction of households, gender roles, and family relations. Specifically, this typically devolves to a bi-modal analysis of a strict sexual division of labor within the household which, given the period's predominance of market agriculture, especially in the West, leads to a reconstruction of families as economic units of production, consumption, reproduction, and laborers. Thus families who survived by market agriculture experienced the separate spheres ideology within their homesteads, with, as the argument goes, the husband making the public market connections while the wife managed the domestic responsibilities. Implicit within this structural approach is a patriarchal hierarchy that leaves little room for companionship among its members, flexibility in its gender roles, or for a pensive ("sober"), emotional private life for its men. In other words we learn how families functioned within a market economy and within a patriarchal structure, but what does this reveal about how family

members regarded their non-labor roles to the household and to each other? What did "family" mean to them? The gender-based separate worlds framework sheds little if any light about family relations.[7]

Historian John Mack Faragher's work on mid-nineteenth-century midwestern Euro-American families exemplifies the limits of the separate worlds interpretation. Faragher argues that midwestern society embraced a "strict division of labor *and* separate cultural character models for men and women," indeed also "separate sexual worlds for men and women, each with its own separate bundle of behaviors and beliefs, each understood and appropriated *by the right sex only.*" (emphases added) These apparently mutually-exclusive worlds were characterized by, according to this thinking, a division based not only upon gender but also by the belief that men and women were definitively and "characterologically different" from each other. The latter manifested itself into the creation of two composite character models, namely masculine and feminine. Faragher further asserts that men and women maintained "contrasting values and placed themselves on different sides of this characterological divide." Under these overdrawn ideological assumptions about nineteenth-century gender relations, men and women, who supposedly were at their core completely and unwaveringly different, could only look across at each other and see aliens from other worlds, not earthly companions.[8]

A framework that focuses on a sex-based emotional segregation and division of labor as well as gender differences as the basis for how men and women related to each other does not bode well for how it will cast marital and family relations. In Faragher's work, men subscribed to the belief that marriage and a "connection with women" were important to their lives. But in essence this was only because of their desire "to participate in the shared

political and social vision of American society" which put a premium on marriage and family. As such it was in a man's best social and political interests to marry, yet it is never clear from this if he received any emotional satisfaction out of it. Faragher's description of a mid-nineteenth-century marriage as a partnership of "mutual duty and responsibility" would prompt few objections. However, portraying marriages in such utilitarian terms as "practical relationships for performing the domestic labor of society," "partnerships in production, processing, and consumption," and held together by the "economic relations of family members to one another" makes them woefully deficient in intimacy and companionship, stripped down to just labor and economics. According to Faragher American culture "decreed women to be helping wives and loving mothers, men productive farmers and protective husbands and fathers[,]...[with] little appreciation of companionate values." What men and women really "aspired to" in marriage was a relationship governed by "reciprocity."[9]

As he considered the roles of romantic love, self-exploration, and self-development in these marriages, Faragher ultimately dismisses them as "largely unobtainable in the context of midwestern society;" "the division of the sexes surely mitigated against" them. Therein lies the structural problem with the "separate worlds" framework. While it is logical to assume that same-sex relationships and networks flourished in the first half of the nineteenth century and that gender roles predisposed men and women to the kinds of work and family roles they would perform, to wed an interpretative framework of gender and family relations to strict sexual segregation would seem to preclude evidence demonstrating the many ways in which men and women bridged these so-called separate worlds, and were in fact companionate. At the time that he wrote *Woman & Men on the Overland Trail*, the work

upon which the preceding analysis has been based, Faragher insisted that nearly all of his evidence "suggests that the notion of companionate marriage was foreign to the thoughts and feelings of ordinary" midwesterners. Evidence presented here will point toward a different conclusion.[10]

Family historians generally agree that the early nineteenth century witnessed the emergence of the modern American family, an entity whose "domestic values and family practices" became enmeshed with the new middle-class identity. The modern middle-class family differed from its Puritan and pre-Revolutionary predecessors in a number of fundamental ways. Most notably, family members began relating to each other differently as a result of ideological shifts pertaining to domestic responsibilities, affections, and authority. Child-rearing and socialization displaced domestic production as the center of family life in the wake of the Industrial Revolution, inflating parental responsibility for children's moral socialization and educational instruction. This is not to imply that families were no longer concerned with domestic production or its members' interdependent contribution to it; rather, the moral, "republican" way of life associated with it was viewed as the seed to plant and nurture in the younger generation. Historian Carl Degler characterizes these families as displaying a "closeness among members" and an "internal cohesion"—developments that would seem to contradict a separate worlds ideology.[11]

Social historians Steven Mintz and Susan Kellogg situate the ideological impetus for these changes in the rise of the democratic family which they contend eroded patriarchal authority and opened the door to more affectionate/emotional and less authoritative familial relationships. Alexis de Tocqueville, the oft-cited young French nobleman, traveled and made observations about Americans and their democratic society during the early 1830s,

roughly the same time period that Tipton was writing especially to his son and daughter. In effect, democracy softened the hierarchy of authority in families, while notions of equality encouraged a sense of mutuality and "familiar intimacy" that was applied to obligations of duty and affection. De Tocqueville believed that "as manners and laws become more democratic, the relation of father and son becomes more intimate and more affectionate; rules and authority are less talked of, confidence and tenderness are often increased...The master and the constituted ruler have vanished; the father remains." In terms of domestic authority, patriarchy was being supplanted by paternalism; familial distance was overtaken by the maturation of openly affectionate families. Thomas Jefferson's enigmatic "pursuit of happiness" found a home in the democratic family, just as William Wirt exclaimed that he himself had found it there. De Tocqueville wrote: "There is certainly no country in the world where the tie of marriage is more respected than America or where the conjugal happiness is more highly or worthily appreciated."[12]

As historian Anya Jabour demonstrates, however, the companionate marriage ideal in the Early Republic was at odds with real existing gender inequalities. A companionate marriage was based upon the creation of "an emotionally fulfilling, egalitarian, and loving relationship" that promoted "mutual happiness." Nevertheless by virtue of the different places that men and women occupied in society and in the home, and the corresponding distribution of power, couples encountered differences in expectations and experiences. Happiness was an elusive marriage ideal that, when missing or strained, caused partners to become dissatisfied with each other, as Jabour's work evidences. Still, as one army officer insisted to a friend: "There is no happiness out of the married state." By the same token, an unmarried man prompted concerns that he was an unhappy man. Until his second marriage

in 1825 Tipton occasionally received comments such as the one from his friend Benjamin Beckes who relayed that his wife, Betsey, "says often she wishes to hear of your being married."[13]

With the arrival of children, marriages turned less on happiness and more on duty; indeed duty became the fruit of love and happiness, and the seat of happiness, as noted in Wirt's earlier comment, shifted to the family hearth. Duty, happiness, family, and love were all interrelated. In 1835 Tipton advised his newly-married son that the only "real happiness in this life...[is] the happy reflection of having done your duty. [Y]our first duty is to your family, next for your country." Men of Tipton's generation already understood duty as an obligation to public service, and they infused the term with public and private meanings. While the former frequently trumped the latter when a choice had to be made, as we shall see men were as likely to back out of a public duty on account of domestic or child responsibilities. Some scholars have perhaps made interpretive leaps in their equating of what could be called a term of endearment within families to a contrived subservience. Children's use of the terms duty and obedience in the closing remarks of their letters, for example, has been given as proof of the nineteenth-century's "emphasis on the subordination of young people...which led boys and girls to send their 'duty' rather than their love to their parents." Yet, this presumes that duty and love were unrelated, or that each was not a manifestation of the other to contemporaries. But a series of letters that Tipton's daughter Matilda (she shared the same name as Tipton's second wife) wrote to him from a boarding school in Cincinnati in the late 1820s suggests otherwise. Occasionally, Matilda signed her letters as "your affectionate Daughter;" or, she might sign off with "youre affectionate and

dutifull Daughter." Once in a while Matilda seemed eager to cover all of the bases to assure her father that she remained "your most obedient, affectionate and dutfull Daughter."[14]

These professions of obedience were probably less a sign of enforced subordination and patriarchy than they were a social convention of respect, given the acknowledged trend toward mutuality and egalitarianism within the home. Outside the home, middle-class men offered each other a brand of mutual obligation. Tipton's voluminous correspondence with male associates illustrates that people of this time period generally employed a formal manner of interpersonal communications, in the public and private realm, that customarily bespoke a respectful deference, yet routinely offered friendship. Even before he attained the power, influence, and status as federal Indian Agent and Senator, Tipton's many correspondents while he was yet a local official typically closed their letters reminding him that they were his friends *and* humble or obedient servants (the latter phrase was spelled a variety of ways). Just as Matilda seemed overly eager at times to affirm her loyalty, so too were some of Tipton's friends. One pledged that he was "Your friend Ready to Serve." To later superiors like Lewis Cass Tipton was more reserved in his writing, withholding a statement of friendship from the closure and signing his letters with some variation of "with grate respect yr mo obt servt."[15]

Both the closings and the salutations ("My dear Friend") in their correspondence indicate that men depended upon and derived personal satisfaction from their friendships, although they are often not credited much with having them. Of course friendship embodied expectations and limits, just like marriages and families. In 1826 William Thomasson wrote to Tipton about the latter's failure to keep his promise on a financial matter. Thomasson was vexed. "There is a point when forbearance ceases to be a virtue and criminal in the agent,"

he chided Tipton. He had wrestled with "great anxiety to be as lenient towards you as possible," motivated, Thomasson said, by "the dictates of friendship." Failure to meet an obligation suddenly cast someone as a stranger to middle class norms, in this case, friendship. On the one hand, patterns of duty and the semblance of obedience worked to reinforce familial and social hierarchies. On the other hand, these structures of power were mitigated by the affection, respect, mutuality, and friendship that guided many of these relationships and implied certain behaviors, as evident in Thomasson's comment about the "dictates of friendship" that Tipton threatened.[16]

More than friendships, however, families and children mattered most to western men of the early nineteenth century. Their letters convey nothing about the utilitarian or economic roles family members filled; instead, men revealed their emotional attachments, especially concerning their children. To Tipton's earlier query about the impending birth of his baby, friend Benjamin Beckes responded that the "blessing" he had asked about "turned out to be A fine Son who since his birth has been A healthy fine child." Men shared news about their children, and their worries over them. Elias Murray apologized for not writing to Tipton sooner in 1830, and would have done so "had it not been for an accident in my family which occupied my strictest attention until now." Apparently, Murray's oldest school-aged son was scalded "in the most shocking manner & his life is yet in great peril." Several weeks later, Murray reported that "my little son is better" but, he added, he still "requires a father[']s kind care." Providing for their families did not end with material support. Fathers were caregivers as well, and it was often enough that a child was ill to cause a man to back out of some other obligation. Because of his son's needs, Murray remarked further that he would forgo making a land purchase in a speculation scheme so as to not leave him. Tipton

did this on a number of occasions as well. Fathers were clearly conscious of the effect of their absences upon the family. In 1832, as Tipton contemplated his prospects of being re-elected Senator, he voiced the concern to one friend that "My young Family requires my presence." To another friend, he confided his mistaken belief that he would lose the election, but that such a loss "will be better for myself and famely." Tipton did note though that he "would have been willing to serve for the sake of my friends a few years longer," thus revealing the tension between the attraction of high public office and family obligations.[17]

If scholars wanted to mount yet another attack on Frederick Jackson Turner's explication of the frontier in American history they could take issue with his failure to appreciate the significance and influence of families and family men in the shaping of the early West. The self-reliance attributed to [male] individuals was achievable primarily because of the strength, cohesiveness, interdependence, and emotional support within the family unit first, then later, the fledgling communities. In fact, according to one frontier scholar, the manuscript censuses for nineteenth-century frontier populations reveal that widowers with children were recorded "in impressive numbers" although our scholarship has yet to illuminate these experiences to any meaningful degree. This family configuration is also a statistical rendering of the frequent intrusion of death in western families. A separate worlds framework tells us nothing about how a widowed father with children functioned within western society.[18]

While the Indiana that Tipton knew during the late 1820s and 1830s was not all frontier in a categorical sense, it was not far removed from it in other ways. Indiana had only attained statehood in 1816, which was, remarkably, only five years after the social and military upheaval involving Native Americans at the Battle of Tippecanoe in 1811 and then

the ensuing western theater of the War of 1812. Tipton and his contemporaries were intimately familiar with the personal costs of American expansion and the building up of the agricultural and settled West. These frontier circumstances, claims historian Mary P. Ryan who looked at families on New York's western frontier, "exaggerated the importance of the family in society beyond what even a Puritan social theorist would advise." The primitive social and economic realities compelled men and women to wholly depend upon their families for emotional and physical survival. Ironically, westerners derived strength from families that were characteristically fragile, constantly being buffeted by circumstances arising from pioneering and building-up the country. Perhaps this characteristic was also what endeared men to their families and elicited protective and paternal displays of affection, as seen in Elias Murray's and Tipton's comments.[19]

Certainly, events transpiring in the early nineteenth-century West gave Tipton much to be sober about. Among the numerous threats to the safety, security, and well-being of men and their families, renewed Indian hostilities, diminished crop harvests, and health issues posed particularly serious threats in the early 1830s. Here, as in other instances, men used their friendships and their correspondence to seek out news in order to keep abreast of dangers to their families and communities. In late May of 1832 word reached Tipton of an Indian uprising near Chicago led by Chief Black Hawk in which white men, women, and children were ambushed and killed, leaving towns along the upper Wabash in northern Indiana anxious and "in great distress." Letters disclosed that some men organized military defenses, while others worked to get information to counter the rumors. Thomas Brown confirmed the extent of the attack to Tipton, but believed that the greater danger facing their people would be "the scarceity of our crops at the ensuing season" on account of their

difficulties in obtaining seed corn. Making matters worse, Brown complained, "a large number of our farmers have deserted their ploughs & fields to engage in this excursion for the Indians, which if they search for 100 miles round they will scarcely find one that is hostile."[20]

Mixed feelings on the matter dominated the letter-writing discussions. As Senator, Tipton issued a circular to his constituents on 19 June advising them of actions being taken to protect the frontier communities, telling them that he would personally join the effort as a private soldier if it came to that. He also reassured them that his "long and intimate acquaintance" with the native peoples in their state made him confident that they would not join the hostilities. An all-out war seemed an unlikely event by 1 July when Tipton wrote to his eighteen-year-old son Spear, but he promised that he could accompany him on one campaign if it continued. Again, however, Tipton and some of his friends wrestled with the prospect of abandoning their families to join the war. Tipton explained to one friend that the reason he had not appointed him commander of a company was that he did not believe that the latter would leave his family to enter the service, just as he thought his friend Beckes would not do so either. Tipton felt the same way and wrote to another friend after returning home from Washington that "in this state of uncertainty I have determined to remain with my family" until something more definitive could be learned.[21]

Even before the rumors and forebodings of an Indian war had subsided, a more sinister and deadly foe loomed on the horizon: cholera. Men used their letters to alert their friends to the disease's movements and local impact. On 18 July, Samuel Milroy relayed that cholera had hit the army at Chicago, and feared that it "may have a verry injurious effect in prosecuting the war on our fronteer." A week later, Tipton heard from David Burr who told

of the "frightful ravages at Detroit" that the disease had made. News and rumor spread in equal measure. In August, John Duret wrote from Cincinnati that cholera "is expected here every hour.—The City is kept very clean." Another friend informed Tipton, who was away in Washington, of the condition of the latter's hometown of Logansport. "The people[,] some of them[,] are terribly scared at the near approach of the cholera," he wrote, "which is marching toward us with steady steps."[22]

As we have already observed, men did not hesitate to disengage from public commitments if they felt that their responsibility to their families warranted it. Johnston Lykins of Missouri was in communication with Tipton on 15 September regarding an impending treaty encampment in Indiana that involved them both. Lykins' participation, however, was jeopardized by the arrival of cholera in his state; "its approach to the neighbourhood of my family...will prevent my being at the treaty." A year later Tipton confronted the epidemic, although his home in northern Indiana was out of danger. In August of 1833 he had grown anxious at not having heard from Spear, who was now studying law in Madison, in the southeastern part of the state. Finally, after two frantic letters inquiring about his son's health and asking him to come home if cholera was there, Tipton learned that Spear was not affected. By the end of the year, the imminent danger had passed.[23]

Along with the ideological changes that influenced the way that early nineteenth-century family members related to each other, frontier families encountered an array of external forces that threatened or penetrated family life. Tipton's correspondence with a network of middle-class male friends and associates clearly demonstrates attitudes and behaviors that challenge the widely held paradigmatic view of nineteenth-century men as

emotionally distant fathers and husbands. Indeed these letters indicate that middle-class norms concerning manhood dictated that men embrace being affectionate, care-giving family men. As we have seen, men were also inclined to duck public commitments in favor of private responsibilities (i.e. to administer "a father's kind care"), although undoubtedly this did not always happen. In his analysis of the personal correspondence of young U.S. Army officers between 1815 and 1846, historian Samuel J. Watson found much that compares favorably with the present chapter. The soldiers' writings validated the prevalence of companionate marriages, affectionate, child-centered families, and men's emotional involvement, if not dependency, in their relationships with family members and their male friends.[24]

Watson's study also contradicts analyses by Faragher and others which adhere to the historiographical interpretation that nineteenth-century American [Mid-] westerners narrowly and rigidly constructed gender roles on the basis of physical anatomy. In reality, gender roles as they pertained to labor and other normative expectations were typically flexible, a situation that is fairly easily substantiated in a number of sources that documented early western life. For example, Ohio pioneer William Cooper Howells' own experiences in the first half of the nineteenth century illustrate the degree to which domestic and farm chores were frequently age and gender blind when he said: "The rule was, that whoever had the strength to work, took hold and helped." Tipton's admonitions to Spear and his new wife Sarah in 1834 were likewise fluid concerning household labor, while also apparently discouraging the use of a servant. "[Y]ou must learn to rise early and make your own fires," he counseled them; "you are both young enough to wa[i]t on yourselves."[25]

Perhaps even more telling, Watson uncovered a surprising degree of flexibility and egalitarianism among the middle-class soldiering men of his study in their perceptions about education and their female kin, particularly with regards to daughters and sisters. As he was about to march against Mexico in 1846, one captain encouraged his daughter about the "privilege of attending school," that she must "gain all the improvement that you can," and to remember that "you are studying for yourself." Recall that William Wirt's pronouncement that he felt "like somebody in the world" rested not just on being a father but upon seeing his children, a boy and a girl, read and write. Beliefs in educating the younger generation for enlightened personal and public outcomes were rooted in the post-Revolutionary generations who linked the success of the new Republic to the strength of an educated citizenry. This was no less true in the early nineteenth-century West, a place where, to outsiders, the character of the rough-edged existence often merged with that of its residents. In one sense, education allowed westerners to separate themselves from their pioneering heritage and made them appear less primitive and more prominent, just as the building of schools gave the landscape an impression of civility. Tipton contributed to this when he helped to organize a subscription school in 1825, soon after arriving in Fort Wayne. As he rose from Harrison County sheriff to federal Indian Agent at Fort Wayne and then to state senator, Tipton was painfully self-conscious of his own sparse formal education; the more public his duties became, the more frequent the reminders. In 1832 he wrote to his son that he "most sensibly feel the want of an early education. I now feel the want of an oppertunity to acquire it but you shall have the opportunity and if you [lack] education when you are grown it shall be your fault." Several months later he added: "cannot you percieve from my letters that I lact the pollish of an education. I feel it everyday."[26]

Tipton took the responsibility of educating both his children – Spear and Matilda – with the same sober pragmatism and view toward self-improvement that directed his own steps. While he entrusted the actual rudimentary teaching to several school masters and tutors, he was the ultimate overseer of his children's learning. "[*K*]*nowledge* is what you *most need*," was Tipton's standard measure in exhorting his children to read and study. His determination to ensure daughter Matilda's education along with Spear's suggests that fathers believed that their daughters profited from learning as well. In this, Tipton was part of the vanguard of changing views on educating girls. According to women's historian Linda Kerber, the period 1790 to 1830 witnessed an expansion of educational facilities for girls despite "pervasive skepticism" throughout American society. Given the positive views voiced by the family men in Watson's study as well as Tipton's own actions, fathers may have been more active than scholars typically acknowledge in erasing the gender boundaries when it came to educating their daughters. Certainly, it was a paternal responsibility of great personal significance to Tipton, and one from which he never wavered. On numerous occasions he excused himself from his Indian Agent duties to attend to situating his children with school masters; in 1824 and 1825, Tipton took teen-aged Matilda to board in Louisville and then to the Cincinnati Female Academy. As discussed in the previous chapter, it was the following year that Tipton wrote to Lewis Cass about his discouragement with living and working conditions in Fort Wayne. "Nothing keeps me in this office now," he told him, "but to enable me to Educate my children."[27]

Although Tipton firmly believed in a paternal obligation to improve the minds of his (and others') children, he nevertheless articulated some of the widely-held gendered assumptions of the times about women and education. His letters to Matilda do not appear to

have survived, but from a handful addressed to him from her we gain insight as to how daughters attempted to rise to their fathers' admonishments to be aggressive in their own learning. Her curriculum at the Cincinnati Female Academy included grammar, geography, history, math, reading, writing, rhetoric, and what she called dictionary and "botanizing." Matilda also described her proficiency in drawing and water-color painting, once sending her father a piece of painted silk for his watch. When the school year started in 1826, Matilda expressed that "I feel more like stud[y]ing than I ever did before." She was grateful for the books that Tipton sent, saying "I should like to red some of the rest if they ware to stay here longanuff." As her father often denigrated his own unpolished writing, Matilda did likewise in her letters to him. "I hope," she offered, "[that] you will not have any cause to be displeased with any more of my letters for I shall take pains both in spelling and writing." By May 1827 her letters home had become brief though her enthusiasm for learning had not dampened. Instead, sixteen-year-old Matilda reported that her "headacks" were very bad. A month later, Tipton received a somber letter from the school official that his daughter had died after nearly a week of fever. Tipton had known death's disruption of family ties before and would know it again up to his own untimely death in 1839. When Spear's young daughter died, Tipton consoled him that "parents shoud prepare thier minds for such heart rending events...it appears that the author of our existence fore ordained such afflictions as necessary to make life the less disereable, and to prepare us for death."[28]

When Spear married Sarah Ann in 1834, as Tipton was overseeing his son's education, his father gained a new student in whom to encourage self-improvement in the form of a doting daughter-in-law. Tipton was touched and "gratifid" that she invited a correspondence with him, saying that it would give him "much pleasure" to "advise your

husband and yourself so long as my advice is kindly received or sought for by either." He hoped that she and Spear could both work to improve their minds and grow intellectually, especially now in her case, before the cares of motherhood descended upon her. In this, one surmises not only Tipton's assumption of, but also the apparent workings of, a companionate marriage. "[U]rge Spear to pursue his studdies," he encouraged, "and I want you to read (not having much in charge now you can improve your mind)." And as he did for Matilda, Tipton sent Sarah Ann a good deal of reading material including books and newspapers. He was particularly eager for her to study the newspaper *The Albion* for its "musick and poetry and much grave reading." How far Sarah Ann progressed in her father-in-law's tutelage is not known. By the next year she and Spear suffered the first birth and death of a child in their family; yet months later Tipton was still encouraging Sarah Ann to read.[29]

Tipton was ardent in his conviction that education and knowledge uplifted and improved all of society, which is to say, the convergence of white and Indian society in the West, however fleeting the mixed society would be given the growing public discourse on removal. Men, women, children, and families benefited because of education. He even sent books to his friends like Calvin Fletcher, encouraging him to "take care of and read them." He was clearly not among the skeptics about educating women that Kerber argues pervaded contemporary American society; in fact, Tipton promoted and acted toward expanding learning opportunities for young women. Just as he seemed oblivious to whatever gender boundaries existed as they pertained to education, Tipton was a strong advocate for educating Native American children—boys and girls—as well, although he did so for complex reasons including the paternalistic racism of the era.[30]

During the mid- to late 1820s, as federal Indian Agent and while overseeing his own children's education, Tipton wrote to an associate, Richard M. Johnson, to learn more about the Choctaw Academy at Blue Springs, Kentucky. For several years, Johnson had been an enthusiastic proponent of educating Native American children under the direction of the Kentucky Baptist Society. Through an 1825 treaty between the Choctaws and the U.S. government, the two parties agreed to a twenty–year annual appropriation of 6,000 dollars for schools to facilitate the educating of Indian children. Johnson and the Baptist Board of the General Convention then submitted a plan for the Choctaw Academy to the War Department which was approved and implemented in November of 1825. Johnson managed the finances and the young students' boarding and clothing. By the following February, Tipton promised Johnson to use his influence in treaty-making with the Potawatomis and the government to appropriate funds for education, and to make it possible for a number of their tribe and the Miami to attend. Johnson was "extremely pleased and gratifyed" at the prospect of seeing the "schollars come from the North" to the Choctaw Academy" and, sounding paternal, he pledged to "treat them like my own children." He hoped that Tipton would arrange for between ten and twenty young Indian scholars from his agency to come and study at the Choctaw Academy for a duration of three to five years. To Johnson's (and fellow reformers') way of thinking, this would supply the Indian nations with "some enlightened men" who could act as models of civility to the rest and "rescue at least a part of these people from barbarism & annehilation." Tipton, however, never presumed to exclude Native American girls from the Indian schools.[31]

Tipton's involvement with what he termed "Indian reform" and the movement to educate Indian children began almost immediately upon his federal appointment to head the

Fort Wayne Indian Agency in 1823. There, Baptist missionary Isaac McCoy had opened up an Indian school in 1820 with modest government and church funding. About six months prior to Tipton's arrival to the Agency, the Reverend McCoy re-located the school to the Carey Mission, in the Michigan Territory. However, in the process of transferring Agency funds to McCoy and learning about the work being done, Tipton found a humane cause to hitch to his drive for improvement, and a lifelong friendship between the two men ensued. On 14 June 1826 he told McCoy that he felt "much solicitude" toward Indian reform, and promised to "promote it by all the laudable means in my power." Indeed he did. He favored McCoy's efforts in keeping the Indian schools in close proximity to the students' parents, yet he hoped to expand this idea in his own Agency work to include the selection of "a few of the most promiseing of booth sex and sending them off" to a more formal western school.[32]

Tipton was instrumental in bringing about the objectives of the government, Indian reformers, and supportive tribal chiefs in using government funds to promote the educational advancement of tribal peoples at the Fort Wayne Agency, specifically, the Potawatomis and the Miamis. As a result of an 1819 congressional act and with the consent of tribal chiefs of the Agency, a so-called Education Fund would be used to transport a number of Indian children, initially male, to either McCoy's school at Carey Mission or Johnson's Choctaw Academy. Interestingly, until the details were worked-out with respect to which of the schools would receive these children, Tipton's correspondence with both men indicated that a degree of rivalry existed over supervising these children; in the end, the Potawatomis' Education Fund was linked to the Choctaw Academy, and the Miamis' to the Carey Mission, although somewhat tenuously.[33]

Both whites and Native Americans understood that Euro-American education represented a mechanism for change, with significant consequences for their societies attached to it. As Johnson's remarks showed, the U.S. government and Indian reformers were confident that educating young Indians was the beginning of a great transformation of Native American societies to be more compatible with Euro-American interests. Tipton's efforts were periodically thwarted by resistance and spoilers. Miami Chief Jean B. Richardville (Pechewah) was vocal in his opposition to his tribe's Education Fund being used to transport children to Carey Mission and used his influence to block the signing of documents with the word "school" in them. Richardville did not believe that educating tribal children away from their families and "out of their own Country" was a good idea. His own son Joseph had been taken to Detroit for schooling and supposedly returned to his people no better than a drunkard. Instead, Richardville advocated that the Miami Education Fund be used for an Indian school in the Miami Reserve.[34]

Tipton was more personally involved in channeling a number of Fort Wayne Agency's Potawatomi children to the Choctaw Academy, although he encountered some unexpected difficulties as he did so. The Potawatomis agreed to set aside 2,000 dollars annually to cover all expenses related to the education of nine of their youth, of whom Tipton was requested to show no partiality in choosing. The War Department required only that they be "boys of the finest promise." Tipton gathered the selected boys at his home in May of 1827. He sent them off on the fifteenth with one of the chiefs and an interpreter, and he followed them a day later. Before leaving Tipton wrote to Lewis Cass to explain why his departure had been delayed. He had been forced to contend with rumors spread by "some evil disposed person" that "the buoys were to be made slaves in [Kentucky]." Hearing this

"Their parents became verry uneasey and demanded their buoys [back]." Two boys quit under these circumstances, and a third refused to go even though his parents were satisfied with Tipton's reassurances. Other boys had to be chosen to replace them, he explained to Cass. Despite the initial setback their journey had been successful. Tipton had another reason for being eager to accompany the group south to the Academy—his wife, who was staying with family in Corydon, had given birth to their son, George, on the fourteenth.[35]

Tipton's 2 June 1827 report to Secretary of War James Barbour about conditions at the Choctaw Academy reveals some of the complex motivations behind the Indian reform movement. Tipton could not have been more favorably impressed by what he saw. The high level of discipline enabled boys who had been there no more than thirteen months to read, write, and draw well enough to "do credit to any institution in the Country of buoys from our best families." They had at their disposal globes, maps, books, other instruments, and an atmosphere of harmony. Typical of Indian reformers, Tipton believed that Native Americans only needed to be plucked from their surroundings, situated in a "wholesom climate," and trained through education to become like their Euro-American counterparts. "[R]emooved from the bad examples of wild Indians in their drunken rivelry," he offered, "there [the Academy] the native tallent can be cultivated." Tipton was effusive in his praise for the Academy. Everything about it, he exclaimed to Barbour, "surpassed my most sanguine expectation."

Given that, like his peers, much of his adult life had been preoccupied with the West's anxious military affairs, Tipton realized that an additional advantage could be gained through this academic enterprise and thus further justify the costs associated with it. So long as the Academy received boys from the leading families "of those numerous and late hostile

tribes," he contended, "we have the surest pledges that the [scenes] of Ft Mimms, Chicago and macinac will not be acted over again should we have another war with any forriegn power." He pointed out that the Creeks and the Potawatomis "were the first and most desperate enemies against us in the last war." The latter were yet a powerful nation, scattered along the Wabash River and on up to the Canadian line where their interactions with the British "continuelly interrupt thier peace and our security[;] ...if ever the Indians can be civillized and preserved from utter extermination, this must be the proper course." The children's present environment was conducive to nurturing friendships with each other, and, more importantly for the U.S. government, with some of the "best families" of Kentucky which presumably would cause them to hesitate before aligning against Euro-Americans.[36]

Tipton concluded his observations and suggestions to Barbour with his opinion that Indian girls should be included in this equation. "[I]t is important," he insisted, "that the Indian girls should be educated." If they were not, he perceived that a gap in intellect would separate men and women of their own generation. One can also infer that Tipton failed to comprehend how a marriage, implicitly ideologically companionate, could successfully function under those circumstances. "[A] learned man," he asserted, "will always seek a wife who is intelligent." While on the surface one could interpret the preceding remark as evidence that Tipton valued educating young women primarily only for the sake of creating more interesting companions for young men, yet to do so would be to ignore and diminish the significance of everything that he said and did to encourage learning in his daughter, daughter-in-law and in public schools. Moreover, in a letter he wrote to McCoy at Carey Mission the next year, Tipton reiterated that he was "anxious that some [M]iami children of

boath sex should be educated." He promised again to "render my aid to procure them for your school," stating that he would eagerly escort them there himself.[37]

Knowledge was a higher plain to which Tipton directed and exhorted white and Native youths who would listen. Collectively, personal enlightenment portended the possibility of engendering group empowerment, improving Native-white relations, and more. Hoping to bring this about, he directly involved himself in the process on numerous occasions. Months after his visit to the Choctaw Academy, he sent a letter addressed to "My young Friends." His object was to remind them of "the grate importance it is to yourselves and to the different nations to which you belong that you obey your teachers and pursue your studdes faithfully." They were of a noble race, he said, "possessing by nature all or as many virtues as has fallen to the lot of men of any colour or Country." Speaking the paternal language of a dominant social group, Tipton wrote that the only area in which they were inferior to the white race was in their lack of formal education, but this situation need not continue. "[T]hat knowledge is derived from books[,] instruments and teachers such as are now placed within your reach," he pointed out, "by the wise provision of the Indian & the white man who established the Choctaw academy." He urged them to complete their education, return to their respective nations, and attend to the public concerns of their people. It soon would be within their power—indeed their responsibility—to prevent "the abuses so loudly and many times Justly [are] complained by the Indian Against the white men." Tipton signed it as "yr friend."[38]

Tipton evidently placed great optimism and high aspirations in the power of knowledge and education to improve men, women, and their surroundings. He was also certain of two related ideological facts: first, that the focus of academic and self-

improvement energies should be on youths; and, second, that he owned the role of conductor of those energies because he was a man, public servant, and father. While historians would likely place Tipton in the vanguard of social change related to educational reform in the West in his broad encouragement of educating girls, gender scholars would nevertheless contend that in important ways his personal correspondence with his son Spear in the 1830s demonstrates that he was a common man among western men. Although he pushed his familial female charges to read and grow intellectually, it was to his son that he also gave moral instruction, and lots of it, mixed in with basic entrepreneurial training. The letters that passed between father and son served as a gendered intergenerational transmission of middle-class male culture and values that occasionally went back and forth for adjustments of opinion.

As de Tocqueville observed, by the 1830s patriarchal authority in the home became less austere and more affectionate and paternal. This was most apparent in the almost tutorial way that fathers related to their sons. Paternalism fit well with emerging middle class goals that embraced affectionate families, the republican ideal of cultivating an educated citizenry, and participating successfully in a commercial market economy. Tipton's correspondence illustrates that westerners pondered and followed these patterns as well. In addition, Tipton fit the archetype of the self-made man which paralleled the emergence of a highly competitive and individualistic market place and that became the dominant male cultural manifestation in the first half of the nineteenth century. According to E. Anthony Rotundo, the measure of all things was now the individual; primary concerns surrounded "self"—self-improvement, self-control, and self-advancement. The culture of manhood redefined itself in terms of ambition, rivalry, aggression, and individual interests. What held these competitive

passions in check was moral scrutiny, and fathers embodied the most important and most immediate source of moral instruction for their sons. The Tipton father to son correspondence is significant not only for this transmission of manhood ideals and ideologies, but also because it represents a veritable passing of the torch, from a representative of the pioneering, path-clearing, Indian-fighting generation to one of the state-building generation. For westerners emerging from a period that was often violent and extreme, the nurturing of morality in the younger generation may also have offered a way for them to recompense and emotionally retreat from the bloodshed that was perpetrated against Native Americans.[39]

Aside from exhortations to study, the initial focus in this series of letters beginning in 1830 dealt with Tipton helping his son Spear, who was sixteen years old, choose a career path. Education and studying would put him on that path; indeed one could go no further in life without those attributes. To study meant to be disciplined and to improve; to advance was incumbent upon the individual. "[Y]our success thro[ugh] life depends mostly on you[r] own exertion," Tipton instructed; "fortune and fame is within the reach of any young man who has moderate intellect[,] studdy habbits and a little education." The process of becoming a self-made man was an ongoing conversation thread to which Tipton later agreed with Spear that "with moderate capacity[,] strct sobriety and never tireing industry" a man can make himself a success. Tipton hoped that the younger would seek a future in law, "the mos[t] noble pursuit," or in the army, "as may suit your inclineation."[40]

His preference, given the choice, would be for Spear to study law and then establish himself as a command-worthy leader in the military; however, "in these dull days of peace" coupled with "the bitterness of party," he conceded that it was quickly becoming unpopular

to do so. But law would make him a "usefull" man. On the other hand, Tipton believed that his son would not like the "dull slow way" of farming despite it being a sure enterprise to make one's bread. Yet if that was his desire then he would buy him a good farm. Tipton constantly worried and expressed that he was "anxious" over Spear's reluctance to decide upon a career. Finally, two years later, he pressured his son to choose a path, any path, "and pursue it steadily, with zeal and energy, even the most humble pursuit." Facetiously, he said: "*Basket makeing* would afford a man his Bread, if pursued faithfully." While status was linked to occupation, the most basic expectation about early nineteenth-century middle-class men was that they be industrious, independent, and able to provide for themselves through a money-making enterprise.[41]

A middle-class man was also a moral man who held himself up to high standards of personal conduct. Tipton devoted a great deal of his instructional enthusiasm to this topic, some of it taking on the quality of unattainable idealism. Periodically he would forward Spear papers to read over frequently and study constantly. One of these concerned integrity which Tipton called "a sufficient monetor for your conduct in life." A man of integrity could not be convicted of idleness, keeping bad company, running through the neighborhood, or being "twitted by any one as his debtor." Nor did he need anything but "one suit of clothes and as many books as you could [tie] in yr [handkerchief]." Personal happiness would always be found in "strict truth[,] never tireing industry in good works[,] and unsullied Honour." Spear must avoid vulgar people "as you would a firy Dragon" because a man acts and speaks like those with whom he associated, and he would share their reputation. The lowest of the "low vulgar clowns" were those who hovered nearby during the payment of Indian annuities to arrange nefarious deals. On this subject Tipton was adamant. Spear was

to have nothing to do with this class of people. "[I]n my house is your home when you wish it," he cautioned, "but if you mingle with those above described you cannot with me nor mine." These principles were "unerring," and he should read over them once a month for ten years and in this way come to understand them as his father does.[42]

Money issues figured prominently in these letters. As youth have ever been, Spear was dependent upon his father for carrying-cash while he was a student. Their exchanges reveal, however, that Spear often appeared more concerned with acquiring money rather than wisdom. Not surprisingly, Tipton frequently used his control over the family finances to prod Spear in the direction of the desired course of action. In August of 1833 Tipton explained to his son that he had given over an amount of money to James Lanier, with whom Spear was studying law in Madison, to be relinquished in small sums. He assured Spear that he would take care of his needs, "provided you pursue your studies faithfully." He did not expect to be repaid, but, he warned his son repeatedly, "when you cease to do well for yourself I will cease to supply your wants." The next year, Tipton addressed a letter to twenty-year-old Spear and his new wife in the form of "My Children," and proceeded to discuss the importance of frugality while his son was yet reading law. "[I]n a word," he admonished, "pursue the most rigid economy...you must be carefull and industrious[;] I know by experiance that industry adds much to our injoyment in this world." Tipton tried to discourage his son from his interest in money and what money could buy. "[M]ind your studdies," Tipton continued to urge; "never mind money more than will find Sarah Ann something to eat and ware." Another time he told Spear that it was better for him to be without a coat "than pestered with bills and duns." Mind, morality, and industry mattered most to Tipton.[43]

Yet it was not money that was problematic to the self-made man or to nineteenth-century morality, it was debt and the contraction of it. To Spear and his wife, Tipton wrote: "*create no debts,* become *security* for no one...if you take this advice I will help you and if I find you contracting debts I will leave you to pay them by your own exertion." He promised that this advice was worth more to them "than all the money I coud give you." Spear, however, persisted in asking his father for financial backing to enter into the commercial trade as a merchandiser. Tipton abhorred the suggestion for a number of reasons, but mainly believed that his son would "ruin" himself if he did. Eventually he relented and set him up with a contract to furnish a small amount of goods in hopes that a taste of trading would curb the appetite.[44]

Instead, Spear approached him again in January of 1835 for a one thousand dollar loan to go into a partnership in merchandising trade goods. Tipton's response was a lengthy diatribe about debt-contraction—and a father's woe. "[L]et me tell you plainly," he scolded, "that your constantly expressing a wish to go into some partnership *traffic* makes my heart ach." He relayed his own failed trading endeavor which "Broke me intirely." Tipton avowed that he would never give his consent, although he was aware that Spear was nearly twenty-one years of age and thus capable of entering into his own agreements. Nonetheless he beseeched him to "tease me no more" about it. Tipton understood youthful ambitions, and he tried to ground his son by pointing out that being on the cusp of adulthood was heating up his mind "with *immaginary business, wealth* and *happiness, phantoms that you can never overtake.*" A year later, in April of 1836, Spear contracted debt anyway despite his father's oft-repeated advice, persuasion, and even scoldings. Tipton reminded him to act honorably in the matter.[45]

In the 1830s, besides acting as state senator Tipton was heavily involved in developing northern Indiana as well as his own diverse and extensive properties and enterprises. As Spear became more active in managing part of his father's holdings, the correspondence between the two incorporated more detail about activities related to the building-up of the region, constituting a birds-eye-view of how Euro-Americans re-made the landscape to suit their socio-economic objectives. Moral instruction continued as Tipton guided his son in the proper way to conduct business and interact with people. Tipton's generation was consumed with building a place for Spear's generation to occupy, and to do so with a certainty that the former did not have.

By definition, self-made men were both visionaries and opportunists, and Tipton and Spear surely qualified. From afar at the nation's capitol, Tipton advised his son on what he wanted done back home in Indiana, in the buying and selling of land such as canal lots or town lots in Lagro or other land speculation schemes. Spear was now responsible for legal filings as well as settling agreements or discretely collecting money owed his father. Tipton acted very carefully in his dealings with people and coached his son to do the same because, he said, he knew what it was to be treated badly by those indebted to him. He told Spear, for example, to "deliver a deed in no case unless you get money[;] I hate [law] suits." In this arrangement, Spear earned ten percent of what he collected for his father which worked satisfactorily to both, although the personal nature of their relationship at times interfered with business. In April of 1836 Spear apparently believed that his father was displeased with the way that he handled Tipton's accounts. Tipton was bewildered as to how Spear arrived at that idea and addressed him in terms of morality. "I never suspected your integerty," Tipton responded, "or your honour, and I surely did [not] write what I never thought of." When he

had asked Spear to keep money matters straight, he said, it was "not so much between *you* and *me* as between my *other children* and *you*," that as a father he must be able to give all of his children an equal portion of his property and money. "[R]ead my letters again," Tipton reassured Spear, "and banish such unreasonable suspicions."[46]

The northern Indiana landscape was a work in progress, and Tipton's aspirations and near-obsession with improvements kept it moving forward. Tipton was involved in building bridges, roads, dams, and mills, as well as the larger internal improvement for the region, including canal-building. He envisioned tremendous possibilities for the area. At one point Tipton asked his son to get some land condemned on the south shore of the Wabash River to abut a dam which would enable him to power a cotton factory, a woolen factory, and flour and saw mills. He was also ready to take advantage of opportunity, as was Spear who served as treasurer of the Logansport and Wabash Bridge Company beginning in 1836. In January of 1838 Tipton learned that bridges in Logansport and West Logan had been washed away by a freshet. He realized that his ferry would now be a valuable commodity, and he directed Spear to rent it for what it was worth. Tipton did not like to part with money for such things as taxes if it could be avoided. In 1838 when he was assessed a nineteen dollar road tax, he got the road supervisor to agree to allow him to labor on the road instead. Interestingly, fifty-two-year-old Senator Tipton told Spear to intervene and extend his time since he had not been able to put a tire on his ox wagon and get the work done before he returned to Washington. Speaking as a family man while also communicating these values to his son, he said that he had been preoccupied with attending to his family's needs first, prior to his departure; the road work could not have been done "without leaving my family unprovided for. [T]hat I could not do."[47]

Tipton was also a landlord who maintained a significant interest in his tenant farmers. They were, afterall, the kinds of people that land speculators and internal improvements promoters like Tipton were trying to attract to the region, next to the actual land purchasing farmers. He was a man in control of detail and often decided what would be grown by his tenants, preferring, in 1836, that corn and oats be sown. The next year, some were growing wheat. For the remainder of the decade, his correspondence indicates that managing tenants and agricultural production absorbed more of his time and produced a considerable amount of frustration, which is not at all to suggest that growing problems existed. Tipton accepted rent paid in crops harvested. In 1838, for example, he sought from one tenant at least ten of the twenty-eight bushels of wheat due him for seed wheat provided the previous year. He also made allowances for day-labor claims to then modify downward the total number of bushels owed him.[48]

As he did with all of his collections, Tipton held the line on tenants paying their rent, even when one died. At the same time, however, he was not insensitive to a family's economic hardship. In one of his bridge-building endeavors, he wrote to Spear to pressure the investors to follow-through with their funds, or within days he would release the hired hands, with the project unfinished. Tipton, who was by his own admission often over-extended in his financial dealings with short-term loans, had no money to pay them and was embarrassed. Worse, one of the hands came to him seeking his wages in order to buy bread for his family; without hesitating Tipton borrowed money to give him. As a rule, he cautioned Spear to deal fairly but firmly with people in business matters. However, troublesome tenants and unreasonable neighboring farmers occasionally required a forceful assertiveness. A certain Mr. Young was becoming rather insistent upon having access to a

piece of land that Tipton was holding and renting out, and wanted to assume control over it even before the current crop was harvested. This, the senator would not accommodate. Young may have had a somewhat valid claim because Tipton remarked to Spear that the man had better not "oust me *vi et armis* or I will trouble him." He urged Spear to "settle it quietly if possible."[49]

Scholars have periodically derided men like Tipton who either directed or participated in the building up of the country with such enthusiasm, during the course of westward expansion. Their efforts and activities have been characterized as driven by greed to exploit and waste the West's natural resources. Historian John Lauritz Larson accuses Tipton of working with friends to mark "for plunder the resources of the upper Wabash Valley" for their own benefit. Yet, just as historian Paul Gates contended that "no evidence" existed to show that Tipton "ever took much enjoyment in reading, or, in fact, ever carried it very far," this, too, is an inaccurate portrayal of who he really was. While he appeared to delight in constructing a new place for Euro-Americans to dominate, he was not determined to denude it of timber for the sake of irresponsible destruction. In fact Tipton admonished Spear repeatedly to preserve trees wherever possible, sometimes for aesthetic reasons, other times because of pragmatic needs such as fencing. Tipton was leery of some of the construction occurring on his land: "I hope that you will see that these bridge builders do not destroy the trees growing on the island; they must have a road *across* the island and it *must be well fenced*." In April of 1836, Spear was told to watch over his father's land carefully. "[S]ell no timber, *not one stick* to any one," Tipton insisted, "I would rather see trees grow, than to sell them for money." And, later, he asked his son to ride out and "see how my timber fares," being sure to convey to his associates to "take care and waste no trees."

Tipton's correspondence demonstrates that it was certainly possible for early nineteenth-century western men and women to be environmentally self-conscious even in the midst of a great sea of construction and development. Indeed scholar Lee Clark Mitchell could easily have had Tipton in mind when he noted that Americans of the 1820s and 1830s often "felt vaguely uncertain about, and sometimes cringed mentally at, their altering of the land."[50]

Throughout their correspondence, father and son explored the relational boundaries and manhood definitions of their era. Tipton negotiated his parental authority over Spear carefully and with an eye more toward instruction and guidance rather than an indifferent exercise of power, which represents the core difference between paternalism and patriarchy. Moreover, affection was upfront and honest, and family was central. Tipton's network of male correspondents reveals that western men were family men who also trained up their sons to respect and adhere to family values. The letters in no way suggest that gender boundaries were rigid, or that women and girls were perceived as lesser, or, "separate" for that matter, family members. The family unit was joined, cohesive, mutually dependent, and largely intergenerational. These values were also cross-cultural and presented a common ground of conceptual language and understanding among the Euro-Americans and Native Americans who were living in a region that was in a state of flux. Within this paradigm, the idea of educating Native American children, boys and girls, along with (although separated from) white boys and girls was not altogether an anomaly despite the discourse of skepticism about educating girls.

Unfortunately, letters from Tipton's second wife, Matilda, to him while he carried out his senatorial duties in Washington are not among the published collection and may not exist at all. Such a correspondence did take place, however, based upon Tipton's remarks to Spear

and others whom he engaged to look over his family while he was gone. It is clear that Matilda, or "Mrs. T." and "maa" as she was referred to by her husband, supervised some of the family's operations in his absence. To a caretaker on the premises, Tipton was reluctant to decide on crop matters from Washington and advised him: "of all these things you and Matilda must Judge." She was also a source of information for him, on which he was highly dependent, whether it was to relay the progress of building stables or, more critically, the supply of corn for the family.[51]

From the time of their marriage in 1825 to 1833, she bore four children. In 1838, her weakened health was frequently noted in Tipton's personal and public correspondences. That summer he succeeded in having her travel to Washington, perhaps in the vain hope that a change of climate would improve her unspecified condition. By November, Tipton's letters to his son show that he was nervous and alarmed about his wife and seemed desperate to make her happy. "I forgot to mention to you about dried fruit & Tea for your maa & for the family," Tipton implored; "...buy Tea & every thing else the family wants...furnish every thing that your maa wants." The next month, he wrote Spear from the Senate Chamber that he was more than anxious to finish up his duties to return home, but that he had to await the decisions of "2 very important matters to Indiana." He was relying on information from Spear's wife Sarah Ann as to when his presence was absolutely required at home; that was his final authority upon which "I will leave all & go home without delay." On 15 January 1839 the government matters still had not been decided, and Tipton was edgy and "very uneasy" that no letter had come from home for three days. He repeated to Spear that if Sarah Ann and another female relative thought best, he would return immediately. Finally, two weeks later Tipton darted out of Washington for home, arriving on 9 February. He had less

than one week with Matilda before she died. On 15 February he wrote to a friend that "my beloved wife is no more." Once again Tipton was a family man with no companion.[52]

NOTES—CHAPTER FIVE

[1] William Wirt to Dabney Carr, 15 February 1814, quoted in Anya Jabour, *Marriage in the Early Republic: Elizabeth and William Wirt and the Companionate Ideal* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1998), 83.

[2] Tipton to Spear S. and Sarah Ann Tipton, 20 February 1834, reprinted in Nellie Armstrong Robertson and Dorothy Riker, eds., *The John Tipton Papers*, vol, 3, (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1942), 26-27, hereafter cited as *Tipton Papers*, with appropriate volume number following.

[3] Tipton to George C. Spencer, 30 September 1829, reprinted in Ibid., 199 (emphasis in original); many scholars of the early nineteenth century and the Jacksonian era have cast it as an age of anxiety as seen in the discussion in chapter one of David G. Pugh, *Sons of Liberty: The Masculine Mind in Nineteenth-Century America* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1983), 3-43, and notes following.

[4] Tipton to Spear S. and Sarah Ann Tipton, 20 February 1834 in Ibid., 27; William Wirt to Benjamin Edwards, 26 February 1809 and William Wirt to Dabney Carr, 21 December 1809 are quoted in Jabour, *Marriage in the Early Republic*, 73, 79; John Mack Faragher comments extensively on marriage and family-making in the mid-nineteenth-century agricultural Midwest in normative terms in his *Women & Men on the Overland Trail,* 2d (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000) as well as *Sugar Creek: Life on the Illinois Prairie* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).

[5] My research and conclusions follow those of Shawn Johansen who also finds the characterization of nineteenth-century middle class men as "indifferent" fathers as counter to what men wrote about themselves in the documents they left behind, as he argues in *Family Men: Middle-Class Fatherhood in Industrializing America* (NY: Routledge, 2001), 19; Smith-Rosenberg's article originally appeared in *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 1(1975): 1-30, but I am using it as reprinted in Linda K. Kerber and Jane Sherron De Hart eds., *Women's America* 4th ed. (NY: Oxford University Press, 1995), 168-83); recent major works on being a man in America include E. Anthony Rotundo, *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* ((NY: Basic Books, 1993), Robert L. Griswold, *Fatherhood in America: A History* (NY: Basic Books, 1993), and Stephen M. Frank, *Life With Father:Parenthood and Masculinity in the Nineteenth-Century American North* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1998); somewhat helpful is Pugh, *Sons of Liberty, the* classic work on the separate spheres ideology remains Nancy F. Cott, *The Bonds of Womanhood:*

"Woman's Sphere" in New England, 1780-1835 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977; the implications of Cott's work have been challenged on a number of levels, including its Eastern bias as a basis for understanding even western women's lives; the Rotundo quote is from E. Anthony Rotundo, "Learning About Manhood: Gender Ideals and the Middle-Class Family in Nineteenth-Century America," in J. A. Mangan and James Walvin, eds., *Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940* (NY: St. Martin's Press, 1987), 35.

[6] Smith-Rosenberg, "Female World," 172, 173.

[7] Shawn Johansen's work on middle-class family men also demonstrates the shortcomings of the separate spheres paradigm as it relates to the men's family roles; see Johansen, *Family Men*, chapter 2.

[8] Faragher, *Overland Trail*, chapters 4-6, but specifically pages 110, 89, and 97 for the quoted material; another important study influenced by Smith-Rosenberg's "separate worlds" is Mary P. Ryan, *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 4.

[9] Ibid., 159, 176, 179, 180; similar to Faragher's "reciprocity," Nancy Osterud argues that rural New York family and community relations of the same period were governed by "mutuality," in Nancy Grey Osterud, *Bonds of Community: The Lives of Farm Women in Nineteenth-Century New York* (NY: Cornell University Press, 1991).

[10] Faragher, *Overland Trail*, 147-48.

[11] Ryan, *Cradle of the Middle Class*, "Introduction" and Chapter One, (quoted material is on page 15); Carl N. Degler, *At Odds: Women and the Family in America from the Revolution to the Present* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1980), chapters 1 and 2; see also the somewhat dated Bernard Wishy, *The Child and the Republic: The Dawn of Modern American Child Nurture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968), and Stephanie Coontz, *The Social Origins of Private Life: A History of American Families 1600-1900* (London: Verso Books, 1998).

[12] Steven Mintz and Susan Kellogg, *Domestic Revolutions: A Social History of American Family Life* (New York: Free Press, 1988), chapter 3; Alexis De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (NY: Adlard and Saunders, 1838); reprint, Phillips Bradley, ed., (NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956), vol. 1: 304, vol. 2: 192-97; see also Jan

Lewis, *The Pursuit of Happiness: Family and Values in Jefferson's Virginia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983; Cott argues that, related to industrialization's spawning of separate spheres for men and women, the women's sphere ideology was a "necessary state in the process of shattering the hierarchy of sex and, more directly, in softening the hierarchical relationship of marriage." She contends that by 1830, "'different' had overwhelmed 'inferior' in usage to depict woman's place," which is to say that in this sense "separate" served to equalize; see Cott, *Bonds of Womanhood*, 197-206; the term "affectionate family" is coined in the provocative Samuel J. Watson, "Flexible Gender Roles During the Market Revolution: Family, Friendship, Marriage, and Masculinity Among U.S. Army Officers, 1815-1846," *Journal of Social History* 29 (Fall 1995): 81-106.

[13] Jabour, *Marriage in the Early Republic,* 1-7, chapters 3 and 4; the army officer is quoted in Watson, "Flexible Gender Roles," 93; Benjamin V. Beckes to Tipton, 29 March 1820, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 1, 191-91; see also Benjamin V. Beckes, 8 February 1820, Ibid., 184-85.

[14] Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 20 January 1835, Ibid., vol. 3, 109-11 (quote is on page 110); Joseph F. Kett, *Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to Present* (NY: Basic Books, 1977), 45; Matilda S. Tipton to Tipton, 3 September 1826, Matilda S. Tipton to Tipton, 26 November 1826, and Matilda S. Tipton to Tipton, 2-11 May 1827, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 1, 571, 621-22, 708-09.

[15] Ratliff Boon to Tipton, 3 July 1820, and Tipton to Lewis Cass, 3 May 1829, Ibid., 217, 531-32.

[16] William P. Thomasson to Tipton, 27 March 1826, Ibid., 524; along with being upbraided about his violation of the friendship norm, Tipton reproached himself on gossiping about another's "faults and follies," in Tipton to James Barbour, 24 February 1827, Ibid., 661-64.

[17] quotes from Tipton's correspondence are listed in the order they are quoted. Benjamin V. Beckes to Tipton, 8 February 1820, Ibid, 184-85; Elias Murray to Tipton, 25 September 1830, and Elias Murray to Tipton, 9 October 1830 are in Ibid., vol. 2, 346-48, 353-54; an example of Tipton choosing to stay behind to watch over a fevered son is found in Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 17 August 1837, Ibid., vol. 3, 427; Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 29 June 1832 and Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 20 December 1832, Ibid., vol. 2, 643-44, 754-55; surprisingly, the term "father's care" and the implications of an emotionally involved father appear scattered in nineteenth-

century sources and is discussed in Frank, *Life With Father*, 1-8; the tension between public office, or public duty, and family obligations is illustrated in detail in Jabour, *Marriage in the Early Republic*, chapters 3 and 4.

[18] see Jack E. Eblen, "An Analysis of Nineteenth-Century Frontier Populations," *Demography* 2 (1965): 399-413 (quote is on page 413); Ryan, *Cradle of the Middle Class,* chapter 1.

[19] Ibid., chapter 1 (quote is on page 51).

[20] Samuel G. Mitchell to Tipton, 28 May 1832, Thomas B. Brown to Tipton, 30 May 1832, and David H. Colerick to Tipton, 16 June 1832, *Tipton Papers,* vol. 2, 615-16, 616-17, 628-29 respectively.

[21] Tipton to His Constituents, 19 June 1832 and Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 1 July 1832, Ibid., 632-36, 645; see also Tipton to Hyacinthe Lasselle, Sr., 6 July 1832, Tipton to Lemuel Ford, 5 August 1832, Tipton to Winfield Scott, 6 August 1832, and Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 11 August 1832, Ibid., 653, 674-75, 675-76, and 684 respectively; for more on the Black Hawk War, see the excellent R. Douglas Hurt, *The Indian Frontier, 1763-1846* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002), chapter 7. Interestingly, Tipton was just shy of his 46th birthday when he stated his intention to serve as a soldier in the Black Hawk campaign if needed.

[22] Samuel Milroy to Tipton, 18 July 1832, David Burr to Tipton, 26 July 1832, John B. Duret to Tipton, 22 August 1832, Howard Stansbury to Tipton, 8 August 1832, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 2, 661-62, 663-64, 687-88, 680-81 respectively; a very readable study of cholera in the U.S. is Charles E. Rosenberg, *The Cholera Years: The United States in 1832, 1849, and 1866* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), chapters 1-5.

[23] Johnston Lykins to Tipton, 15 September 1832, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 8 August 1832, and Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 18 August 1832, Ibid, 710-711, 821, and 822; see also Edward A. Hannegan to Tipton, 26 July 1832, David Burr to Tipton, 7 August 1832, and Elijah to Tipton, 22 December 1833, Ibid., 664-65, 676, and 862-63.

[24] Watson, "Flexible Gender Roles," 81, 96-97.

[25] Ibid., 97-97; William Cooper Howells, *Recollections of Life in Ohio, From 1813 to 1840* (Cincinnati: Robert Clarke Co., 1895), 156-57; Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 12 March 1834, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 35; other examples of the prevalence of flexible gender roles among rural early Midwesterners are found in the forthcoming Ginette Aley, "Grist, Grit, and Rural Society in the Early Midwest: Insight Gleaned From Grain," *Ohio Valley History* ? (Summer 2005).

[26] Watson, "Flexible Gender Roles," 95; Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 24 April 1832, and Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 3 July 1832, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 2, 590, 647; see also James Barnett, Tipton, et al: Subscription, School Building, 18 May 1825, Ibid., vol. 1, 461-62.

[27] Tipton: Cash Account, Trip into Kentucky, 31 January to 6 February 1824, Tipton: Memorandum of Daughter's Expenses, 2 February 1824 to 5 January 1825, Tipton to Lewis Cass, 3 April 1825, Matilda S. Tipton to Tipton, 22 August 1826, and Tipton to Lewis Cass 27 November 1826, Ibid, vol. 1, 337-39, 452, 570, 570n, and 622-23; Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 17 December 1834, Ibid., vol. 3, 93-94 (emphasis in original); Linda K. Kerber, *Women of the Republic: Intellect & Ideology in Revolutionary America* (Williamsburg: Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1980), chapter 7; Tipton's relinquishing of Spear's academic education to a schoolmaster or tutor is evident in Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 13 January 1830 and Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 2 February 1832, Ibid., vol. 2, 241, 518.

[28] Matilda S. Tipton to Tipton, 22 August 1826, Matilda S. Tipton to Tipton, 3 September 1826, Matilda S. Tipton to Tipton, 12 October 1826, Matilda S. Tipton to Tipton, 26 November 1826, Matilda S. Tipton to Tipton, 2-11 May 1827, and John Davis to Tipton, 14 June 1827, in *Tipton Papers*, vol. 1, 570, 571, 595, 621-22, 708-09, and 729 respectively; see also Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 10 February 1837, ibid., vol. 3, 364; during Tipton's 2 marriages, at least 3 of his children died in infancy, as noted in the genealogy in Ibid., vol. 1, xvii.

[29] Tipton to Spear S. and Sarah Ann Tipton, 20 February 1834, Tipton to Sarah Ann Tipton, 21 March 1834, Tipton to Sarah Ann Tipton, 26 March 1834, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 12 April 1834, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 7 June 1834, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 3 February 1835, and Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 18 December 1835, Ibid., vol. 3, 26-27, 39-40, 44-45, 48-49, 60, 121, and 190 respectively.

[30] Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 9 July 1832, Ibid., vol. 2, 653-54.

[31] Richard M. Johnson to Tipton, 3 May 1826 and Richard M. Johnson to Tipton, 8 September 1826, Ibid., vol. 1, 529-30 (see especially footnote 22 at the bottom of page 530 for details about the Choctaw Academy and its founding), 571-72n, 573; child members of the Creek nation were educated at the Academy as well; the last quote is taken from Richard M. Johnson to Tipton, 1 February 1827, Ibid., 647-48.

[32] William Lee to Tipton, 17 May 1823, Tipton to John C. Calhoun, 30 August 1823, and Tipton to Isaac McCoy, 14 June 1826, in Ibid., 307-08n, 315, 541-42; for more on appropriations for Indian education, see "An Act of March 3, 1819," *U.S. Statutes at Large*, 3: 516-17, and *American State Papers*. Indian Affairs, 2: 368, 370, 443; a good overview of the topic is Jon Reyhner and Jeanne Eder, *American Indian Education: A History* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004).

[33] Potawatomi Chiefs: Request Concerning Disposition of Education Fund, 16 October 1826, Richard M. Johnson to Tipton, 12 January 1827, Richard M. Johnson to Tipton, 23 January 1827, Thomas L. McKenney to Tipton, 27 January 1827, Richard M. Johnson to Tipton, 1 February 1827, Richard M. Johnson to Tipton, 26 February 1827, Tipton to Isaac McCoy, 3 March 1827, Potawatomi Chiefs: Agreement Concerning Choctaw Academy, 4 May 1827, and Richard M. Johnson to Tipton, 22 September 1827, Ibid., 596, 638n-39, 642-43, 646-47, 647-48, 665-666, 679, 709-710, and 785-86 respectively.

[34] Tipton to Isaac McCoy, 20 December 1826, Tipton to Thomas L. McKenney, 24 February 1827, and Tipton to McCoy, 31 August 1827, Ibid., 630-31n, 664, 778.

[35] Thomas L. McKenney to Tipton, 27 January 1827, Potawatomi Chiefs: Agreement Concerning Choctaw Academy, 4 May 1827, Tipton to Thomas L. McKenney, 5 May 1827, Tipton to Lewis Cass, 15 May 1827, and Sarah Spencer to Matilda S. Tipton, 16 May 1827, Ibid., 646-47, 709-10, 711, 715-16, and 717; during this trip to the Choctaw Academy, Tipton placed 11 boys at the Academy: 7 Potawatomi boys from the Agency, one who preceded them there, and 3 who joined them at a stop in Cincinnati.

[36] Tipton to James Barbour, 2 June 1827, Ibid., 719-21.

[37] Ibid., 721; Tipton to Isaac McCoy, 2 March 1828, Ibid., vol. 2, 24.

[38] Tipton to Students, Choctaw Academy, 26 September 1827, Ibid., vol. 1, 788-89n; a group of the students answered Tipton's letter several weeks letter.

[39] Mintz and Kellogg, *Domestic Revolutions*, 53-55; Ryan, *Cradle of the Middle Class*, chapter 4; Johansen, *Family Men*, chapters 1, 2, 4, and 5.

[40] Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 13 January 1830, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 17 January 1831, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 29 January 1832, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 2, 241, 388, 518.

[41] Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 24 April 1832, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 7 May 1832, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 3 July 1832, Ibid., 590, 598, 647 (emphasis in original).

[42] Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 8 January 1833, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 23 January 1833, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 24 January 1833, Ibid., 767, 785-86, 789-90; Tipton repeats to Spear that the latter needs nothing "but one suit and 1 doz. books" in Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 5 February 1833, Ibid., 799-800.

[43] Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 21 August 1833, Ibid., 822; Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 1 February 1834, Tipton to Spear S. and Sarah Ann Tipton, 28 February 1834, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 17 December 1834, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 20 January 1835, Ibid., vol. 3, 17-18, 31, 93-94, 109-11 (quote is on page 110).

[44] Tipton to Spear S. and Sarah Ann Tipton, 28 February 1834, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 27 March 1834, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 29 March 1834, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 28 November 1834, Ibid., 31 (emphasis in original), 45, 46, 84.

[45] Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 20 January 1835, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 19 April 1836, Ibid., 109-11, 261-62; see also Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 17 December 1835, Ibid., 190.

[46] Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 30 November 1835, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 16 December 1835, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 18 December 1835, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 13 January 1836, Tipton to Spear, 8 March 1836, Tipton: Advertisement of Sale of Lots in Lagro, 15 April 1836, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 19 April 1836, Ibid., 182, 189, 190, 205-06, 237, 258-59, 261-62.

[47] Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 21 January 1836, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 10 March 1836, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton 19 April 1836, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 29 January 1837, Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 17 August 1837, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 18 August 1837, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 25 January 1838, and Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 23 December 1838, Ibid., 212, 237-38, 262-63, 355-56, 427-28, 515, and 784-85 respectively.

[48] (citations listed in the order that they were referenced) Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 4 April 1836, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 9 December 1838, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 25 December 1838, Ibid., 255, 778-79, 787.

[49] (citations listed in the order that they were referenced) Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 5 June 1837, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 19 April 1836, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 4 April 1836, Ibid., 408, 262-63, 254-55; in Latin, the phrase "vi et armis" roughly translates to an implication of a forceful or violent, if not armed, confrontation.

[50] John Lauritz Larson, *Internal Improvement: National Public Works and the Promise of Popular Government in the Early United States* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 207; Paul Wallace Gates, "Introduction," *Tipton Papers*, vol. 1, 4; Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 21 January 1836, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 4 April 1836, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 14 April 1836, Ibid., 212, 254-55 (emphasis in original), 257; Lee Clark Mitchell, *Witnesses to a Vanishing America: The Nineteenth-Century Response* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 6.

[51] Tipton to Moses Barclay, 4 June 1834, Tipton to Moses Barclay, 27 December 1835, Tipton to Moses Barclay, 16 January 1837, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 57-58, 195, 344.

[52] Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 29 March 1838, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 10 July 1838, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 23 November 1838, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 30 December 1838, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 31 December 1838, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 2 January 1839, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 16 January 1839, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 19 January 1839, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 29 January 1839, Tipton to Oliver H. Smith, 15 February 1839, Ibid., 579, 654, 769, 788-89, 791, 800, 806, 810-11.

CHAPTER SIX

"We Who Live on the Upper Wabash:" the Politics of Improvement in the Western Country, 1831-1839

"The Jackson men will be taught by fatal Experience, who the strong man is, and will seek him on the upper Wabash." --James T. Pollock to Tipton, 22 October 1831[1]

"...but let us have a Jackson senator...if occasion requires it dont be too reluctant." --John Carr to Tipton, 1 November 1831[2]

"Hurrah & Huzza for internal improvement!!!! --G. W. Johnston to Tipton, 8 April 1832[3]

"It is [proba]ble," John Tipton wrote to an acquaintance in October of 1831, "that my friends will nominate me for the U S Senate this winter[.] I would have preferd remaining as I am but will yeald if it is thought best and I thought it my duty to apprise you—would like to know your opinion[.]" As he had done throughout his public career, Tipton freely and frankly sought out the opinions of friends and acquaintances as he contemplated a political landscape that was fraught with contradictions. A year earlier he had remarked to his friend Calvin Fletcher that in the upper Wabash River country, "every day brings news of moovements political. [E]verything is *doubt* and *uncertainty.*" One matter that kept surfacing was whether Tipton would or should entertain a notion to present himself as a candidate for the Senate seat left vacant in February of 1831 by the death of James Noble. In this he appeared to appreciate the gravity of such a position, especially in comparison to his rather frustrated role as federal Indian Agent. Tipton inquired of Fletcher "if it would not be *better* for *my friends* not to have me *named*, for sir believe me that I am not anxious to be in [the] Senate. [T]o resign this Agency *next year and retire will give peace* and suit *me* better, much *better* I have no *doubt.*" Several months and much vacillating later he reiterated the

belief that he could "do more good for the State as Indian Agent for two years than in any other station."[4]

Yet Tipton would not sit this political opportunity out despite his outward reluctance. His mixed feelings reveal the multiple complexities surrounding Jacksonian era politics in the West, a region where the ardent pursuit of federal support for much-needed internal improvements frequently trumped the national democratic limited-government agenda, causing a confusion of party lines and loyalty that persisted after Jackson left office. Tipton embodied the West's Jacksonian dilemma: a near reverence for Andrew Jackson, the Hero of New Orleans ("the old Hero") and fellow military man that conflicted with an unrelenting commitment to building the infrastructure needed for regional development and prosperity. In northern Indiana (the "northern country") and elsewhere in the West, many believed as Tipton did that this development and prosperity hinged upon the building of roads, canals and improved waterways and harbors as much as it did in encouraging productive agriculture. Farm produce could not be effectively marketed, if at all, without this network. Nor would prospective settlers be inclined to migrate. The opening of New York's immediately profitable Erie Canal in 1825 fed the optimism of the internal improvement movement and ambitious westerners with seeming proof that fortunes could be made in the West by industrious farm people and through the support of staunch political advocates like John Tipton.[5]

Vocal support of the internal improvement interests who fought to ultimately link Indiana's Wabash River to the Erie Canal would rise to crescendo-level throughout the 1830s, a louder, more passionate, and influential force than is generally recognized by scholars. This was not just an Indiana issue. It was a complex regional movement that

linked productive agriculture, internal improvements, and the dispossession of Indian lands into a commercial nexus, in a way that reveals another layer of motivation for local support of Indian Removal—that of building a commercial agricultural empire in the West. In the Jacksonian era West, the achievement of these ends at times coincided and at other times conflicted with the larger objectives of developing Jacksonian party politics. But Jackson-man Tipton would cling to the support of the people of the Wabash country whose interests matched his own even as they differed with that of the Chief Magistrate. "GO AHEAD," his supporters would cheer in 1835. Standing up for internal improvements represented "the true doctrine of the West" and what one person called the "ton of the day." This chapter disputes the notion that to any significant degree early Midwestern settlers harbored "deep ambivalence" toward the market, a contention that is yet found in the recent work of prominent regional scholars.[6]

As he considered his political options in 1831, then, and the desires of friends and prospective constituents, he weighed the consequences carefully. To William G. Ewing he repeated that he would not be a candidate. "[A] seat in the senate should not be declined when fairly presented," Tipton reasoned; "but if it is only to be obtained at the loss of the [W]abash canal let us take the *canal* and [risk] the other." He added that vanity did not compel him to pursue his "slender claims" on the candidacy. The objects he deemed of greater consequence, upon which he would keep a steady eye, were the roads, the canal, and the extinguishing of Indian title related to these projects.[7]

Tipton engendered some public criticism from those who initially viewed his independence as a weakness—and the cause of some lost votes and party strength in the Fall elections. In the 17 September 1831 Vincennes *Western Sun* he responded forcefully to the

editor about accusations that he had "deserted" his party, pointing out that "Desertion is a serious charge against an old soldier." He denied ever chaining himself to "the car of any party." To the editor of the Madison *Herald* Tipton expressed contempt at the implication that people's votes in this matter should come under the scrutiny of a public journal in the first place. More troubling than this to him was the apparent inability of both his enemies and political allies to recognize that while the results of recent local elections did not yield Jackson men, for which he was blamed, the outcome did not diminish the strength of "Jacksonianism." Tipton claimed that when the time came to re-elect the man westerners called General Jackson, Cass county people would do so. "[B]ut," he continued, "the completion of the Michigan road, and the commencement of the Wabash canal are questions of more immediate interest to them, than that of who shall or shall not be Governor or go to Congress." Indeed this fixation on local issues, "measures not men" as he frequently alluded to it, remained dominant and would characterize western politics throughout the 1830s, as the settlers and their advocates refused to give ground on such topics as internal improvements. From Indianapolis in 1835 Nathan Palmer informed Tipton that "Local questions" consumed "all attention & interest—The most exciting & important of which was the subject of internal improvements." "Local politics," on the other hand, were "entirely passive."[8]

Whatever stigma he bore over his independence was light although it would politically mark him and later cause some disaffection with him. If anything, the Fall 1831 elections would demonstrate Tipton's strength of commitment and his willingness to prioritize the broader interests of Indiana. His overt independence was repeatedly noted. One correspondent was confident that "We shall not be disappointed in looking to you for *independent* action, regardless of partyism." Others who knew him never doubted his core

"Jacksonism." James T. Polluck wrote: "The Jackson men will be taught by fatal Experience, who the strong man is, and will seek him on the upper Wabash." By November Tipton emerged as one of the three leading Jackson candidates for the vacant senate seat, along with Jonathan Jennings and Samuel Judah. Party policy dictated backing the candidate best able to unite Jackson men, the one who would also be the most likely to attract the greatest number of Henry Clay votes; according to one correspondent, this last was crucial.[9]

Indiana's Jackson men convened in Indianapolis in early December, with about one hundred and fifty "harmonious" delegates in attendance. Samuel Milroy described it as "the most interesting assemblage, of the kind, that was ever held in the State, perhaps in the west." He was struck by the prevalence of the region's agricultural pioneers, a group with whom Tipton could relate. The convention, Milroy reported, "was composed, *Not* of Lawyers; &c, but it was composed, of the *Gray Headed* Fathers of the land, the substantial yeemanry—of the country, askeing, nor seekeing nothing, from the Goverment, but that protection that is guaranteed to them by the constitution of the U.S." In the balloting that followed in the General Assembly, Tipton received one vote to Judah's 36 votes in the first round. Six ballots later, however, Tipton had garnered an impressive reversal of 55 votes to Judah's three and was the clear party choice. On 11 December Tipton informed an associate that "Contrary to my expectation" he had been elected to the Senate. He was greeted by many who, like this correspondent, reminded him that he was foremost "a Wabash man" whose "election [w]as auspicious to the best interests of the west." Tipton accepted the seat and tendered his resignation as federal Indian Agent to the President effective 31 December 1831.[10]

By accepting the senate seat in 1831, forty-five year old Tipton was reaching toward the pinnacle of a public career that stretched back even further than Indiana's statehood in 1816, to an 1812 appointment as deputy sheriff in Harrison County. In a number of important ways Tipton had matured with Indiana and the western country. He was not only a keen observer and recorder of the transformative changes that overwhelmed both the native peoples and the native habitat, he very often engaged in them. Now he would direct them from Washington. What follows is less a history of Tipton's legislative career than an exploration of how he negotiated the inherent contradictions of Jacksonian era politics in the developing West, as one with independent though vested leanings, until he left public office in 1839. This political independence was significant because without it the region's interests and needs would have been drowned out by Jacksonian "partyism" and its adherence to limited-government principles. In this Tipton serves as a barometer of the political tensions in the developing West while his correspondence provides ample clues as to how westerners viewed themselves in relation to the rest of the United States.

Unlike his stand on internal improvement, Tipton was in step with the Jacksonian discourse of supporting "speedy" Indian Removal. However, westerners tended to see these movements as connected, not separate, given the location of some routes (canal, road, or otherwise) through Indian-owned lands. This reality embodied the most tragic of the inherent contradictions of westward expansion: that gains made in regional development came at the cost of an almost unfathomable loss in national integrity and cultural vitality in the aggressive dispossession and displacement of the native peoples from the region. Jacksonian era Indian Removal was complex in and of itself, and it would be overly simplistic to contend that Euro-Americans favored Indian removal solely because of their

greed and racial prejudice, although elements of both can easily be found in the documentary sources. Competing economic designs, land-use patterns, and cultural ideologies comprised forces that were also in play here. Tipton's particular role in Indian-White relations and his relationship with the development of Indiana and the West give us a unique perspective from which to analyze these tensions. What becomes evident is that the ideology of "improvement," as applied freely to the issues of the day, was utilized as a pragmatic rationalization for working out the details of westward expansion.[11]

Tipton's correspondence during this period reveals that Jackson men in the West articulated an identity crisis. Confusion and frustration arose over the tension between supporting national party politics, such as it was, and ensuring that the region's needs were not ignored. A Vigo County friend, William Linton, characterized the political times as "selfish," and that the measures of both the federal government and Jackson himself were "at variance with our interests" as they related to internal improvements and the U.S. Bank. "I could not, nor cannot," he continued, "but wish some of our notions more in unison with our interests in the Presidency." But he and like-minded others were comfortable with Tipton's representation of their interests: "of your opinions on these subjects, I know enough to be satisfied that they differ with the Adm[inistration] and that your independance will lead you to a course consistent with our wants." Pursuing a course consistent with the interests of constituents, who were hard at work building a profitable agricultural commercial empire and beginning to promote the development of a manufacturing sector, was what often put Jackson men in the West at odds with their namesake. As Robert Bell instructed Tipton, he must now adhere to the political "doctrin" whereby a representative must know "the will of his constituants." "Go on and attend to our affairs," urged Linton, "and you have nothing to

fear." Tipton was about to acquire an intense education as to the exact nature of those affairs.[12]

Almost immediately following the pronouncement that he had been elected to the Senate, Tipton was welcomed to the world of high-stakes politics, special interests, and friends seeking favors and appointments by a stream of letters proffering advice and information. Some acquaintances appeared to merely want to secure a future favor such as Lucius Scott who played upon Tipton's sincere "friendly feelings," saying that he might one day have occasion to tax his generosity "for the benefit of our common community, or in aid of the wishes of some particular friend." Some, like John Davis, were more direct in stating that "I know you have the power under existing circumstances to serve me in this matter and I am confident you will do so."[13]

Tipton heard, though not for the first time, that the state and advancement of internal improvements and transportation technologies were foremost in his constituents' minds. From these letters we discern that even sub-standard roads were something to be hoped for. William Polke of Plymouth relayed the following to Tipton: "When the Improvements of this year are Completed we shall have a good road such as a stage can pass in any new country among stumps." William Linton reported that because workers on the Indiana portion of the Cumberland Road, otherwise known as the National Road, could not get provisions, they were going to have to relocate to the Illinois line and work eastward. The scarcity of provisions i.e. corn and wheat stemmed from the very problem that Indianans hoped would be ameliorated with road- and canal-building, that is, access to markets. According to one Bloomington resident, the situation had become so dire that "many persons must go without bread." The National Road along with state roads were particularly important to those who

either chose to farm or speculate in land situated nearby. Talk of re-routing them provoked anxiety and frustration, and Tipton received numerous such letters seeking his assistance. The National Road was one project that the President fiscally supported, but only until it was completed and could then be turned over to the states to maintain. In the meantime, Tipton would have to act quickly to include the cost of building a bridge across the Wabash in the federal appropriations. Ultimately the measure would afford residents not only cheaper supplies and improved commerce, but also a better U.S. mail route, "an object [desirable] much beyond the Expense."[14]

The procuring of mail routes was an urgent matter to many of Tipton's constituents. Some wrote seeking support for an existing contract, such as Samuel Emison who wanted to continue carrying the U.S. mail in a four-horse coach from Evansville to Lafayette. He proposed an additional route from Terre Haute to Lafayette, twice a week, for an annual salary of two thousand dollars. In thanking Tipton for a postmaster's appointment, one acquaintance from "the Wilderness" of northern Indiana remarked that "but for this recommendation we might remain almost destitute of intercourse with society." Others forwarded citizens' petitions to have new mail routes established. "[W]e labour under so many disadvantages for the want of these routes...," Lathrop Taylor of South Bend complained, "it now takes much longer for mails to come from Indianapolis than it does from Washington, and from Detroit about the same time." Additionally, Tipton was notified when the current route was no longer able to accommodate settlers. In 1836 Jordan Vigus of Logansport complained "the Mail is so increased in waight that it cannot be carrid on horse back" which led to the construction of a box with wheels pulled by two horses, run between there and Indianapolis. Occasionally the mail carriers were actually boys paid by the

contractors. Just as good roads and bridges were essential to the development of commerce, so, too, was an efficient mail route, according to Isaac Elston. Indeed roads, bridges, and mail routes went hand-in-hand, and the latter could not happen without the former. He wanted Tipton to get a mail route from Lafayette to Michigan City on Lake Michigan in anticipation of a considerable amount of salt and other merchandise that would be landed there the following summer. A viable mail route was imperative, Elston asserted, "to give us notice[e] of their arrival." In order for westerners to participate in the growing market economy, they would have to devote a great deal of their energies toward building a complex infrastructure to accommodate it, which was something that differentiated them from their eastern counterparts.[15]

New technological developments in transportation—steamboats and railroads—captured the imaginations of some of Tipton's constituents who saw exciting possibilities in the way that they could be adapted for commerce and more. As early as 1828 Tipton's correspondents remarked on the increasingly frequent appearances of steamboats on major water thoroughfares, and they used this new fact of life to broaden support for the improvement of rivers like the Wabash. Along with this, after his election Tipton was alerted by Samuel Milroy that the "Rail Road favour, appears to be giting up" in terms of interest in Indianapolis. Israel Canby of Crawfordsville told Tipton that a group of supporters had filed an application with a private company about constructing a line from the Wabash to Michigan City. Given the longer standing commitment to the canal-building movement, however, Canby noted that their enthusiasm was tempered by political and economic realities: "We are full of rail roads here and have had a rail road meeting where it was wisely determined to be premature to do anything." So far, the canal men were holding their own.

At this time and place canals and roads, especially the Michigan Road, were fundamentally important to local settlers and advocates of regional development. Tipton was well-informed about them due to his long-term, active, and self-interested promotion of them. And as has been noted in previous chapters, he was no stranger to fending off criticisms by contemporaries who challenged his and others' practices and motivations.[16]

Three-and-a-half years prior to his senatorial election and soon after his successful relocation of the Fort Wayne Indian Agency to the Miami Reserve laying opposite the mouth of the Eel River in 1828, Tipton published an editorial in the Indianapolis *Indiana Journal* that responded to allegations that he and the new "infant" settlement were exercising improper influence in the determination of the Michigan Road and canal routes to their advantage. "We who live on the upper Wabash," Tipton observed, were aware of and regretted a certain disposition against their ambitions. "No new county—no representation—not even a road, nor any thing of a public nature," he pointed out, "can be allowed us without the strictest scrutiny; and I must be allowed to say, [the] appearance of jealousy." Tipton affirmed to the readers that he had neither heard nor did he believe that "an effort will be made to influence the commissioners to locate the [Michigan] road, or end the [Wabash and Erie] Canal" at their Eel River settlement. Moreover, he contended, that kind of effort would be unnecessary because the "natural advantages of their country and its position" would "*give* them the road and the Canal." In other words, Tipton believed that judicious pragmatism not political pressure would cause theirs to be a "chosen" site, and he rationalized the Eel River settlement route with all the detail of someone who had carefully, as opposed to surreptitiously, studied the situation. Yet not everyone saw it the way that Tipton did. "Many persons" contested the route of the northern portion of the road that

began at Indianapolis and would end at his settlement and discouraged prospective contract bidders with depictions of the land as swampy and going through Indian country. The Michigan Road was plagued by controversy even as of Tipton's senatorial election, when a correspondent referred to it as "one of the political Torments of the Land."[17]

Although he had worried that his election would cost northern Indiana essential canal votes, the Wabash and Erie Canal Bill passed "triumphantly" as he took office. Considering the political wrangling and the promise of railroad technology, feelings were mixed about the bill. Henry Hoover confessed to Tipton, "I wish I may be deceived in my opinion on this project." Yet internal improvements still portended prosperity to westerners who believed in their hearts that better times would follow the lean years of pioneering if they could only conquer the lack of market access. Then they could capitalize on the region's agricultural fertility. Tipton heard from Andrew Waymire of Logansport that "Grain and provisions is Scerse but the Spirits of the people is up on account of the Canall bill passing." Austin Morris reported that "all sorts of doings" took place in Indianapolis the night the bill passed including "illuminating, firing of guns, the cannon and every thing else down to Indian crackers." Celebrants drank wine, made music, and paraded in the streets until ending up at the Governor's house where, under the weight of so many people inside, the floor caved in. Nobody was seriously hurt, but Morris was certain that Tipton's new Washington friends would have reacted by "reading the riot act, or calling out the Militia."[18]

Tipton's long and active public career, along with his intuitive, if unpolished, political acumen prepared him well for his new role as Senator. His love affair with books and knowledge fostered an outlook of being not a master of politics, but a student. A few weeks after arriving in Washington, Tipton confided his first impressions about the job to his friend

Calvin Fletcher. He wrote: "There is some things to learn, some to unlearn and some that one would fain forget, but we must take the world as it is." Regardless of his professed humility, Tipton aspired to look the part of a senator. He assembled a new wardrobe that included a blue and black coat (at $27 and $30 respectively), coordinating pantaloons (at $11 each), waistcoats of black cloth and English silk (at $4 and $5.50 respectively), a goat hair cloak (at $29), suspenders (at $1.25), an Italian Lutestring handkerchief (at $2), and a silk umbrella (at $5.50). His new "City" life, of which he initially appeared to readily adapt to, sharply contrasted with his earlier rugged frontier activities, and this surprised some who knew him. Joshua Shields commented that Tipton was now "leading a life so different from the one which you have heretofore [led]." He and his wife had always held the opinion "that a sedentary life could never agree with you," but that he was "happy to see the reverse" was true.[19]

However by February of 1832, his second month, Tipton was already writing that he had grown "tiard of this City." He missed his home, his family, and the West—the three most important influences and sources of support in his life, as previously demonstrated. Washington and everything associated with it were poor substitutes. "[A]ny man here who cares for home," he concluded to a friend, "is an exile." It seemed to him that what passed for republicanism among the leaders was really "deceit[,] folly[,] foppery[,] and missery," and embodied neither patriotism nor "love of Country." He charged that there was "more *real love* of *Country* in our western wilds than in some here," and professed that he "prefer[red] the western roads" to being in Washington. By now Tipton had become accustomed to dealing with the litany of complaints and accusations as well as the duplicities that seemed to accompany public appointees, but he was nonetheless discouraged. A friend

reminded him to stand firm: "You have not endured the *hardships* of a Tippecanoe Campaign; and stood amongst the foremost of our pioneers, now to be *diverted* from your course by a few mushroom politicians and envious bloodsuckers."[20]

A good portion of the political conflicts and stress that Tipton began encountering almost as soon as he arrived in Washington had to do with a quality that was esteemed by his constituents but disdained by some of his fellow Jackson men—his independence. Here, Tipton's correspondence with his friend and fellow Indiana colleague Calvin Fletcher is insightful not only regarding his own political maturation but also about Jacksonian era politics in the West. Tipton called himself a Jackson man, and he was an open admirer of "Genl Jackson." But he consciously worked to avoid being called a party man because to do so would imply obligation as well as standing for measures that might not profit his constituents. In mid-January he wrote to Fletcher that he regretted that anyone would claim that his election was a party victory. "*I never considered it so,*" he stated, "and I authorize you to deny it in any way that you deem best."[21]

Tipton shared party interests in some respects yet not in all. He viewed himself as more liberal in his policies than Jackson. He favored the Tariff "*modified*" and the Bank "*restricted,*" while he strongly opposed office removals on party grounds, "*unless on well founded charges*." Most importantly, he deviated from the Administration in being a strong and vocal proponent of internal improvements in the West. This contradiction in Jacksonian politics was generally understood as such and exemplified by another friend, Elias Murray, who wrote: "We know you & expect you to remain the friend of Gen. Jackson but not the devotee of measures inconsistent with the prosperity of your Country." Tipton was keenly aware that his independence was costing him some political currency in Washington. Not

unexpectedly, later in the year when talk about Tipton's chances for re-election to a full term swirled, a friendly source told the senator that Jackson's friends were endeavoring to elect "a more *thorough going* (as they termed it) Jackson man, than yourself." Undeterred, Tipton urged Fletcher in response to "let us look to the people who fell the trees and hold the plow[,] not to aspirants" for political direction.[22]

Along these lines, this attitude dominated the political instruction that Tipton gave to his son Spear, who had an eye on public office in the 1830s. He repeatedly admonished him that if elected he must be mindful of his duty to "*obey your constituents*" and to forgo urging his own claims. A public life also required discretion and a bit of secrecy, and Tipton advised his son to never disclose his political ambitions to anyone. "[T]his lets others into a knowledge of what you want," he said, "and they can thereby defeet you." Self-interestedness was ubiquitous and perhaps endemic to Jacksonian era politics in the West where the needs were many in a developing country. Tipton cautioned Spear to be on his guard because "few men are to be trusted where self can be thrown in the way." To his son, friends, and constituents Tipton was apparently known for his motto: "still go for your country."[23]

In his politics, Tipton was nothing if not a westerner, and he asserted his independence from party-line votes as if it were a mandate from his constituents, as some believed it to be. He came to realize that what they noted as his devotion to the progress and prosperity "of our country" worked to sustain their loyalty. This was especially notable when Jackson appeared to turn his back on westerners in 1832 and then again 1834 by refusing to sign internal improvement bills which included provisions for improving Chicago's harbor and Wabash River navigation. Old Hickory's 1832 veto, wrote Isaac

Elston of Crawfordsville, was "a hard pill for us," as it was for a number of Tipton's correspondents. Rumors circulated that Tipton had "abandoned" Jackson afterwards, and detractors used this as proof that the party could not support his re-election. In either case, he had not abandoned Jackson, although, as was his nature, he firmly stated his grievance with the President's decisions. Tipton would later tell his constituents in a circular not to despair of the ultimate success of "our laudable undertakings to improve our country." But in forceful language that was criticized by the Washington *Globe* for its undisguised disapproval of the Chief Magistrate, he argued that "the opposition of no one individual, however elevated he may be, can long resist the will of the freemen of the West, when expressed through the ballot boxes." In December of 1834, Tipton would make another passionate yet reasoned appeal (that ultimately failed) for congressional support of an appropriation to improve navigation on the Wabash, and detail why he believed that Jackson's stance was really "a mistaken apprehension of the facts." He was clobbered again by the *Globe.*[24]

Locally, some tried to distance Tipton from Jackson by making a distinction between "whole hog" Jackson men and "Tiptonites." Again, however, Tipton's independence would work to his advantage in and out of his district. Jacob Walker of Lafayette assured Tipton that sentiments among Jackson men there favored a man of the party "provided he was friendly to [W]abash interests" as he was, for the upcoming senate election. Similarly, Tipton had the support of fellow western colleagues like Ohio Senator Thomas Ewing who had regarded Jackson's veto of the 1832 internal improvement bill with great disappointment. He wondered aloud to Tipton if this did not in effect "take away all that we in the West have ever contended for, & struggled for" in building up the country. "[R]eally,"

he continued, "it seems to me you cannot sustain the Hero unless you give these up." Tipton would freely lay this dilemma at the feet of his constituents in his circulars, warning them that anyone with an interest in the growth and prosperity of the West should be mindful of those to whom they give their political allegiance.[25]

Senator Ewing's remarks typified westerners' deeply rooted sense of entitlement, that on some significant level the government owed them a just compensation for their contributions to national expansion in terms of labor, agricultural productivity, and numerous personal sacrifices. The debt could really only be satisfied with federal appropriations for internal improvements which, they argued, would benefit all involved—except of course the Native Americans. Tipton's friend Calvin Fletcher captured this increasingly popular sentiment of the 1830s when he insisted that "Congress can well afford to be libral to us—our energy & enterprise has brought all her waist territory into market [and] furnished her soldiers & revenue." The public recounting of the privations and sacrifices endured and made by the settlers served as reminders of not only what westerners had done for themselves, but also what they were achieving for the national economy. Tipton's emerging legislative agenda would reflect this perspective of entitlement as seen, for example, in his revival of the pre-emption law of 1830 and in his later failed attempt to push through an amendment on the sale of public lands that would have resulted in the graduated valuation of land relative to the length of time it had remained unsold in the market.[26]

Clearly, though, despite the political sparring, Tipton was still northern Indiana's man in the 1832 election; this time, however, the victory would be harder won than the first. Two weeks before the election Tipton came to terms with what the impending results would indicate to him, his supporters, and party politics. He believed that his victory would signify

"a tryumph of principle over *party* and plots," and his defeat "the victory of party over liberallity and Justice." The election process in the General Assembly began on 8 December 1832 but was carried over several days because of the need for excessive balloting. It was described variously as "disagreeable," "notorious," and as containing "intrigue of all sorts here and much of it." One attendee wrote: "I never witness[ed] such combinations to put one [man] down before in my whole life." Calvin Fletcher reported that "unprincpelled Jacksonism spent all its force upon you." Nineteen ballots and much "electioneering" later, however, Tipton emerged victorious. Afterwards he reflected that the events affirmed that his like-minded friends carried the day, not the party; "to *party* I owe nothing," he told Fletcher. He would come out against party more publicly the following Fall with the approach of the presidential election. Under the pseudonym of "A Voter," Tipton authored a series of articles that appeared in the Indianapolis *Indiana Journal* in which he gave an account of the evolution of party politics and cautioned Indianans not to blindly embark on this road and prematurely commit their votes in the current call for a state convention and the appointment of delegates. "Can it be the public weal," he questioned, "or is it some intrigue to throw dust in the eyes of the honest yeomanry, and by a caucus resolve to pledge the party vote and transfer Gen. Jackson's popularity to some other candidate for the Presidency?"[27]

Senator Tipton may have been at odds with party politics, but he nonetheless stood with the President, sometimes literally, on certain grave national issues. By early 1833, the chief of these was the Nullification Crisis and South Carolina's belligerence, as it was widely comprehended. Jackson factionalism suddenly faded to the background in the face of calls for unity. Tipton's northern colleagues considered the crisis a serious threat to the Union. "*Resist nullification unto blood, if necessary to save the Union,*" urged one of Tipton's

correspondents. Opinions were not mild on the topic. Fletcher contended that South Carolina had gone too far, that John C. Calhoun was a "perjured traitor," and that the movement constituted the rebellion of a state against the nation of which no compromise should be entertained. In January Tipton met privately with Jackson who read from letters sent by North Carolina militia regimental officers stationed near the South Carolina state line. They proposed to "march against the nulifiers." The President hoped to quell the movement without bloodshed, by denouncing it first, then modifying the offending tariff downward as a conciliatory gesture. Tipton and others were troubled by the overture, as it was made to a state in rebellion. Yet, in a 2 March circular to his constituents, Tipton conceded that "In agreeing to it the North and West yielded much for peace and the permanency of our institutions."[28]

With the Nullification Crisis now being like a moment that had passed, Tipton alerted his constituents to one within their own midst—the disposition of the Miami people. In this the Indiana Senator was joining in the Jacksonian rhetoric of Indian Removal, and because of his earlier Indian Agent role he was especially well informed of the particulars. It is also at this juncture that we can observe a complex of justifications used in rationalizing the aggressive dispossession of Native Americans in the emerging Midwest. Again, racism alone does not fully account for removal sentiment in Indiana; one must also appreciate the degree to which an ambitious pragmatism existed among Euro-Americans which, when combined with racism (blatant or latent), admitted no leeway on whether domination or cooperation would rule the day. To an ambitious people caught up in the frenzy of building up the country, coincidental in time with a rising national discourse on Indian Removal, the

scattered tribes represented obstacles to the same progress and prosperity that Tipton had been charged to bring about.

If there is inevitability in any outcome, one could argue that the westward expansion of the nation's agricultural frontier would compel not only conflicting Native-White land claims but also the competition for space to build the infrastructure network that was fundamental to creating the market access component of the equation. Commercial agriculture, Indian policy, and internal improvements were thus inherently linked in the expansion of Euro-American hegemony in the Old Northwest. The conduit through which these changes would be effected was the internal improvement movement which, by the 1830s, encountered resistance at various places in the emerging Midwest by the attempt to run certain transportation routes through land which still remained in the hands of Native Americans. All too bluntly and with obvious prejudicial overtones, Tipton relayed to his constituents that it was now up to Indiana to decide a course of action involving "a people who obstruct the progress of our public works, the extension of our settlements...and who remain unmoved by every effort on the part of the General Government to procure for us a small part of their lands so important to us and entirely useless to the Indians." Increasingly, the removal rhetoric would expand to incorporate a different level of improvement as part of the rationalization, that of improving the lives of Native Americans. Tipton once again occupied a pivotal moment in both Indiana and national history.[29]

As early as 2 September 1830, four months after the passage of Jackson's Indian Removal Act, Tipton as Indian Agent had written to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Thomas McKenney to inform him that the Native American groups for which he was responsible, the Miamis and the Potawatomis, were already contemplating removal. Several Miamis had

gone west of the Mississippi River, and more would follow as soon as they received their annuity and could be assured by the President that once relocated they would not be disturbed again. The Potawatomis were more numerous and scattered yet many were ready as well and urging that an official go with them to view this new land. Acknowledging the conflicting forces in the social politics of Indian Removal, Tipton recommended that "Him that accompanies them should be a *removal* not a *retarding* man." He offered himself. In a subsequent letter to Secretary of War John Eaton he expressed the hope that his assurances to agency Indians "that they would not be driven over the river without their consent" would be honored. The War Department responded by telling Tipton to do nothing further without instructions.[30]

Tipton was a "removal man" for complex and—to his thinking--pragmatic reasons. As described in a previous chapter, his role as Indian Agent had placed him face to face with the "vicious whites" who routinely assailed and perpetrated all manner of frauds against the Native Americans. "[T]he sooner we send them west of the mississippi," Tipton asserted to Eaton, "the better for the Indians and for us." Environmental conditions had deteriorated in other ways. In mid-February of 1831, Tipton reported that the snow there for the past month had ranged from two feet to waist-level deep, and for some time his thermometer had been reading five to twelve degrees below zero. "At no time since I have been Agent of the U.S. for Indian Affairs," he told the Secretary, "has there been half the suffering for clothes and provisions amongst the Potawattimie Indians, as at this time." Tipton sought a compassionate response from officials, and he relayed the following situation. A Potawatomi father who was desperate to relieve the starvation of his family left them to hunt down a deer for food and bring it back. While making his way back to their cabin he collapsed in a snow

bank and died, with the deer still slung across his back. The brutal winter annihilated their horses, hogs, and cattle and left them vulnerable as well as amenable to suggestions of trading their Indiana lands for western lands stocked with game, fish, and grass.[31]

Tipton's correspondence indicates that in the face of mounting pressure to remove, deteriorating living conditions, and a menacing and encroaching neighboring white population, Agency Indians considered their prospects on both sides of the Mississippi with a similar kind of pragmatism that they exercised in choosing to allocate annuity monies, for example, to pay whites to perform agricultural labor for them. According to Tipton a sizeable portion of Indiana's Potawatomi and Miami populations, from a total of nearly six thousand, were unopposed to a gradual removal as of 1831. Virtually the same circumstance was true for Native Americans the following year in nearby Niles, Michigan Territory, from where a correspondent noted that they "cannot support themselves by their usual occupations, without trespassing upon the whites." In January of 1833 Tipton was told that Potawatomis living along the Illinois River were in a "starving condition" and, given their unfortunate circumstances, seemed likely to "embrace the opportunity of removeing West." Throughout the region the tension was characteristically high between native peoples and settlers, often made worse because of alcohol, and frequently resulting in damage done to whites' property. This would invariably lead to the filing of depredations claims, protracted conflicts, and more. Tipton estimated that "A large majority" of Indiana citizens favored removal. Opportunistically, many like Tipton did not dissociate Indian removal from the logical end result that whites would gain access to Indian lands. Ideologically, then, removal produced a resonance that was widely heard and understood across the racial divide, and its

meanings were many. At the same time, this is not to suggest that Indian Removal was *not* the embodiment of a cruel assertion of power and cultural bigotry; undeniably, it was.[32]

Tipton's earlier reference to "retarding men" was indicative of a major shift in federal policy and social thinking about the utility of continuing to encourage Native Americans to take up Euro-American agriculture, east of the Mississippi River. As described in a previous chapter, Tipton, himself, pursued various means to facilitate the agricultural instruction of Agency Indians. And he believed this to be an appropriate course of action until Indiana's growth and Jackson's assumption of the presidency caused him (and many others) to believe differently. Although earlier federal Indian policy had incorporated the use of missionaries to assist in the government's "civilizing" objectives, by the 1830s the efforts of Catholic clerics such as Father Louis Deseille were now viewed as counter productive. Deseille worked among Potawatomi villages in the Michigan Territory in the mid-1830s, trying to persuade receptive converts that a pastoral life was more advantageous than one that revolved around "the chase."[33]

From the point of view of government officials, however, Deseille was actually encouraging an attachment to the land in the midst of removal operations, and he was warned not to subvert official policy. One exasperated agent to the Potwatomis remarked that he wished that Catholic missionary Stephen Badin "and his Catholickism had been some where else than operating among the Indians for it has had no other effect on them than to make them troublesome to the Government." Those of mixed-race parentage like Billy Caldwell, who was labeled a half-breed Potawatomi, represented another retarding factor to officials. Potawatomi Emigrating Agent Anthony Davis charged that Caldwell and those like him maintained interests that were "entirely different" from the native people they lived among.

By inciting them to resist removal Caldwell made it difficult for Davis to carry out his responsibilities by being "the greatest curse that could possibly be entailed upon them." The term "retarding men," then, signified those who not only retarded removal policy but who, in doing so, also delayed the achievement of the objects of growth and prosperity.[34]

As Indianans and the rest of the West eagerly anticipated the commercial consequences of Indian removal and the completed internal improvement projects, a stream of migrants that swelled to a tide began inundating the state to determine if their own circumstances could be improved there. "Farmers are beginning to visit us," Elias Murray wrote in April of 1834 from the new town of Huntington. Yet the two variables that were most attractive to prospective farmers—the opening up of new land and access to a commercial market through canal construction—proved resistant to resolution and was thus off-putting to some purchasers.[35]

The opening up of new (i.e. formerly Indian) lands in Indiana in the 1830s was predicated upon the successful conclusion of cession treaties with the Miami and Potawatomi nations, followed by the Jackson Administration's approval of them. Settlers held their breath upon learning that a treaty had been negotiated. In January 1835 a Fort Wayne resident expressed this anticipation to Tipton stating the belief that "[the western country's] most vital interests are concerned in the ratification of the miami Treaty." While the senator could write to political colleagues and constituents that negotiations had resulted in desirable land cessions for the state, the treaties had yet to be approved by the President before being forwarded to the Senate for ratification.[36]

Some treaties were concluded only after the negotiating Native American chiefs won the concession of reserves, or, land held in reserve for tribal members within the state. This

left land-seekers like Hiram Decker confused as to what land was available for a *bona fide* purchase. Decker was interested in northern Indiana land, but had learned that a recent Potawatomi treaty included reserves that had not yet been specified. He asked Tipton: "will they be selected before that portion of country is offered for sale? or in the name of justice when will they be ordered to be selected?" Of course an additional concern about these treaties was whether all or just a remnant of the nations in question would emigrate. In 1836 Tipton received at least two different petitions from Potawatomi villages that refused to recognize treaties by signers who erroneously purported to have such authority to speak for all tribal members. In one petition Chief Menominee protested that during the recent negotiations he and the other "owners" of the contested land had not even been involved. At the time they were "Peacebley working at our Fields," and thus the treaty was void.[37]

Treaties that provided for reserves were problematic to the government as well as to the state where the land in question was located. From the government's perspective, native groups like the Miami impeded the removal policy by insisting on the inclusion of reserves. Tipton was close to the Indiana treaty negotiations but was not troubled by the issue of small reserves, seeing them as only an inconvenience in comparison to gaining unfettered use of other land earmarked for canal construction. Indeed, in this relationship we again observe how Indian policy, internal improvement, and developing commercial agriculture were connected. After informing Indiana's Governor Noah Noble of the recent Miami cession, Tipton reported that "the way for our canal is now clear and an additional quantity of first rate land will come into [the] market." Similarly, John Bouré concurred with the idea that "the indians retaining their lands lately ceded would greatly retard the prosperity of the Wabash Valley, and be almost incompatible with the National work now in progress."[38]

However, Tipton had spoken too soon about the Miami lands. While he explained to his constituents in August of 1836 that the Potawatomi treaties had all been ratified and removal from the state was imminent, negotiations with the Miamis had failed to produce a treaty that the President would approve. As a result of being "embarrassed" by the reserve issue in the removal of tribal nations of the South, in what would become known as the Cherokees' Trail of Tears, Jackson had begun taking a hard-line approach against treaties that included any provision "in which a portion of the best lands are reserved." For Indiana, the "best lands" related to their proximity to the canal line. In this regard, the disposition of the Miami lands within the state would not be completely resolved to the federal government's liking until February of 1839. Meanwhile Jackson's inflexibility and treaties that failed to guarantee the canal frustrated Tipton who came to realize that transforming a vision into reality entailed a fight at every turn.[39]

In 1835 Tipton was at war with the Wabash and Erie Canal Commissioners. Impatient at their lack of expediency in discharging their official responsibilities and a failure to comprehend the full impact of canal-building on adjacent landowners, he once again used the newsprint to publicly apprise them of his concerns. Under the not-so-anonymous pseudonym "A Friend of the Canal," Tipton wrote three articles for the Logansport *Canal Telegraph* which provoked the commissioners to a heated exchange, part of which was later published in the Indianapolis *Indiana Journal.* The commissioners had been authorized by the legislature to permanently locate and "let" open for contract bidding work on the northern portion of the canal. Yet, as of April they had allowed themselves to be lured away to do surveys for the canal's middle portion and were not "progressing with that energy which should characterize those who conduct a public work." Did they not know, asked "Friend,"

that, given the region's canal-building activity, if contract letting did not begin in May that both contractors and laborers will be engaged elsewhere? If the operations were delayed even one month, "you will thereby retard the completion of this great public work one year."[40]

Of equal importance, Tipton charged, was getting out the official word as to the final location of the canal with respect to the towns and farms through which it would run. Property owners needed to know how to conform their farms, houses, and fences. And for those whose property would be "lost" to the canal line, advanced word would enable them to leave and build houses and make improvements elsewhere. Citizens' needs should be considered here, Tipton argued. "If this part of the line had been permanently located in [the] last month," he pointed out, "the derangement made in our farms and town property would have been known before the time to plant crops and make gardens." Less than six months later, Tipton might have wished that his dream for northern Indiana was not cutting a swath so close to home. He now wrote to the commissioners as himself, a landowner who was fearful about "a sad destruction of my property" during the impending canal construction by way of his fences being "thrown down" and his crops destroyed. To prevent this, Tipton bid to do the work on these sections but was told that he was underbid by competent contractors. As with other farmers, he also realized that the new waterway would bisect his property. When he asked that a bridge be built as compensation, the much maligned commissioners responded that Tipton could well afford to build his own. The antagonism back and forth continued for some time and broadened to include numerous allegations against the commissioners, all of which contributed toward a rather confused approach to the state's internal improvement agenda.[41]

Canal laborers posed another challenge to completing the public works projects. Elias Murray of Lagro, a town some thirty miles east of Tipton's adopted hometown of Logansport, relayed information about the canal's progress to the Senator. He suggested that the high demand for laborers be met in part by sending an official to Germany to indent workers in five year contracts that paid eight or ten dollars a month. As it was, the Irish laborers already employed from the East brought their ethnic clan-related hostilities with them and were viewed as disruptive. By July of 1835, it was widely rumored that the workers were on the very brink of staging a pitched battle on the canal line. Settlers organized a voluntary militia and were joined by several companies of guards from Fort Wayne who went on to stop the Irish groups from attacking each other. Murray commanded a temporary garrison and was part of the company that marched the instigators to Indianapolis. He was galled, as he told Tipton, that the only reward he and his fellow settlers received from the state for preventing "the intended Massacre" was ingratitude. They were eventually allotted one dollar per day plus expenses for their trouble.[42]

Canal-building and the prospects of profitable access to regional and national markets opened the door to a range of new economic activities in Indiana, but this had been a long time in the making. The state's flirtation with competing improved road, river, and canal projects, and a more than passing interest in the potential offered by railroad technology, without a serious commitment to either one, left Indiana's internal improvement movement in disarray as of 1835. This was ten years after the opening of New York's Erie Canal. Yet, as has been demonstrated from Tipton's correspondence, westerners unwaveringly desired markets to which they attached meanings of progress, prosperity, and entitlement and which often made them thorns in the Jackson Administration's side. By and large they had not

come to the West to be isolated from the East, but rather to participate in the building up of the nation's newest section and, hopefully, their own fortunes as well. This optimism was evident in the reports of town builders and landowners like Elias Murray who could boast in 1836 that Lagro "is the best market between Logansport & the Lake...It is almost daily full of Waggons loaded with produce & most of the pork lands here first." Moreover, he glibly relayed to Tipton, the other Wabash River towns came *there* to buy what they needed.[43]

Activity and excitement increased as the market connection materialized more clearly with the passage of Indiana's "mammoth" internal improvement bill in January of 1836. This bill comprised an overly ambitious (and ultimately financially disastrous) plan for a statewide network of improved roads, rivers, and canals that was to be developed simultaneously. One skeptical public official labeled it an "enormously large" scheme. To make matters worse a serious depression, the Panic of 1837, blindsided the nation's economy the following year and severely impeded the progress on canal construction. Finally, however, Indianans would have their internal improvements even if the vision would do more to inaugurate market connections than to exploit them. Inarguably, the dream was infectious. Calvin Fletcher wrote from Indianapolis that "All is life since the passage of the great internal improvement bill. Every acre of land is selling." By May, Joseph Hayes was describing the "Speculating Fever" that had reached up to the Wabash Country. The Vincennes land office told part of the story. "Land that no man in his rational senses three year ago could or would have thought worth the taxes," noted Hayes, "are sought after with avidity and entered." Some parcels were purchased "second & third handed," still considerably above the original cost. According to Hayes, property values in Evansville alone had increased one thousand percent since January. Crowded steamboats, stages, and

private hacks brought northern and eastern speculators to Indiana on a daily basis. "The Substantial Pioneers of the country stand aghast...at this new state of things," he claimed. "He who a few days since thought his farm worth only a thousand dollars finds his neighbour last week selling out for two thousand (a less valuable farm than his own) and the purchaser this week selling again for three thousand Dollars." Elias Murray and the town of Lagro again epitomized the western dream of the 1830s, the fruits of the politics of improvement. He informed Tipton that "A good deal of Corn & Potatoes are growing in the vicinity—the Country is settling—[this portion of] the Canal will be finished next month & the saw Mills will run I think next week."[44]

As Indiana began to physically transform itself in earnest following the passage of the "mammoth" internal improvement bill in 1836, Jacksonism as Tipton and his state colleagues knew it was changing as well. In May of that year a correspondent asked: "What has become of all the warm and zealous Jackson men in our country? [N]ot a whisper do you hear from them in publick company." Surely Tipton had come to believe his own political fortunes were no longer what they had been, probably as a result of his notorious independence from party allegiance, or the very public fighting he engaged in within the internal improvement movement. He had been aware as early as 1834 that his criticism of President Jackson's veto of the Wabash River improvement appropriations bill had "rendered me odious" to some. By 1836 he was conceding to his long time friend Calvin Fletcher that "*times have changed since I wielded the power of the north portion of our state and now have to beg.*" It may be the curse of visionaries to outlive the materialization of their dream, the fruits and possibilities of which capture the imaginations of other men and women who are likewise energized to envision something more. Being part of defining the West had been Tipton's

dream, not becoming Senator as his earlier letters expressing his reluctance at such a position indicated. By 1836 fifty-year-old Tipton was ready for others to take over. "I can see the time," he wrote to Fletcher, "when my friends will as the[y] shou[l]d be uppermost. [F]or myself nothing more is wanted [and] *never will be but the success of my friends."* His public supporters, however, were not ready for him to bow out.[45]

Despite Tipton's frequent assertions that he advocated "measures, not men" and disparaged blind party loyalties, he allied himself with Jacksonian Democrats. As Old Hickory approached the end of his second term, Tipton tried to rally Indianans behind Democrat candidate Martin Van Buren, calling upon the "true Jackson men" to hold the ranks. The 1836 presidential election contained an irony in William Henry Harrison as a Whig candidate. For years following the battle of Tippecanoe, Tipton had admired Harrison, his former commander and territorial governor, even naming a son after him. Yet he could not bring himself to back Harrison's presidential aspirations, although in the end Indianans did.[46]

As President, Van Buren inherited some unfinished business including two matters that would heavily upon him and the nation. The economic devastation wrought by the Panic of 1837 coursed through Tipton's correspondence. Former Virginia Senator John Tyler depicted how his region was shrouded in gloom. "Merchants are failing daily and all confidence betwen man and man," he recorded, "Never have I known any thing to equal the convulsion produced by the derangement of the currency...The Farmer can sell nothing for cash." Indianan James Lanier referred to the "present unheard of state of affairs." By August, "panic" described more than just the nation's economic "derangement." Calvin Fletcher exhorted Tipton to seek the citizens' relief of fear and alarm through legislation that

would counter the "utter ruin & confusion of our currency." In fact Tipton and his fellow congressmen were called into a special session "to legislate the Government out of its difficulties." A key piece of legislation before them was a subtreasury bill. Tipton spoke against the measure, his concern centering on being pressured to push it through without bringing it to the people first. This went against the core of Tipton's views on a democratic republic which he had repeatedly articulated since becoming Senator. As reported in *Congressional Debates* Tipton claimed that his role was not to "register the Executive will," but to look to the "boys of the West, those with hard hands, warm hearts, and strong arms, who fell the forest, hold the plough, and repel foreign invasion" for his instructions. It was their voice he felt obligated to obey without apology.[47]

The second matter left for Van Buren to finish was the process of removing Native Americans who resided east of the Mississippi to land west of it. Here would lie Tipton's last major official encounter with the native peoples of Indiana. It would serve to close the lengthiest and most formative chapter of the senator's life in which they had been a constant presence. The same could also be said of the relationship regarding Indiana and the early West, and is illustrative of the inherent contradictions that were embedded within westward expansion. While still a boy in Tennessee, Tipton's father had been attacked and killed by a group of Cherokees. As a young man, he migrated into Indiana Territory with the remainder of his family and like, many of his western male peers, was active in the militia in defensive maneuvers against native warriors who attacked settlers. He soldiered at Tippecanoe and subsequently rose through the militia ranks while also holding a series of public offices. While it would be tempting to label Tipton a mere Indian fighter, his official actions and personal and public correspondence do not bear this out. As noted elsewhere in this study,

Tipton was troubled by the Indians' plight. His 1823 appointment as federal Indian Agent placed him in the demanding if not impossible role in which he was to safeguard both his native constituents' and the government's interests. In this capacity he was known for his promotion of the education of Indian boys and girls as well as for his rigid and aggressive enforcement of prohibitions against plying Native Americans with alcohol.

By the time he became a senator in 1831, Indiana had come alive in the eyes of optimistic Euro-Americans who believed that growth and prosperity would result from the construction of an internal improvement system. Tipton's concern for "this noble race" and "ill-fated people" had not abated and was yet a frequent topic of conversation in his letters. But through their ambition, pragmatism, and cultural bigotry, westerners viewed removal as a mutually beneficial remedy, which is not at all to suggest that both parties benefited equally, or even that native groups benefited at all. Compassion and integrity were only mere apparitions throughout this whole process. Nor can one deny that whites profited financially from removal in a number of ways. However, the fact that Native Americans represented a group that was continually vulnerable to such actions and behaviors strongly suggested to many of Tipton's generation that they would be "better off" west of the Mississippi, out of the reach of fraudulent, interfering, and complaining whites. More to the point, Indian policy scholar Reginald Horsman has observed that by the 1830s Euro-Americans had come to believe that "expansion meant the disappearance or subordination of other peoples, not their acceptance as equal participants in a republican society." And so Tipton would end his public career the way that he began it, engaged in a turning-point relationship with Native Americans.[48]

From Tipton's perspective, Indiana's process of removing the Miami and Potawatomi nations was complicated, problematic, and overrun by self interest from the start. An outline of the problems is discernible in the correspondence between Tipton and Isaac McCoy, a long-time friend and Baptist missionary to the Indians who emigrated with the Potawatomis. By the Fall of 1837 he was discouraged, telling McCoy that "one mistake, or neglect, after another looks like half defeating our wishes and best indevours to save them poor Indians." "[B]ut," he continued, "what is to be expect[ed] where *carelessness & ignorance* of *duty presides.* [T]hing[s] dont look right here." Many recognized that emigrating Indian nations would take their annuities with them, and to appease those with financial claims against them, the Secretary of War had to appoint a commission to "ferret out and defeat rascality." On one level, even Tipton considered the annuity as something to manipulate when he advocated adding pressure to the Potawatomis by refusing to pay them their next annuity *east* of the Mississippi to influence their rapid departure. As a result of one of the "exploring tours" of the Osage Country he made, McCoy alerted Tipton to another set of difficulties. While the prospective land appeared suitable, the tensions and hostilities from the indigenous peoples already residing in the designated area along the Osage River were of some concern. Additionally, more attention had to be given to emigrating expenses such as ferriage and provisions during and after the move. And certainly, one sub agent would not be enough or the entire effort would fall apart.[49]

It became clear to McCoy right away that whites west of the Mississippi were just as adept at fleecing Native Americans of their money, their lands, even their provisions, as their eastern counterparts had been. Emigrating Indians were being promised that the exchanged lands awaiting them in the Indian Country were not only theirs forever, but also to be

undisturbed by whites. However, McCoy relayed to Tipton the problem with tracts of land therein being set aside as so-called half-breed lands, some of which were then being conveyed to whites. To prevent the degradation of whatever good reformers like McCoy and Tipton hoped would come from removal, both men supported the idea of a government-organized Indian Territory.[50]

The movement to establish a designated Indian Territory represents a crucial juncture in the history of Native-White relations in the U.S. As he had done before, Tipton took the lead during his time and tried to build support for the bill he introduced on 20 December 1837 by using the familiar rhetoric of improvement. When he actually spoke on it the following April, he was engaging an idea that had been argued for more than a decade. In conjunction with removal, reformers and other interested parties had long noted the need for an exclusive and permanent territory for Native Americans that would be governed by them, at least in part. Beginning in 1824, plans and bills were submitted that, like Tipton's in 1837, ultimately either failed or were tabled for future consideration. However, Tipton's speech on the issue is instructive about the competing ideologies that supported removal and the creation of an Indian Territory, and the justification that somehow the end result would mean the "improvement" of both societies. As we have seen, however, the term was layered with different meanings depending on which side of the racial divide one stood.[51]

In his speech Tipton lamented the current situation of Native Americans and the history of the government's lackluster response to it. "A hundred times over have we declared that we wished them well," he reminded his political colleagues, "and yet our wishes have not been reduced to practice: neither their retreat nor their decline has been arrested." He deplored the "dereliction of duty toward the race that preceded us."

Articulating widely held assumptions of cultural superiority, Tipton spoke of the "difficulties that have been experienced in improving the Indians for near two hundred years." Drawing on his own career in negotiating land cession treaties, he stated his belief that the "insecurity of title" has been the chief stumbling block to the native peoples' improvement and the paralysis of their industry and enterprise. Thus the issuing of patents to the tribes in order to secure the "peaceable possession for ever" of their lands (unless abandoned at which case they reverted back to the government), was a major feature of the bill. In other words, Native American lands in the Indian Territory could never come into the private ownership of land-seeking whites, or so it was believed. The bill was debated throughout April and passed by the Senate on 2 May. The House, however, took no action.[52]

Three months later the emigrating process in Indiana was breaking down. On 27 August 1838 Indiana Governor David Wallace sought out Senator Tipton's service to the northern country at the request of Potawatomi Emigrating Agent Colonel Abel C. Pepper. Hostilities were becoming more overt between the Yellow River Potawatomis and white land-seekers chomping at the bit to obtain the soon-to-be-former Indian lands in anticipation of a pre-emption law. Wallace and Pepper believed that a show of force under Tipton's charge in all likelihood would dissolve the tensions on both sides. Tipton was in possession of himself when it came to western matters, and he immediately replied in the affirmative to Wallace with only one condition—that he receive no pay for this service. Tipton then dashed off a flurry of letters to friends and acquaintances to get their assistance in bringing together the requisite number of volunteers spread out over several northern Indiana counties. The subsequent exchanges reveal an almost comic interplay. Volunteers were hard to bring together into squads on account of a large number being ill. A great deal was made about not

being able to get an appropriate corps of drummers, fifers, and musicians. The same was true about rifles, cartridges, and tents. Some men had no horses and were stranded in places where an outbound stage had already departed. William Polke's reply to Tipton was typical: "what can be got I will have in readiness when wanted."[53]

Just four days after Governor Wallace's original letter, Tipton marched into the encampment of emigrating Potawatomis, some of whom were in "a very bad humor." On the afternoon of 2 September he began enrolling them for the emigration, and before sunset had obtained the names of some seven hundred men, women, and children. The next day an additional forty-seven Potawatomis came into camp to be enrolled, and they began to load all of their baggage and movable property into thirteen wagons. Tipton was also there to settle accounts. It seems that the notion that improved land translated into an increased valuation had not been lost on the Potawatomis who insisted that the Senator appraise and indemnify them for the loss of the corn standing in their fields, which he did. On 5 September Tipton launched the westward emigration, and the party covered twenty-one miles, mostly on foot. That evening he wrote to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs of the state of the move in his characteristic take-charge tone. "Every thing under the old plan of emigration has failed," he complained, "and I must take the responsibility of discharging the whole." The wagon contractors had failed to furnish enough, forcing many of the women, children, and the elderly to move on foot. The Potawatomis appeared to him to be in a "miserably poor" condition, mostly "bair foot and entirely destitute of blankets." And, Tipton pointedly remarked to the Commissioner, "Your disbursing agents are a nuisance." He also contended with thievery and a near mutiny among those waggoners who were available but then exploited the situation by demanding higher wages. Tipton wrote to his son that he even had

to train the accompanying accounting clerks. On 14 September Tipton notified the Commissioner that he would continue another few days to the Illinois state line "when after organizing and setling the emigration on a sane footing, I shall return home." He did so on 22 September in time to assist in caring for his own ailing household. William Polke took over Tipton's responsibilities after which he wrote and teased the Senator that "some of the Boys says I am harder on them then even old Tipton."[54]

Tipton garnered praise for his management of a critical situation. His willingness to participate, even take charge of, the Potawatomi emigration does not mean that he was entirely comfortable with the process. His letters make frequent reference to "this unpleasant business" and about his anxiety over the Potawatomis' plight. Indian Affairs Commissioner Harris, though, expressed gratitude for Tipton's "decision & energy." One correspondent pointed out to Tipton that in starting the emigration party west he had achieved "What all others had faild to do" up to that moment. In his official report, the emigration superintendent noted "that Gen. Tipton consented to submit to the privation of an absence from a sick family, in bad health himself, and assumed the onerous duties required to organize and regulate a large party of emigrating Indians." Citizens of Laporte were particularly relieved that he came to the assistance of his fellow westerners, allaying their fears about how the matter *could* have played out. In their petition they stated the belief that without his skill and decision "the attempt at removal would have failed, leaving this portion of our state to the horrors of a guerrilla war such as has been wasting Florida for three years past." While the praise was welcomed, Tipton harbored unresolved feelings. Upon returning home in late September he wrote Commissioner Harris that he had been "one month

imployed in this business & can only hope that my motives may be properly understood by every one."[55]

Tipton's view of his place in the west had changed by late Fall. Although he was urged by his correspondents to seek another term as Senator, Tipton was satisfied that he had done as much for the region as he could and, frankly, as he wanted. Isaac McCoy beseeched him to continue to work toward the cause of improving the lives of Native Americans. "*You cannot—must not* be separated from Indian business at this important juncture," he stated. But Tipton believed it was time to return home, and end his Washington tenure. To Secretary of War William J. Brown he confided how his personal obligations must now take priority. "[T]he declining health of mrs T and our young children," he explained, "call loudly on me to remain and take care of them." Indeed in three months his beloved wife would be dead. Tipton's letter to Brown also evidenced his modified views on politics such that he sounded less like the independent he had first been known as, and more like a Democratic party adherent in his references to "our party."[56]

Tipton would not get to enjoy private life for very long. Within two weeks of his wife's death in February of 1839, he was defending himself again in newsprint, this time from accusations that his self-interestedness in the local water-power and land rights (which he owned) was choking off Logansport's prospects for growth and prosperity. In other words, other enterprising and ambitious men wanted access to the improvements to the northern country that he had worked to make possible, and he resented that. "I came here before the country was inhabited by what the writer would call society folks," Tipton responded, "and secured for myself and children a comfortable competency which I decline surrendering as common property for the mutual benefit of all the people of Logansport."

Nor did he intend to live under public scrutiny. He had retired to his farm "in sight of the village where I had hoped to live in peace and expect to die…yet I will guard my reputation with the same tenacity now that I did thirty-one years ago, when I first entered the Indiana territory an orphan boy, in pursuit of fortune and fame." The next month he heard from Calvin Fletcher, who regretted that his current business affairs had driven him "from those attentions I hereafter wish to give to my friends—a few old ones I yet look to as a great source of comfort." But in early April Tipton joined his wife in death, four months shy of his fifty-third birthday, from what was described as an apoplexy of the lungs. The West had lost one of its own.[57]

NOTES—CHAPTER SIX

[1] James T. Pollock to Tipton, 22 October 1831, is reprinted in Nellie Armstrong Robertson and Dorothy Riker, eds., *The John Tipton Papers*, vol, 2, (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1942), 449-51, hereafter cited as *Tipton Papers*, with the appropriate volume number following.

[2] John Carr to Tipton, 1 November 1831, Ibid., 457-58.

[3] General Washington Johnston to Tipton, 8 April 1832, Ibid., 575-76.

[4] Tipton to D. Slaughter, 12 October 1831, Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 22 August 1830, Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 23 October 1830, Ibid., 446, 326-27 (emphasis in original), 359-60; see also Joseph Holman to Tipton, 10 September 1830, Calvin Fletcher to Tipton, 29 September 1830, Noah Noble to Tipton, 11 October 1830, Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 2 December 1830, Ibid., 333-34, 348-49, 355-56, 377.

[5] James T. Pollock to Tipton, 22 October 1831, Ibid., 449-51; in an older award-winning work, Arthur Schlesinger discusses westerners' "glowing enthusiasm" for Jackson as a war hero which continued even as his administration operated against important issues in the West such as internal improvements, in Arthur Meier Schlesinger, *The Age of Jackson* (New York: Little, Brown and Co., 1945), 206-07; two of the more recent and applicable studies of the Erie Canal are Laurence M. Hauptman, *Conspiracy of Interests: Iroquois Dispossession and the Rise of New York State* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1999), and Carol Sheriff, *The Artificial River: The Erie Canal and the Paradox of Progress, 1817-1862* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1996); a good study of the nation's canal era is Ronald E. Shaw, *Canals for a Nation: the Canal Era in the United States, 1790-1860* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1990); the definitive economic study of Ohio's canal system is Harry N. Scheiber, *Ohio Canal Era: A Case Study of Government and the Economy, 1820-1861* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1969); from Paul Fatout we learn about Indiana's canal politics, but not about what the canal meant to those it would serve, see Fatout, *Indiana Canals* (West Lafayette: Purdue University Studies, 1972); an engaging study of the national politics surrounding the internal improvement movement is John Lauritz Larson, *Internal Improvement: National Public Works and the Promise of Popular Government in the Early United States* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001); see also the useful Ronald E. Shaw, "The Canal Era in the Old Northwest," in *Transportation and the Early Nation: Papers*

Presented at an Indiana American Revolution Bicentennial Symposium (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1982), 89-112.

[6] William C. Bramwell to Tipton, 14 January 1835, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 104; Robertson and Riker note that the preceding letter "is typical of others received by Tipton from citizens in Indiana and adjacent states expressing approval of the position he had taken on the question of improving the navigation of the Wabash River," in Ibid., 104n; an examination of the historical commercial nexus of federal Indian policy, internal improvements, and agricultural development in the early Midwest, see the forthcoming Ginette Aley, "Bringing About the Dawn: Agriculture, Internal Improvement, Indian Policy, and Euro-American Hegemony in the Old Northwest, 1800-1846," in Daniel P. Barr, ed., *The Boundaries Between Us: Natives, Newcomers, and the Struggle for the Old Northwest, 1740-1840.* (Kent State University Press, 2005); the pervasive spirit of improvement is described well in Daniel Feller, *The Jacksonian Promise: America, 1815-1840* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1995), chapter 2; Andrew R. L. Cayton and Peter S. Onuf, *The Midwest and the Nation: Rethinking the History of an American Region* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 44; I find the contention that early Midwesterns held a "deep ambivalence" toward the market as found in the preceding work to be largely unsupported in settlers' letters as well as in the state papers.

[7] Tipton to William G. Ewing, 27 October 1831, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 2, 456 (emphasis in original); Tipton's association with pushing internal improvements for his region was widely known as evidenced in an 1832 letter that characterizes the senator as "so firm, steady & prominent an advocate" of the movement, in Howard Stansbury to Tipton, 8 August 1832, Ibid., 680-81.

[8] Vincennes *Western Sun & General Advertiser*, 17 September 1831 and Lawrenceburg *Indiana Palladium,* 8 October 1831 are also reprinted in *Tipton Papers*, 439-40, 440-42; see also Thomas B. Brown to Tipton, 5 October 1831, Ibid., 443-45; Nathan B. Palmer to Tipton, 18 February 1835, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 127-28.

[9] (references are listed in the order they occur in the paragraph) Philip Sweetsner to Tipton, 13 December 1831, William Marshall to Tipton, 20 October 1831, James T. Pollock to Tipton, 22 October 1831, John Carr to Tipton, 1 November 1831, Joseph M. Hayes to Tipton, 8 December 1831, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 2, 463, 447-48, 449-51, 457-58, 461.

[10] (references are listed in the order they occur in the paragraph) Samuel Milroy to Tipton, 16 December 1831, Tipton to Richard M. Johnson, 11 December, 1831, John W. Davis to Tipton, 18 December 1831, Lucius H. Scott to Tipton, 15 December 1831, Tipton to Andrew Jackson, 31 December 1831, *Tipton Papers,* vol. 2, 468-69 (emphasis in original), 462, 470, 465-66, 490 respectively; the balloting is reprinted in Ibid., 461n and in Indiana *House Journal, 1831-32*, 41-42, 44; see also William Marshall to Tipton, 6 June 1829, 172-73.

[11] Prolific Jackson scholar Robert Remini addresses some of the complexities involving Indian Removal and the common misunderstandings about the generation that supported it: "Today Americans are quite prone to fault Jackson for the removal without understanding the circumstances surrounding the event...To begin to understand that situation, modern Americans must first appreciate the fact that the mood and temper of Americans during Jackson's lifetime tolerated and actually condoned removal," in Robert V. Remini, *Andrew Jackson and His Indian Wars* (New York: Viking, 2001), vii and chapters 13 and 14.

[12] William C. Linton to Tipton, 15 December 1831, Robert F. Bell to Tipton, 18 December, 1831, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 2, 464-65, 469-70; see also David H. Colerick to Tipton, 22 December 1831, Ibid., 474-75.

[13] (references are listed in the order they occur in the paragraph) Philip Sweetsner to Tipton, 13 December 1831, Lucius H. Scott to Tipton, 15 December 1831, John W. Davis to Tipton, 18 December 1831, Ibid., 463, 465-66, 470.

[14] William Polke to Tipton, 21 April 1834, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 52; William C. Linton to Tipton, 15 December 1831, David H. Maxwell to Tipton, 6 March 1832, Ibid., vol. 2, 464-65, 540, and Chaning Madison to Tipton, 26 March 1836 and Elias Murray to Tipton, 8 January 1837, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 247-48 and 337-38; a good depiction of the political tensions and technologies involved in road-building during the 1830s is found in John Milroy to Tipton, 27 December 1831, James Rariden to Tipton, 26 January 1832, and Atticus Siddall to Tipton, 27 January 1832, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 2, 480-82, 515-16, and 517; challenges besetting bridge-building by frontier conditions and harsh wintry weather are found in Edwin J. Peck to Tipton, 8 December 1837 in Ibid., vol. 3, 470-71; for more on the politics of friendship and favors, see also Joseph M. Hayes to Tipton, 5 December 1831 and John Spencer to Tipton, 28 December 1831, Ibid., vol. 2, 460 and 485-87; see also Tipton's speech on the bill for the continuation of the Cumberland Road in *Congressional Debates*, 24 Cong., 1 sess, cols. 616-23.

[15] (references are listed in the order they occur in the paragraph) Samuel Emison to Tipton, 24 December 1831, Elias Murray to Tipton, 25 January 1832, Lathrop M. Taylor to Tipton, 28 December 1831, John Scott to Tipton, 30 December, 1831, Isaac C. Elston to Tipton, 28 December 1831, Chauncy Carter to Tipton, 24 February 1832, John Scott to Tipton, 29 February 1832, Samuel Milroy to Tipton, 7 March 1832, Richard W. Clarke to Tipton, 31 March 1832, Ibid., 476-77, 514-15, 487-88, 489-90, 482-83, 529-30, 538, 541-42, 565-66; a good example of a petition letter for the establishment of a post office is Mahlon to Tipton, 17 April 1832, Ibid., 586-87; for some of Tipton's constituents a post office offered little in terms of information if no one in town received a Washington paper. Burt Dickinson of Muncietown told Tipton that people there "are anxious to know what you are doing for us," and he asked the Senator to have papers sent to them in Dickinson Burt to Tipton, 29 February 1832, Ibid., 536-37; Jordan Vigus to Tipton, 26 January 1836, Elias Murray to Tipton, 15 February 1836, Jordan Vigus to Tipton, 14 January 1837, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 215-17, 228-29, 342-44; a good though somewhat controversial social history of the market revolution and the Jacksonian era is Charles Sellers, *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

[16] Of the numerous references to steamboats in the Tipton papers, see for example Tipton to Editor of the Indianapolis *Indiana Journal*, 21 May 1828, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 2, 48, and Thomas B. Brown to Tipton, 13 March 1834, Ibid., vol. 3, 35-37; Samuel Milroy to Tipton, 16 December 1831, Isaac C. Elston to Tipton, 28 December 1831, and Israel T. Canby to Tipton, 22 December 1831, Ibid., vol. 2, 468-69, 482-83, and 473-74 respectively; Tipton and some 300 others attended a railroad convention in Knoxville, Tennessee, in 1836 as described in Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 14 March 1836, Ibid., vol. 3, 244; technological innovations in processing and production including milling also peaked interest in their possibilities as seen in Rodney Davis to Tipton, 6 August 1837, Ibid., vol. 3, 426.

[17] Tipton to Editor, 29 May 1828 and 31 July 1828, Indianapolis *Indiana Journal*, are also reprinted in *Tipton Papers*, vol. 2, 48-50 and 72-73; this settlement would grow to become Tipton's hometown of Logansport, as noted in Ibid., 47n; James T. Pollock to Tipton, 21 December 1831, Ibid, 472-73; Tipton's determination to secure the route through Logansport led to a series of legal actions taken by him which he detailed in Tipton: Statement of Case Against Thomas Martin, Et Al, 12 January 1836, reprinted in Ibid., vol. 3, 203-05.

[18] (references are listed in the order they occur in the paragraph) Henry Hoover to Tipton, 12 January 1832, Andrew Waymire to Tipton, 23 February 1832, Austin W. Morris, 12 January 1832, Ibid., vol. 2, 495, 527-29, 496-97 respectively; see also Elias Murray to Tipton, 25 January 1832, Ibid., 514-15.

[19] Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 14 January 1832, C. Eckloff to Tipton: Receipted Bill, 7 January 1832, Joshua Shields to Tipton, 8 April 1832, Ibid., 501, 492-93, 492n, 576.

[20] Tipton to John B. Duret, 23 February 1832, Tipton to George C. Spencer, 19 February 1832, Tipton to John B. Duret, 26 February 1832, Tipton to James B. Slaughter, 26 February 1832, General Washington Johnston to Tipton, 8 April 1832, Ibid., 527, 525-26, 532-33 (emphasis in original), 534, 575-76 (emphasis in original).

[21] Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 14 January 1832, Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 18 January 1832, Ibid., 501, 508-10 (emphasis in original).

[22] Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 18 January 1832, Elias Murray to Tipton, 11 March 1832, Tipton to Noah Noble, 15 April 1832, Isaac Howk to Tipton, 10 May 1832, Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 9 July 1832, Ibid., 508-10 (emphasis in original), 547-48, 585, 600-01 (emphasis in original), 653-54; at this point some of Tipton's adversaries among Jackson men intended to "Break you down and Rise on the Ruins," in William Polke to Tipton, 10 September 1832, Ibid., 706-07; see also Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 31 January 1832, 518-19.

[23] (references are listed in the order they occur in the paragraph) Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 4 May 1836, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 12 March 1834, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 4 April 1836, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 274-75, 35, 255-56 respectively; see also Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 6 January 1836 and Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 12 March 1836, Ibid., vol. 2, 202-03 and 241-42; reference his motto is found in Calvin Fletcher to Tipton, 17 January 1837, Ibid., vol. 3, 344-46.

[24] (references are listed in the order they occur in the paragraph) Isaac C. Elston to Tipton, 21 August, 1832, Howard Stansbury to Tipton, 8 August 1832, Nicholas McCarty to Tipton, 16 August 1832, John D. DeFrees to Tipton, 7 September 1832, Thomas Fitzgerald to Tipton, 21 November 1832, David H. Colerick to Tipton, 20 September 1832, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 2, 687, 680-81, 684-85, 700-02, 688-89, 700-02, 716-18, 711-12; examples of Tipton's circulars are dated 19 June 1832, Ibid., 632-36, and 30 June 1834, Ibid., vol. 3, 61-64; a description of Jackson's veto of the earlier of the internal improvement bill appeared in *Niles' Weekly Register*, 11 August 1832, 42: 428-29; public criticism of Tipton's severity toward Jackson in his 1834 circular appeared

in Washington *Globe*, 16 August 1834, 18 December 1834, and 29 December 1834; see also the *National Intelligencer*, 27 December 1834; on the other hand, Tipton garnered warm support from Indianans as seen in the Indianapolis *Indiana Journal*, 30 December 1834.

[25] Another Jacksonian reference to "whole hog men" is found in Austin W. Morris to Tipton, 24 December 1832, Ibid., 756-58; Jacob Walker to Tipton, 8 September 1832, Thomas Ewing to Tipton, 9 September 1832, Ibid., 703-04, 704-05.

[26] Calvin Fletcher to Tipton, 20 January 1836, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 209-11; Tipton's bill to extend the pre-emption law of 1830 for 2 more years was approved on 19 June 1834, as discussed in Ibid., 32n; see also U.S. *Statutes at Large*, 4:420-21, 678; Tipton received a revealing letter about an unexpected "distressing" reaction by the writer's "squatting neighbors" who, upon learning of the law, began a "predatory warfair" against each other that included "pulling down houses,...killing cattle, burning haystacks—and a destruction of every thing that would prevent another from a settlement," in John B. Chapman to Tipton, 4 March 1834, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 32-34; see also Tipton's Speech on the Sale of Public Lands, 24 January 1837 in Ibid., 349-53, and which originally appeared in *Congressional Debates*, 24 Cong., 2 sess., cols. 535, 553-55.

[27] Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 28 November 1832, John W. Davis to Tipton, 8 December 1832, James T. Pollock to Tipton, 8 December 1832, Hiram Decker to Tipton, 9 December 1832, Israel T. Canby to Tipton, 10 December 1832, Benjamin Ferguson to Tipton, 10 December 1832, Aaron Finch to Tipton, 10 December 1832, Calvin Fletcher to Tipton, 10 December 1832, Tipton to Fletcher, 11 January 1833, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 2, 718-19 (emphasis in original), 731, 732, 732-34, 735, 736, 737-38, 738-39, 771-72 (emphasis in original); see also James T. Pollock to Tipton, 10 December 1832, Alexander F. Morrison to Tipton, 11 December 1832, James T. Pollock to Tipton, 16 December 1832, Ibid.,740-41, 742-43, 749-51; Tipton's pseudonymous articles appeared in the Indianapolis *Indiana Journal*, 2 November 1833, 4 December 1833, and 5 January 1834; they are also reprinted in *Tipton Papers*, vol. 2, 841-43, 849-50, and in vol. 3, 6-9.

[28] Elisha M. Huntington to Tipton, 11 December 1832, Calvin Fletcher to Tipton, 14 December 1832, Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 17 December 1832, Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 11 January 1833, Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 15 January 1833, Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 16 January 1833, Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 18 January 1833, Calvin Fletcher to Tipton, 24 January 1833, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 2, 741-42 (emphasis in original), 746-48, 751-52, 771-

72, 777, 778-79, 786-88; Tipton's 2 March 1833 Circular is reprinted in Ibid., 805-07 and was originally published in the Logansport *Cass County Times*, 4 April 1833.

[29] Tipton: Circular, 2 March 1833, Gurdon S. Hubbard, 27 January 1833, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 2, 805-07, 791-93.

[30] Tipton to Thomas L. McKenney, 2 September 1830, Tipton to John H. Eaton, 13 September 1830, Philip G. Randolph to Tipton, 8 September 1830, Ibid., 329-31 (emphasis in original), 338, 333.

[31] Tipton to John H. Eaton, 17 February 1831, Tipton to John H. Eaton, 5 April 1831, Ibid., 396-97, 399-401; good example of a letter detailing fraud against Agency Indians is Tipton to Elijah Hayward, 21 April 1831, in Ibid., 404-05.

[32] Tipton to John H. Eaton, 5 April 1831, Cogswell K. Green to Tipton, 1 April 1832, Gurdon S. Hubbard to Tipton, 27 January 1833, Ibid., 399-401, 566-67, 791; see also Samuel S. Hamilton: Report on Depredation Claims Against Miami and Potawatomi Indians, 6 April 1831, Ibid., 401-03; Tipton's speech on the Cherokee removal are found in *Congressional Debates*, 23 Cong., 1 sess., cols., 1776-77.

[33] Louis Deseille to Abel C. Pepper, 21 March 1836, *Tipton Papers,* vol. 3, 246-47; see also the note on page 246, Abel C. Pepper to Tipton, 16 April 1836, George W. Ewing and Cyrus Taber to Tipton, 21 August 1836, Ibid., 259-60, 304-05; Anthony F. C. Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians: The Tragic Fate of the First Americans* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999); for Indian policy relevant to the period see Francis Paul Prucha, *American Indian Policy in the Formative Years: The Indian Trade and Intercourse Acts* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970) and George Dewey Harmon, *Sixty Years of Indian Affairs* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941), chapters iv, xi, and xix; Bert Anson offers a highly useful overview of the policy of Indian removal in Bert Anson, "Variations of the Indian Conflict: The Effects of the Emigrant Indian Removal Policy, 1830-1854," *Missouri Historical Review* 59 (1964-1965): 64-89.

[34] Anthony L. Davis to Tipton, 2 March 1836, Anthony L. Davis to Tipton, 8 February 1837, Anthony L. Davis to Tipton, 21 November 1837, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 233-35, 362, 465-66; on the Miami and Potawatomi during the Removal era, see Stewart Rafert, *The Miami Indians of Indiana: A Persistent People, 1654-1994* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1996) and R. David Edmunds, *The Potawatomis: Keepers of the Fire* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1978).

[35] Andrew Cayton states that "The vast majority of the migrants to Indiana arrived in the decades between the late 1810s and the late 1830s," in Andrew R. L. Cayton, *Frontier Indiana* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 267; Elias Murray to Tipton, 27 April 1834, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 53-55.

[36] John B. Bouré to Tipton, 19 January 1835, Ibid., 108-09.

[37] Hiram Decker to Tipton, 5 April 1835, Tipton to Lewis Cass, 28 December 1835, Menominee et al to Tipton, 4 November 1836, Ibid., 141, 196, 312-13, and notes on pages 196 (referring to citizen petitions asking for official confirmation of the location of reserves) and 312; representative of the confusion about available public land and "floating" Indian reserves are Jeremiah Grover to Tipton, 25 January 1837 and Tipton to Benjamin F. Butler, 26 January 1837, Ibid., 353-54, 354-55.

[38] Tipton to Lewis Cass, 26 October 1834, Tipton to Noah Noble, 26 October 1834, John B. Bouré to Tipton, 19 January 1835, Ibid., 78, 79, 108-09; see also Jordan Vigus to Tipton, 29 January 1837, Ibid., vol. 3, 356-57.

[39] Tipton: To the People of Indiana, 6 August 1836, Logansport *Canal Telegraph*; the preceding is also reprinted in *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 293-300.

[40] Tipton: to Messers. Burr, Johnson, & Lewis, Canal Commissioners [or to Messrs. Editors], Logansport *Canal Telegraph*, 4 and 25 April, and 16 May 1835; the preceding is also reprinted in *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 139-40, 146-48, 151-55; the resulting heated exchange was published in Indianapolis *Indiana Journal*, 16 April 1836; a discussion of Indiana's "Politics of Improvement" as it relates to canal-building is found in Cayton, *Frontier Indiana*, 281-87.

[41] Tipton to the Editors, Logansport *Canal Telegraph*, 25 April 1835 and reprinted in *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 146-48; Tipton to the Commissioners of Wabash and Erie Canal, 15 September 1835, Ibid., 169-70; the preceding as well as the commissioners' response appeared in the Indianapolis *Indiana Journal*, 16 April 1836; one correspondent told Tipton that he had "frightened the [canal] *board* half out of their wits," in Elias Murray to Tipton, 15 February 1836, *Tipton Papers*, 229-30 (emphasis in original); a sense of the frustration with the canal commissioners is evident in the following: Tipton to Howard Stansbury, 8 November 1835, Tipton to Jesse L. Williams, 12 December 1835, Tipton to Jesse L. Noble, 24 December 1835, Tipton to Noah Noble, 27 December 1835, Ibid., 179-80, 187-89, 192-94, 195; Logansport *Canal Telegraph*, 29 August and 19 December 1835; Indianapolis *Indiana Journal*, 16 April 1836; Indiana *House Journal*, 1835-36, 31, 37, 83, 86, 178-81.

[42] Elias Murray to Tipton, 31 March 1836, *Tipton Papers*, 249-250; see also Indiana *Documentary Journal*, 1835-36, no. 18; the banking and specie problems in the West added another burden to the internal improvement movement there when canal hands resisted taking Indiana's paper currency not backed by specie for their wages, as described in Calvin Fletcher to Tipton, 21-22 December 1836, *Tipton Papers*, 329-32; interestingly, Tipton wrote to a man in County Cork, Ireland, to arrange the passage for the three children of one Mr. Murphy and wife so that they could join their parents who now resided near his Logansport home. It is possible that like many Irish who came to work on the early Midwest's canals, the Murphys elected to stay and become tenant farmers or landowners; see Tipton to Daniel Murphy, 28 January 1838, Ibid., 528.

[43] Elias Murray to Tipton, 1 January 1836, *Tipton Papers,* 197-99.

[44] Calvin Fletcher to Tipton, 20 January 1836, Othniel L. Clark to Tipton, Joseph M. Hayes to Tipton, 22 May 1836, Elias Murray to Tipton, 24 June 1836, Ibid., 209-11, 213-14, 277-80, 290-92; regarding Easterners contacting Tipton for information related to speculating in western lands following the passage of Indiana's 1836 internal improvement bill, see Arnold Naudain to Tipton, 3 October 1836, Ibid., 309-10; consistent with my contention that the pursuit of the dream of growth, prosperity, and commercial agriculture mattered more to Tipton's generation than the ultimate fact that the canal system for which they had worked so hard would not realize their financial goals is James H. Madison, *The Indiana Way: A State History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 74-75, 82-86; while Indiana's canal system did not afford the same degree of profits, by any stretch, that New York's Erie Canal did, it nonetheless shifted economic trade from a southerly route to a more remunerative north-easterly one. Andrew Cayton and Peter Onuf have noted that "By 1853, only 29% of Midwestern trade went through New Orleans while more than 60% left via the Erie Canal," in Cayton and Onuf, *Midwest and the Nation*, 38.

[45] Joseph M. Hayes to Tipton, 22 May 1836, Tipton to Noah Noble, 16 September 1834, Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 7 February 1836, Tipton to Calvin Fletcher, 14 August 1836, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 277-80, 75-76, 223 (emphasis in original), 302-03 (emphasis in original).

[46] Tipton: Extract of Speech at Van Burn Meeting in Fort Wayne, Indianapolis *Indiana Journal*, sometime prior to 19 November 1836; the preceding was reprinted in *Tipton Papers,* vol. 3, 314-15; Tipton to Spear S. Tipton,

6 January 1836, Ibid., 202-03; see also Logansport *Canal Telegraph*, 5 December 1835; Tipton's genealogy indicates that his son, William Henry Harrison Tipton, died in infancy, see Ibid., vol. 1, xvii.

[47] John Tyler to Tipton, 15 May 1837, James F. D. Lanier to Tipton, 27 May 1837, Calvin Fletcher to Tipton, 27 August 1837, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 401-02, 403-03, 428-30; Tipton: Speech on the Subtreasury Bill, 23 September 1837, reprinted in Ibid., 439-45; the preceding was originally published in *Congressional Debates,* 25 Cong., 1 sess., cols. 244-47; a good description of the roots and consequences of the Panic of 1837 is found in James A. Henretta, et al, *America's History*, 4th ed. (Boston: Bedford St. Martins, 2000), 370-72; because of the persistent economic depression, Congress was called into a special session on 4 September 1837.

[48] Indiana historian James Madison points out that "Removal was the logical consequence" of land cession treaties by virtue of the shrinking Native American land base they created in Madison, *Indiana Way*, 122-26; Madison also reiterates that "All argued that removal was in the best interests of the Indians" whose relationship with whites in Indiana, as Tipton's career as federal Indian Agent attested to, was clearly disadvantageous if not outright destructive to them, in Ibid; Reginald Horsman, "The Indian Policy of an Empire for Liberty," in Frederick E. Hoxie, ed., et al, *Native Americans and the Early Republic* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999), 61; James Merrell makes the important observation that by 1840 "widespread face-to-face contacts between Natives and whites were a thing of the past; never again would Indians occupy so central a place in American life," in James H. Merrell, "American Nations, Old and New: Reflections on Indians and the Early Republic," in Hoxie, *Native Americans and the Early Republic*, 338.

[49] Tipton to Isaac McCoy, 11 October 1837, Carey A. Harris to Tipton, 28 April 1837, Tipton to Carey A. Harris, 25 June 1837, Tipton to Carey A. Harris, 29 June 1837, Carey A. Harris, 10 July 1837, Isaac McCoy to Tipton, 29 May 1837, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 451-52 (emphasis in original), 397, 410, 412-13, 413-14, 405-07 respectively; see also Anthony L. Davis to Tipton, 8 May 1837, Ibid., 398-99.

[50] Isaac McCoy to Tipton, 20 July 1837, Isaac McCoy to Tipton, 21 July 1837, Isaac McCoy to Tipton, 27 July 1837, Ibid., 416-19, 419-22, 423-25.

[51] Although subsequently tabled, Tipton had introduced an earlier bill to establish an Indian Territory as recorded in *Senate Documents*, 24 Cong., 1 sess., 3: no. 246 and 24 Cong., 2 sess., 1: no. 1: 383, *Senate Journal*, 24 Cong., 1 sess., 199,220, 404; Anthony L. Davis to Tipton, 2 March 1836, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3,

233-35 and 234n; see also Annie H. Abel, "Proposals for an Indian State, 1778-1878," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* 1 (1907): 89-104.

[52] Tipton: Speech on Indian Territory Bill, 18 April 1838, *Congressional Globe*, 25 Cong., 2 sess., Appendix, 269-74 and is reprinted in *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 594-614; see also *Congressional Globe*, 25 Cong., 2 sess., 318, 334-35, 338-41, 345-48, 351-52; an example of the often farcical nature of government dealings with Native American groups during the era of Removal, see Isaac McCoy to Tipton, 15 December 1837, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 474-75; Tipton's bill also spoke to the movement to induce administrative reforms in the area of Indian Affairs.

[53] David Wallace to Tipton, 27 August 1838, Tipton to David Wallact, 27 August 1838, Tipton to Edward A. Hannegan, 27 August 1838, George W. Ewing to Tipton, 28 August 1838, George W. Ewing to Tipton, 28 August 1838, William Polke to Tipton, 28 August 1838, Tipton to Alexis Coquillard, 28 August 1838, Tipton to William Reyburn et al., 28 August 1838, Tipton to David Wallace, 28 August 1838, George W. Ewing to Tipton, 29 August 1838, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 675, 676, 676-77, 677, 677-78, 678, 679, 679-80, 680-81, 681.

[54] Tipton to David Wallace, 31 August 1838, Appraisement of Corn in Indian Fields, 1 September 1838, Tipton to Carey A. Harris, 2 September 1838, Tipton to David Wallace, 2 September 1838, Tipton to Samuel Taber and James Nash, 3 September 1838, Tipton to David Wallace, 3 September 1838, Jordan Vigus to Tipton, 3 September 1838, Tipton to Carey A. Harris, 5 September 1838, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 5 September 1838, Tipton to David Wallace, 5 September 1838, Tipton to David Wallace, 5 September 1838, Abel C. Pepper to Carey A. Harris, 6 September 1838, Tipton and William Polke to Wagoners, 8 September 1838, Tipton to Carey A. Harris, 10 September 1838, Jacob Hull to Tipton, 11 September 1838, Tipton to Carey A. Harris, 12 September 1838, Tipton to Spear S. Tipton, 12 September 1838, Tipton to Carey A. Harris, 14 September 1838, William Polke to Abel C. Pepper, 15 September 1838, Tipton to David Wallace, 16 September 1838, Tipton to David Wallace, 18 September 1838, Tipton to Carey A. Harris, 19 September 1838, Tipton to Abel C. Pepper, 23 September 1838, William Polke to Tipton, 26 September 1838, Ibid., 683, 683-85, 685-86, 687-88, 689-690, 690, 690-91, 691-92, 692-93, 693, 693-94, 696-97, 698, 698-99, 700, 702-03, 704, 706-07, 708-09, 710-11, 713-18, 718-20, 727-28, 730-31 (respectively); the official count of enrolled Potawatomi men, women, and children that Tipton led west was 859; Tipton's correspondence and reports comment on the prevalence of

sickness among the Indians although the Senator also observed that he believed it fairly equally corresponded to sickness among the same number of whites; the harshness of the emigration from another perspective is Irving McKee, *The Trail of Death: the Letters of Benjamin Marie Petit* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1941).

[55] Tipton to Carey A. Harris, 3 September 1838, Jordan Vigus to Tipton, 3 September 1838, Abel C. Pepper to Carey A. Harris, 13 September 1838, Edward A. Hannegan et al to Tipton, 6 September 1838, Tipton to Carey A. Harris, 27 September 1838, *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 688-89, 694, 707-08, 695, 731-32.

[56] Isaac McCoy to Tipton, 8 November 1838, Tipton to William J. Brown, 12 November 1838, Ibid., 763-64 (emphasis in original), 764-65.

[57] Tipton to Editor, Logansport *Herald*, 28 February 1839, and is reprinted in *Tipton Papers*, vol. 3, 813-16; Calvin Fletcher to Tipton, 19 March 1839, Ibid., 825-26; Tipton's obituary is reprinted in Ibid., 832, and originally appeared in Logansport *Herald*, 6 April 1839.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Epilogue

Following the sudden death of John Tipton in 1839, whatever direction the path of the emerging American Midwest, especially Indiana, would now lay out for itself would flow from many of the events and activities that were associated with the pioneer-turned-Senator and his generation. They were uniquely situated in place and time to offer the perspective of life at the vanguard of westward expansion. Tipton's male and female cohorts cultivated a wilderness, sowed the seeds of commercial agriculture, created rural towns and communities, built local and regional economies, pursued the objects of their goals (material, financial, and others) with a vigor not always accompanied by thoughts about consequences, and constructed complex relationships within and outside of their racial groups. In the process, they transformed the undeveloped West as a hinterland into a new American region that gained in importance to the rest of the nation. At the time of the Senator's death, Indiana had been a state only twenty-three years. As Tipton's life exemplified and his extensive correspondence reveals, the first four decades of the nineteenth century constantly formed the backdrop of what he once referred to as "altered times," a force of insistent change that kept altering the landscape of geography and relations. Tipton assumed an important role in extending, defining, and leading the West of the early republic, while also infusing it with multi-level boundaries and meanings. From the outset the region was beset with and shaped by waves of anxieties and complexities as its residents worked to negotiate a concurrent existence. John Tipton's life demonstrates just how very difficult and one-sided that was.

REFERENCES CITED AND CONSULTED--BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

Tipton, John. Papers. Indiana State Library, Indiana Division, Indianapolis.

Corlis-Respess Family. Papers. Filson Special Collections, Filson Historical Society, Louisville.

English, William H. Collection. Indiana Historical Society, Indianapolis.

Harrison County Records, Courthouse, Corydon, IN. Microfilm records in Indiana State Library, Archives Division.
Circuit Court. *Order Book, 1817-1820.*
Commissioners' Records, 1817-1824. Typed transcript by Works Projects Admin., in Indiana Stat Library.
Deed Book, A, B.
Record of the Court of Common Pleas, Minute Book, 1809-1812; Minute Book, 1811-1814.
Estray Records, 1809-1817.
Marriage Records, 1809-1817.

McCoy, Isaac. Papers. Photocopies in Indiana State Library, Indiana Division, from originals in the Kansas State Historical Society.

PRIMARY SOURCES—PUBLISHED GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

Carter, Clarence E. ed. *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, vols. 1-3. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1934.

Commager, Henry Steele, ed. *Documents of American History,* 7th ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

Dunn, Jacob Piatt. *Slavery Petitions and Papers.* Indiana Historical Society Publications, vol. 2. Indianapolis: Bowen-Merrill Co., 1894.

Esarey, Logan, ed., *Messages and Letters of William Henry Harrison,* vol. 1, 1800-1811. New York: Arno Press, 1975.

_____ *Messages and Letters of William Henry Harrison,* vol. 2, 1812-1816. New York: Arno Press, 1975.

_____ *Messages and Papers of Jonathan Jennings, Ratliff Boon, and William Hendricks, 1816-1825*, vol. 3 of *Governor's Messages and Letters.* Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1924.

Ewbank, Louis B. and Dorothy L. Riker, eds. *Laws of Indiana Territory, 1809-1816,* vol xx. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1934.

Hawkins, Herbert H., comp. *Indiana's Road to Statehood: A Documentary Record.* Indianapolis: Indiana Sesquicentennial Commission, 1964.

Heitman, Francis Bernard. *Historical Register and Dictionary of the U.S. Army.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1903.

Indiana. *House Journal*, 1823-1839.

Indiana. *Senate Journal*, 1823-1839.

Kappler, Charles, ed. *Indian Treaties, 1778-1883,* 2 vols. New York: Interland Publishing Company, 1972.

Pease, Theodore Calvin, ed. *Laws of the Northwest Territory, 1788-1800*, vol. xvii. Springfield, IL: Trustees of the Illinois State Historical Library, 1925.

Peters, Richard, comp. *Reports of the Cases Argued and Adjudged in the Supreme Court of the United States*. January Term, 1829. 3rd ed. New York: Banks Law Pub. Co., 1883.

Philbrick, Francis S., ed. *Laws of Indiana Territory, 1801-1809,* vol. xxi. Springfield, IL: Trustees of the Illinois State Historical Society, 1930.

Prucha, Francis Paul, ed. *Documents of United States Indian Policy*. 2d ed., expanded. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990.

Riker, Dorothy. "Abstracts of Early Wills of Harrison County, Indiana," *Indiana Magazine of History* 37 (March 1941): 92-95.

Riker, Dorothy, ed., *Executive Proceedings of the State of Indiana, 1816-1836,* vol. 29. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1947.

_____ *Messages and Papers Relating to the Administration of David Wallace: Governor of Indiana, 1837-1840.* Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1963.

Riker, Dorothy and Gayle Thornbrough, eds. *Messages and Papers Relating to the Administration of James Brown Ray, Governor of Indiana, 1825-1831.* Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1954.

Royce, Charles, ed. *Indian Land Cessions in the United States.* U.S. Bureau of American Ethnology, Annual Report, 1896-1897, 2 pts. Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1899.

Thornbrough, Gayle, ed. *Letterbook of the Indian Agency at Fort Wayne, 1809-1815.* Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society Publications, vol. 21, 1961.

Thornbrough, Gayle and Dorothy Riker, eds. *Journals of the General Assembly of Indiana Territory, 1805-1815.* Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1950.

United States. *American State Papers*: Indian Affairs, 2 vols., 1832-1839; Military Affairs, 7 vols., 1832-1861; Public Lands, 8 vols., 1832-1861. Washington, D.C.: Gales and Seaten, 1858-1859.

_____ *Annals of Congress,* 18 Congress, 1 Session, 1823-1824.

_____ *Congressional Debates*, 19 Congress to 25 Congress.

_____ *Congressional Globe,* 23 Congress, 2 Session to 25 Congress, 3 Session.

_____ *Statutes at Large,* 3, 4, 5, 7.

United States Congress. Senate. *Investigation of the Removal of Indian Agency from Fort Wayne to Logansport.* 20th Cong., 1st sess., v. 5, S. Doc. 189. Serial 167.

_____ *Progress in Civilizing the Indians in Last 8 Years.* 21st Cong., 1st sess., v. 2, S. Doc. 110. Serial 193.

_____ *Correspondence on the Subject of the Emigration of the Indians, 1831-1833.* 23rd Cong., 1st sess., v. 23, S. Doc. 512. Serial 244-248.

United States Treasury Department. *A Statement of the Arts and Manufactures of the United States of America for the Year 1810.* Philadelphia: A. Cornman, 1814.

Woollen, William Wesley, Daniel Wait Howe, and Jacob Piatt Dunn, eds. *Executive Journal of Indiana Territory,* vol. III, number III. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society Publications, 1900.

NEWSPAPERS

Niles' Weekly Register
Washington *Globe.*
Washington *Intelligencer.*

Corydon *Indiana Gazette.*
Indianapolis *Gazette.*
Indianapolis *Indiana Democrat.*
Indianapolis *Indiana Journal.*
Lawrenceburg *Indiana Palladium.*
Logansport *Canal Telegraph.*
Logansport *Cass County Times.*
Logansport *Herald.*
Logansport *Potawattimie & Miami Times.*
Logansport *Republican and Indiana Herald.*
Madison *Indiana Republican.*
Vincennes *Western Sun.*
Vincennes *Western Sun and General Advertiser.*

PRIMARY SOURCES—PUBLISHED ACCOUNTS, WRITINGS, AND COLLECTIONS

"A Military Circular of 1812." *Indiana Magazine of History* 2 (December 1906): 185-86.

Barba, Preston A., ed. "Steam-boating on the Ohio and Mississippi Before the Civil War: Memoirs of Capt. Wilson Daniels, of Troy, Indiana." *Indiana Magazine of History* 2 (June 1915): 99-127.

Barnes, Lela, ed. "Journal of Isaac McCoy for the Exploring Expedition of 1828." *Kansas Historical Quarterly* 5 (August 1936): 227-77.

Barnhart, John D. "Letters of William H. Harrison to Thomas Worthington, 1799-1813." *Indiana Magazine of History* 47 (March 1951): 53-84.

"The Battle of Tippecanoe as Described by Judge Isaac Naylor, a Participant—a Recently Discovered Account." *Indiana Magazine of History* 2 (December 1906): 163-69.

"Battlefield of Tippecanoe." *Indiana Magazine of History* 2 (September 1906): 163.

Beggs, S. R. *Pages from the Early History of the West and North-West.* Cincinnati: Methodist Book Concern, 1868.

Beldon, Roy H. *The Collings Story of the Pigeon Roost Massacre.* Crothersville, IN: R.H. Beldon, 1957.

Bergh, Albert Ellery. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson.* vol. x. Washington: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Assoc., 1903.

Bolton, Nathaniel. *A Lecture Delivered Before the Indiana Historical Society on the Early History of Indianapolis and Central Indiana.* Indianapolis: Austin H. Brown, Printer, 1853.

Brice, Wallace A. *History of Fort Wayne: From the Earliest Known Accounts*. Fort Wayne, IN: D. W. Jones & Son, 1868.

Brown, Samuel R. *The Western Gazetteer; or Emigrant's Directory*. Auburn, New York: H.C. Southwick, 1817.

Bruce, William. "Memoirs of the Bruce Family." *Indiana Magazine of History* 23 (March 1927): 63-69.

Carlson, Richard G., ed. "George P. Peters' Version of the Battle of Tippecanoe (November 7, 1811)." *Vermont History* 45 (Winter 1977): 38-43.

Cass, Lewis. "Removal of the Indians." *North American Review* 30 (1830): 62-121.

Cockrum, William M. *Pioneer History of Indiana Including Stories, Incidents and Customs of the Early Settlers*. Oakland City, IN: Press of Oakland City Journal, 1907.

Cox, Isaac Joslin, ed. "Selections from the Torrence Papers, III." *Quarterly Publication of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio* 2 (July-September 1907): 97-66.

Crawford, Mary M. ed. "Mrs. Lydia B. Bacon's Journal, 1811-1812." *Indiana Magazine of History* 40 (December 1944): 367-86.

Dillon, John B. *A History of Indiana, From its Earliest Exploration*. Indianapolis: Bingham & Doughty, 1859.

_____. *The National Decline of the Miami Indians*. Indiana Historical Society Publications, vol. 1. Indianapolis: Bowen-Merrill Co., 1897.

"Documents: Correspondence on Indian Removal, Indiana, 1835-1838." *MidAmerica* 15 (January 1933): 177-92.

Duncan, Robert B. "Old Settlers." *Indiana Historical Society Publications*. 2 (1894): 376-402.

Espy, Josiah. "Memorandums of a Tour by Josiah Espy in the States of Ohio and Kentucky and Indiana Territory in 1805." *Ohio Valley Historical Series Miscellanies*. 1 (1870): 1-26.

"The Expeditions of Major-General Samuel Hopkins up the Wabash, 1812; The Letters of Captain Robert Hamilton." *Indiana Magazine of History* 43 (December 1947): 393-402.

Gibson, John. "Some Letters of John Gibson." *Indiana Magazine of History* 1 (September 1905):

Hopkins, Thomas M. *Reminiscences of Col. John Ketcham.* Bloomington, IN: Whitaker and Walker, 1866; reprint, New York: Garland Pub., 1977.

Howells, William Cooper. *Recollections of Life in Ohio, From 1813 to 1840.* Cincinnati: Robert Clarke Co., 1895.

Jackson, Donald, ed. *Letters of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, With Related Documents, 1783-1854.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1962.

Jakle, John A. *Images of the Ohio Valley: A Historical Geography of Travel, 1740-1860.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

"John Tipton's Tippecanoe Journal." *Indiana Magazine of History* 2 (December 1906): 170-84.

"Journal of an Emigrating Party of Pottawattomie Indians, 1838." *Indiana Magazine of History* 21 (December 1925): 315-36.

Kellar, Herbert A., ed. *Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturist, Selected Writings.* 2 vols. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1936.

Lindley, Harlow, ed. *Indiana As Seen By Early Travelers.* Indianapolis: Indian Historical Commission, 1916.

Martindale, Charles. "Loughery's Defeat and Pigeon Roost Massacre." *Indiana Historical Society Publications* 2 (1988): 97-134.

"The Massacre at Pigeon Roost." *Indiana History Bulletin* 53 (November-December 1976): 158-61.

McAfee, Robert B. *History of the Late War in the Western Country.* Bowling Green, OH: Historical Publications Co., 1919.

McCoy, Isaac. *History of Baptist Indian Missions: Embracing Remarks on the Former and Present Condition of Aboriginal Tribes, Their Former Settlement Within the Indian Territory and Their Future Prospects.* Washington, D.C.: William H. Morrison, 1840.

McDonald, Daniel. *A History of Freemasonry in Indiana From 1806-1898*. Indianapolis: The Grand Lodge, 1898.

McKee, Irving, ed. *The Trail of Death: Letters of Benjamin Marie Petit*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1941.

"Minutes of the Indiana Historical Society." *Proceedings of the Indiana Historical Society, 1830-1886*. Indiana Historical Society Publications. vol. 1. Indianapolis: Bowen-Merrill Co., 1897.

Moulton, Gary E., ed. *The Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition*. 13 vols. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983-2001.

Nowland, John H. B. *Early Reminiscences of Indianapolis*. Indianapolis: Sentinel Book and Job Printing House, 1870.

Paul, John Peter. *We Run the Canal Line: Being the Diary of John Peter Paul, a Member of the Party Engaged in the Preliminary Survey of the Wabash and Erie Canal in the Year 1827*. Crawfordsville, Indiana: R. E. Banter, 1933.

Pence, George and Nellie C. Armstrong. *Indiana Boundaries, Territory, State, and County*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1933.

"The Pigeon Roost Massacre: An Eyewitness Account." *Indiana History Bulletin* 53 (November-December 1976): 158-61.

Riker, Dorothy, ed. "Two Accounts of the Upper Wabash Country, 1819-20." *Indiana Magazine of History* 37 (December 1941): 384-95.

Robertson, Nellie Armstrong and Dorothy Riker, eds. *The John Tipton Papers,* vols. 1-3. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1942.

Schoolcraft, Henry Rowe. *Travels in the Central Portions of the Mississippi Valley*. New York: Collins and Hannay, 1825.

Scott, John. *The Indiana Gazetteer or Topographical Dictionary*. Centreville, IN: John Scott, 1826; reprint, Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1954.

Smith, Dwight L. "Notes on the Wabash River in 1795." *Indiana Magazine of History* 50 (September 1954): 277-90.

Thomas, David. *Travels Through the Western Country in the Summer of 1816*. New York: David Rumsey, 1819; reprint, Darien, CN: Hafner Pub. Co., 1970.

Thwaites, Reuben, ed. *Early Western Travels, 1748-1848.* 32 vols. Cleveland: Arthur C. Clark Co., 1904-1907.

"To Illinois in 1811." *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* 36 (1943): 208-10.

de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America.* New York: Adlard and Saunders, 1838; reprint, Phillips Bradley, ed., New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956.

Walker, Adam. "A Journal of Two Campaigns of the Fourth Regiment of the U.S. Infantry in the Michigan and Indiana Territories." In *Messages and Letters of Harrison*, ed. Esarey. vol. 2. New York: Arno Press, 1975.

Walker, Joseph E., ed. "Plowshares and Pruning Hooks for the Miami and Potawatomi: The Journal of Gerard T. Hopkins, 1804." *Ohio History* 88 (Autumn 1979): 361-407.

Watts, Florence G., ed. "Lieutenant Charles Larrabee's Account of the Battle of Tippecanoe, 1811." *Indiana Magazine of History* 57 (September 1961): 225-47.

Whickar, J. Wesley, ed. "Shabonee's Account of Tippecanoe." *Indiana Magazine of History* 17 (December 1921): 353-63.

Williams, Samuel. "Two Campaigns in the War of 1812-13." *Ohio Valley Historical Series. Miscellanies.* no. 2. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co., 1870.

Winter, George. *The Journals and Indian Paintings of George Winter, 1837-1839.* Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1948.

Wood, Aaron. *Sketches of Things and People in Indiana.* Indianapolis: J. M. Olcott, Publ., 1883.

THESES AND DISSERTATIONS

Anson, Bert. "The Fur Traders in Northern Indiana, 1796-1850." Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1953.

Collins, William Frederick. "John Tipton and the Indians of the Old Northwest." Ph.D. diss., Purdue University, 1997.

Hisey, Stella Josephine. "Harrison County 1808-1825." Master's thesis, Indiana University, 1936.

Nation, Richard Franklin. "Home in the Hoosier Hills: Agriculture, Politics, and Religion in Southern Indiana, 1810-1870." Ph.D. diss, University of Michigan, 1995.

Richardson, Willis. "History of the Wabash and Erie Canal." Master's thesis. Indiana University, 1925.

Skinkiwiller, William F. "The Land Office Business in Indiana." Master's thesis, Indiana University, 1950.

Smith, Dwight L. "Indiana Land Cessions in the Old Northwest." Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1949.

Warner, John P. "The Influence of the Wabash and Erie Canal on the Development of Two Northern Indiana Communities, 1830-1860." Master's thesis. Indiana University, 1996.

SECONDARY STUDIES--Books

Antal, Sandy. *A Wampum Denied: Proctor's War of 1812.* Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1997.

Barnhart, John D. and Dorothy L. Riker. *Indiana to 1816.* Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau and Indiana Historical Society, 1971.

Barnhart, John D. and Donald Carmony. *Indiana: From Frontier to Industrial Commonwealth.* 4 vols. New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co., 1954.

Bigham, Darrel E. *The Indiana Territory, 1800-2000: A Bicentennial Perspective.* Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 2001.

Buley, R. Carlyle. *The Old Northwest: Pioneer Period 1815-1840.* 2 vols. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1951.

Cayton, Andrew R. L. *Frontier Indiana.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.

_____. *The Frontier Republic: Ideology and Politics in the Ohio Country, 1780-1825.* Kent: Kent State University Press, 1986.

Cayton, Andrew R. L. and Peter S. Onuf. *The Midwest and the Nation: Rethinking the History of an American Region.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.

Clark, John G. *The Grain Trade in the Old Northwest.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1966.

Clarke, Charles G. *Men of the Lewis and Clark Expedition.* Glendale: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1970.

Coontz, Stephanie. *The Social Origins of Private Life: A History of American Families, 1600-1900.* London: Verso, 1998.

Cott, Nancy F. *The Bonds of Womanhood: 'Woman's Sphere' in New England, 1780-1835.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

Degler, Carl N. *At Odds: Women and the Family in America From the Revolution to the Present.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Drake, Benjamin. *Life of Tecumseh.* Cincinnati: E. Morgan, 1841; reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1969.

Edmonds, R. David. *The Potawatomis: Keepers of the Fire.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1978.

_____. *The Shawnee Prophet.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983.

_____. *Tecumseh and the Quest for Indiana Leadership.* Boston: Little, Brown, Co., 1984.

Esarey, Logan. *History of Indiana, From Its Exploration to 1922.* Dayton: Dayton Historical Publishing Co., 1923.

_____. *Internal Improvements in Early Indiana.* Indiana Historical Society Publications, vol. 5. Indianapolis: Edward J. Hecker, 1912.

Etcheson, Nicole. *The Emerging Midwest: Upland Southerners and the Political Culture of the Old Northwest, 1787-1861.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.

Faragher, John Mack. *Sugar Creek: Life on the Illinois Prairie.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

_____. *Women and Men on the Overland Trail.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Fatout, Paul. *Indiana Canals.* West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Studies, 1972.

Ferris, Ezra. *The Early Settlement of the Miami Country.* Indiana Historical Society Publications, vol. 1. Indianapolis: Bowen-Merrill Co., 1897.

Frank, Stephen M. *Life With Father: Parenthood and Masculinity in the Nineteenth-Century American North.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1998.

Griswold, Bert J. *Pictorial History of Fort Wayne, Indiana.* 2 vols. Chicago: Robert O. Law Co., 1917.

Griswold, Robert L. *Fatherhood in America: A History*. New York: Basic Books, 1993.

Harmon, George Dewey. *Sixty Years of Indian Affairs: Political, Economic, and Diplomatic, 1789-1850*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941.

Hauptman, Laurence M. *Conspiracy of Interests: Iroquois Dispossession and the Rise of New York State*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1999.

Hickey, Donald R. *The War of 1812: A Forgotten Conflict*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989.

Hoffman, Ronald and Peter J. Albert. eds. *Launching the 'Extended Republic': The Federalist Era*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1996.

Horsman, Reginald. *Expansion and American Indian Policy, 1783-1812*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1967.

Howe, Daniel Howe. *Laws and Courts of Northwest and Indiana Territories*. Indiana Historical Society Publications, vol. 2. Indianapolis: Bowen-Merrill, 1895.

_____. *Making a Capital in the Wilderness*. Indiana Historical Society Publications, vol. 4. Indianpolis: Edward J. Hecker, 1908.

Hoxie, Frederick E., Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, eds. *Native Americans and the New Republic*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999.

Hurt, R. Douglas. *Indian Agriculture in America: Prehistory to the Present*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1987.

_____. *The Indian Frontier, 1763-1846*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002.

_____. *The Ohio Frontier: Crucible of the Old Northwest, 1720-1830*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.

Jabour, Anya. *Marriage in the Early Republic: Elizabeth and William Wirt and the Companionate Ideal*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1998.

Johansen, Shawn. *Family Men: Middle-Class Fatherhood in Industrializing America*. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Kerber, Linda K. *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America*. Williamsburg: Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1980.

Kett, Joseph K. *Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to Present*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Larson, John Lauritz. *Internal Improvement: National Public Works and the Promise of Popular Government in the Early United States*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Lewis, Jan. *The Pursuit of Happiness: Family and Values in Jefferson's Virginia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Madison, James H. *The Indiana Way*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Mangan, J.A. and James Walvin, eds. *Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.

McCollough, Alameda, ed. *The Battle of Tippecanoe: Conflict of Cultures*. Lafayette, IN: Tippecanoe County Historical Association, 1988.

Mintz, Steven and Susan Kellogg. *Domestic Revolutions: A Social History of American Family Life*. New York: Free Press, 1988.

Mitchell, Lee Clark. *Witnesses to a Vanishing America: The Nineteenth-Century Response*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Morris, Larry E. *The Fate of the Corps: What Became of the Lewis and Clark Explorers After the Expedition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

Onuf, Peter S. *Statehood and Union: A History of the Northwest Ordinance*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Opie, John. *The Law of the Land: Two Hundred Years of American Farmland Policy*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994.

Osterud, Nancy Grey. *Bonds of Community: The Lives of Farm Women in Nineteenth-Century New York*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Pirtle, Alfred. *The Battle of Tippecanoe*. Filson Club Publications, no. 15. Louisville: John P. Morgan and Co., 1900.

Prucha, Francis Paul. *American Indian Policy in the Formative Years: The Indian Trade and Intercourse Acts*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970.

_____. *Broadax and Bayonet: The Role of the United States Army in the Development of the Northwest, 1815-1860*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995.

_____. *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians.* Abridged ed. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986.

Pugh, David G. *Sons of Liberty: The Masculine Mind in Nineteenth-Century America.* Westport: Greenwood Press, 1983.

Rafert, Stewart, *The Miami Indians of Indiana: A Persistent People, 1654-1994.* Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1996.

Remini, Robert V. *Andrew Jackson and His Indian Wars.* New York: Viking, 2001.

Reyhner, Jon and Jeanne Eder. *American Indian Education: A History.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004.

Richter, Daniel K. "'Believing That Many of the Red People Suffer Much for the Want of Food': Hunting, Agriculture, and a Quaker Construction of Indianness in the Early Republic." *Journal of the Early Republic* 19 (Winter 1999): 601-28.

Riley, Glenda. *The Female Frontier: A Comparative View of Women on the Prairie and the Plains.* Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1988.

Rohrbough, Malcolm J. *The Land Office Business: The Settlement and Administration of American Public Lands, 1789-1837.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

_____. *The Trans-Appalachian Frontier: People, Societies, and Institutions, 1775-1850.* Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1968.

Roose, William H. *Indiana's Birthplace: A History of Harrison County Indiana.* New Albany, IN: Tribune Co., Printers, 1911; reprint, revised by Arville L. Funk, Chicago: Adams Press, 1966.

Rosenberg, Charles E. *The Cholera Years: The United States in 1832, 1848, and 1866.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Rotundo, E. Anthony. *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity From the Revolution in the Modern Era.* New York: Basic Books, 1993.

Ryan, Mary. *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Scheiber, Harry N. *Ohio Canal Era: A Case Study of Government and the Economy, 1820-1861.* Athens: Ohio University Press, 1969.

Schlesinger, Arthur Meier. *The Age of Jackson.* New York: Little, Brown, and Co., 1945.

Sellers, Charles. *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Shaw, Ronald E. *Canals For A Nation: The Canal Era in the United States, 1790-1860.* Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1990.

Sheriff, Carol. *The Artificial River: The Erie Canal and the Paradox of Progress, 1817-1862.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1996.

Taylor, George Rogers. *The Transportation Revolution, 1815-1860.* New York: Harper and Row, 1951.

Thompson, Dave O. *One Hundred and Fifty Years of Indiana Agriculture.* Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1969.

Thornbrough, Emma Lou. *The Negro in Indiana: A Study of a Minority.* Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1957.

Transportation and the Early Nation: Papers Presented at an Indiana American Revolution Bicentennial Symposium. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1982.

Trennert, Robert A. *Indian Traders on the Middle Border: The House of Ewing, 1827-1854.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1981.

Wallace, Anthony F. C. *Jefferson and the Indians: The Tragic Fate of the First Americans.* Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999.

Webster, Homer J. *William Henry Harrison's Administration of Indiana Territory.* Indiana Historical Society Publications, vol. iv. Indianapolis: Sentinel Printing Co., 1907.

White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Wilson, George R. *Early Indiana Trails and Surveys.* Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society Publications, 1919; reprint, 1991.

Wishy, Bernard. *The Child and the Republic: The Dawn of Modern American Child Nurture.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968.

Woehrmann, Paul. *At the Headwaters of the Maumee: A History of the Forts of Fort Wayne.* Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1971.

Woollen, William Wesley. *Biographical and Historical Sketches of Early Indiana.* Indianapolis: Hammond & Co., 1883.

SECONDARY STUDIES—Articles and Chapters

Abel, Annie H. "Proposals for an Indian State, 1778-1878." *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* 1 (1907): 89-104.

Adelman, Jeremy and Stephen Aron. "From Borderlands to Borders: Empires, Nation-States, and the Peoples in Between in North American History." *The American Historical Review* 104 (June 1999): 814-41.

Aley, Ginette. "'Bringing About the Dawn': Agriculture, Internal Improvement, Indian Policy, and Euro-American Hegemony in the Old Northwest, 1800-1846." In Daniel P. Barr, ed., *The Boundaries Between Us: Natives, Newcomers, and the Struggle for the Old Northwest, 1740-1840.* Kent: Kent State University Press, 2005, forthcoming.

_____. "Grist, Grit, and Rural Society in the Early Midwest: Insight Gleaned From Grain." *Ohio Valley History* 5 (Summer 2005 forthcoming).

Anson, Bert. "Variations of the Indian Conflict: The Effects of the Emigrant Indian Removal Policy, 1830-1854." *Missouri Historical Review* 59 (October 1964-July 1965): 64-89.

Barce, Elmer. "General Harrison and the Treaty of Fort Wayne, 1809." *Indiana Magazine of History* 11 (December 1915): 352-67.

Barker, William L. "Warrick County and the Northwest Territory." *Indiana Magazine of History* 24 (June 1928): 121-29.

Cammack, Eleanore A. "Notes on Wabash River Steamboating: Early Lafayette." *Indiana Magazine of History* 50 (March 1954): 35-50.

Campbell, John T. "Some Comments on Tipton's Journal." *Indiana Magazine of History* 3 (March 1907): 30-33.

Carmony, Donald F. "Indiana Territorial Expenditures, 1800-1816." *Indiana Magazine of History* 39 (September 1943): 237-62.

Cayton, Andrew R. L. "'Separate Interests' and the Nation-State: The Washington Administration and the Origins of Regionalism in the Trans-Appalachian West." *Journal of the American History* 79 (January 1992): 39-67.

Cave, Alfred A. "The Shawnee Prophet, Tecumseh, and Tippecanoe: A Case Study of Historical Myth-Making." *Journal of the Early Republic* 22 (Winter 2002): 637-73.

Eblen, Jack E. "An Analysis of Nineteenth-Century Frontier Populations." *Demography* 2 (1965): 399-413.

Evans, Nelson W. "The First Steamboat on the Ohio." *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Publications*. vol. xvi (1907): 310-15.

Fickle, James E. "The 'People' Versus 'Progress' in the Old Northwest: Local Opposition of the Wabash & Erie Canal." *The Old Northwest* 8 (Winter 1982-83): 309-328.

Finkelman, Paul. "Evading the Ordinance: The Persistence of Bondage in Indiana and Illinois." *Journal of the Early Republic* 9 (Spring 1989): 21-51.

_____. "Slavery and the Northwest Ordinance: A Study in Ambiguity." *Journal of the Early Republic* 6 (Winter 1986): 343-70.

Gallaher, Ruth. "The Indian Agent in the United States Before 1850." *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* 14 (1916): 3-55.

Gehret, Ellen J. and Alan G. Keyser. "Flax Processing in Pennsylvania From Seed to Fiber." *Pennsylvania Folklife* 22 (Autumn 1972): 10-34.

Giffin, William W. "Destruction of Delaware and Miami Towns in the Aftermath of the Battle of Tippecanoe: The Impact of Perspective on History." *Papers of the Algonquin Conference* (2000): 68-76.

Hauptman, Laurence M. "The Iroquois Indians and the Rise of the Empire State: Ditches, Defense, and Dispossession." *New York History* 79 (October 1998): 325-58.

"Historical and Picturesque Indiana, Clark County." *The Indianan* 5 (January 1900): 2-37.

Hockett, Leola. "The Wabash County Pioneer Society." *Indiana Magazine of History* 29 (December 1933): 287-96.

Horsman, Reginald. "American Indian Policy in the Old Northwest, 1783-1812." *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series. 18 (January 1961): 35-53.

_____. "The Dimensions of an 'Empire for Liberty': Expansion and Republicanism, 1775-1825." *Journal of the Early Republic* 9 (Spring 1989): 1-20.

Hurt, R. Douglas. "Historians and the Northwest Ordinance." *Western Historical Quarterly* 20 (August 1989): 261-80.

Lange, Robert E. "John Shields: Lewis and Clark's Handyman Gunsmith—Blacksmith—General Mechanic—For the Expedition." *We Proceeded On* 5 (July 1979): 14-16.

Lazenby, John C. "Jackson County Prior to 1850." *Indiana Magazine of History* 10 (September 1914): 255-78.

Lewis, G. Malcolm. "An Early Map on Skin of the Area Later to Become Indiana and Illinois." *The British Library Journal* 22 (Spring 1996): 66-87.

Lonn, Ella. "Ripples of the Black Hawk War in Northern Indiana." *Indiana Magazine of History* 20 (September 1924): 288-307.

Lynch, William O. "An Early Crisis in Indiana History." *Indiana Magazine of History* 43 (June 1947): 105-24.

McKee, Irving. "The Centennial of 'The Trail of Death.'" *Indiana Magazine of History* 35 (March 1939): 27-41.

Millett, Allan, R. "Caesar and the Conquest of the Northwest Territory: The Harrison Campaign, 1811." *Timeline* 14 (July-August 1997): 3-19.

Mitchell, Waldo G. "Indiana's Growth 1812-1820." *Indiana Magazine of History* 10 (December 1914):

Onuf, Peter S. "Liberty, Development, and Union: Visions of the West in the 1780s." *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series 43 (April 1986): 179-213.

Owens, Robert M. "Jeffersonian Benevolence on the Ground: The Indian Land Cession Treaties of William Henry Harrison." *Journal of the Early Republic* 22 (Fall 2002): 405-35.

Parsons, jr., Joseph A. "Civilizing the Indians of the Old Northwest, 1800-1810." *Indiana Magazine of History* 56 (September 1960): 195-216.

Pitcavage, Mark. "'Burthened in Defence of our Rights': Opposition to Military Service in Ohio During the War of 1812." *Ohio History* 104 (Summer-Autumn 1995): 142-62.

Prather, Geneal. "The Construction of the Michigan Road, 1830-1840." *Indiana Magazine of History* 40 (September 1944): 243-79.

Prucha, Francis Paul. "American Indian Policy in the 1840s: Visions of Reform." In *The Frontier Challenge: Responses to the Trans-Mississippi West*, ed. John G. Clark, 81-110. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1971.

Purcell, George W. "Collecting Taxes in Indiana Territory, 1797-1802." *Indiana Magazine of History* 40 (December 1944): 353-63.

Reid, Nina Kathleen Reid. "Sketches of Early Indiana Senators, IV, John Tipton." *Indiana Magazine of History* 9 (December 1913): 250-51.

Robertson, Nellie A. "John Hays and the Fort Wayne Indian Agency." *Indiana Magazine of History* 39 (September 1943): 221-36.

Sheehan, Bernard W. "Indian-White Relations in Early America: A Review Essay." *William and Mary Quarterly,* 3rd series 26 (April 1969): 267-86.

Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll. "The Female World of Love and Ritual: Relations Between Women in Nineteenth-Century America." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 1 (1975): 1-30.

Vogel, William Frederick. "Home Life in Early Indiana, part 1." *Indiana Magazine of History* 10 (June 1914): 1-29.

_____. "Home Life in Early Indiana, part 2." *Indiana Magazine of History* 10 (September 1914): 284-320.

Warrick, W. Sheridan. "The American Indian Policy in the Upper Old Northwest Following the War of 1812." *Ethnohistory* 3 (Spring 1956): 115-17.

Watson, Samuel J. "Flexible Gender Roles During the Market Revolution: Family, Friendship, Marriage, and Masculinity Among U.S. Army Officers, 1815-1846." *Journal of Social History* 29 (Fall 1995): 81-106.

Whickar, J. Wesley. "Tecumseh and Pushmataha." *Indiana Magazine of History* 18 (December 1922): 315-31.

Willig, Timothy D. "Prophetstown on the Wabash: The Native Spiritual Defense of the Old Northwest." *The Michigan Historical Review* 23 (Fall 1997): 115-58.

Wilson, George R. "The First Public Land Surveys in Indiana: Freeman's Lines." *Indiana Magazine of History* 12 (March 1916): 1-33.

Wilson, George R. and Gayle Thornbrough. "The Buffalo Trace." *Indiana Historical Society Publications*. vol. 15. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1946.