UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA PRESS

Untangling the Roots of Dependency: Choctaw Economics, 1700-1860

Author(s): Stephen P. van Hoak

Source: *American Indian Quarterly*, Summer - Autumn, 1999, Vol. 23, No. 3/4 (Summer - Autumn, 1999), pp. 113-128

Published by: University of Nebraska Press

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/1185831

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

University of Nebraska Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Indian Quarterly*

JSTOR

This content downloaded from 149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Untangling the Roots of Dependency

Choctaw Economics, 1700–1860

STEPHEN P. VAN HOAK

The Roots of Dependency, published in 1983, was a groundbreaking interdisciplinary examination of Euro-American-Indian cultural contact and its disastrous effects on Native Americans. Focusing on the Choctaws, Pawnees, and Navajos, Richard White attempted to identify and isolate the various factors that contributed to the material decline of American Indian peoples. *Roots of Dependency* was widely acclaimed when it was first published, both for White's strong thesis and his new approach to Native American history. White's methodology differed from that of traditional historians most notably in his interdisciplinary approach and in his incorporation of a Native American focus and perspective into his narrative.[1]

White began his study by examining the Mississippi Choctaw of the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, showing how their initial adaptations to Euro-American influences eventually turned to disaster. As Euro-American market forces penetrated their economy, the Choctaws were driven to overhunt deer populations to extinction and in the process destroyed their resources, environment, and economy. Although he also cited alcohol as a major element of this decline, White asserted that the Euro-American market economy was the "critical" factor in understanding the "fate" of the Choctaws. White claimed that the Choctaws "were lured into the market" by liquor, that the subsequent exchanges "were literally dictated by whites," and that ultimately "commerce . . . left them hungry and vulnerable." White further asserted that Choctaw resistance was rendered "utterly superfluous" and that their actions served only to slow the destructive consequences of the market economy. By the 1770s, according to White, the Choctaws had become dependent upon Euro-Americans to adequately feed and clothe themselves.[2]

Stephen P. Van Hoak is currently a graduate student of history in the Ph.D. program at the University of Oklahoma.

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

White's materialist thesis was based on the modern world systems theory that became fashionable in the 1970s. This theory, as posited by Immanuel Wallerstein, centered around the relationship between underdeveloped "peripheral" regions and capitalist "core" regions. According to Wallerstein, as peripheral regions are drawn into the global market they become subject to an increasingly unequal and exploitative commercial exchange with core nations. This unequal exchange eventually causes the peripheral regions to become "dependent" on the core regions, lacking any other viable economic choices. In White's work the core regions were the European powers of the eighteenth century, while the peripheral regions were Native American peoples, including the Choctaws.[3] Armed with this theoretical framework, White asserted that

> For the Choctaws as a whole, trade and market meant not wealth but impoverishment, not well-being but dependency, and not progress but exile and dispossession. They never fought the Americans; they were never conquered. Instead, through the market they were made dependent and dispossessed.[4]

In recent years Richard White has shifted his focus from dependency theory and begun to examine commonality and accommodation between American Indians and Euro-Americans. In *The Middle Ground* White asserts that the Native Americans of the Great Lakes region were able, throughout the seventeenth and most of the eighteenth century, to forge a relationship with Euro-Americans that was at least partially realized on the Indians' own terms. Despite his new emphasis, however, the Native Americans of White's "middle ground" still eventually succumbed to economic dependency by the late eighteenth century. His definitions and explanations of dependency are strikingly similar to those used in *Roots of Dependency*. White is not alone in his support of his earlier study; other historians, with few exceptions, have also refrained from directly challenging White's work.[5]

The idea that the Euro-American market had disastrous economic and environmental consequences for Native Americans is a popular one. But recent scholars have begun to question why American Indians and other peoples of diverse races, ethnicity, and genders have predominantly been portrayed as victims of the market. Were a few elite Euro-Americans really the only people to prosper and benefit from commerce and the "world market"? Historian R. David Edmunds has reminded historians that American Indians were not new to the processes of the market, but rather had a long history of specialized and complex trade prior to Euro-American contact. Bradley Birzer has recently shown that many Native Americans and Western people of color embraced entrepreneurship, some using voluntary associations to prevent economic stratification and to temper the volatility of the market. Birzer demonstrates

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

that non-Anglos have traditionally been given little credit for their ability to adapt to changing economic conditions and markets. Ironically, borrowing from Richard White's concept of a "middle ground," Birzer argues that native peoples were creative and energetic in finding new ways to make the market work for them. Historian Daniel H. Usner has similarly found that Indians from the region of the Mississippi responded to the changing market with a "resourceful adaptability . . . too often neglected by historians."[6]

This essay will survey postcolonial Choctaw history and reevaluate *Roots of Dependency*, focusing on the three primary weaknesses in White's materialist argument. First, and most fundamental, the Choctaws did not emerge from the eighteenth century an impoverished and economically dependent people. By vacillating in their allegiance between rival European powers, by vigorously combating the scourge of chemical dependency, and by shifting their subsistence strategy to better exploit their changing environment the Choctaws were able to maintain their economic independence both before and after the abrupt end of White's story in 1830. Second, White failed to identify the strong rhetorical element in self-abasing Choctaw speeches, instead misinterpreting such speeches as evidence of Choctaw dependency. Third, White's linking of liquor with the Euro-American market in his analysis was misleading—alcohol was neither an inevitable nor a permanent consequence of trade and commerce. Although many Euro-Americans certainly used alcohol as a tool to manipulate commercial benefits, the Choctaws *chose* to consume liquor and *chose* to combat its use after the deadly effects of its consumption became apparent. By understanding that their problems arose from chemical dependency and not from the Euro-American market as a whole, they continued their long history of trade by seizing the benefits of commerce even as they increasingly resisted the negative effects of the Euro-American market such as alcohol. This essay will show the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to be a time when the Choctaws began a long series of eventually successful economic adaptations, rather than as a time that saw the culmination of a futile Choctaw struggle against capitalist market forces and dependency.[7]

When the French colonized Louisiana in 1699 they began an extended period of friendly relations and trade with the Choctaws. Welcoming their new neighbors, the Choctaws exchanged easily obtained deer skins with the French for guns, ammunition, cloth, metal goods, jewelry, and blankets. But gift-giving and reciprocity, more than trade, characterized the Choctaw-French relationship; the exchange was not always "equal" nor subject to modern Western economic concepts of supply and demand. In annual Indian "congresses" French officials presented certain honored Choctaw chiefs—"medal" chiefs—with lavish "presents," receiving only their goodwill in exchange.[8]

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

By 1729 the English also began to entreat the Choctaws as potential trading partners and allies. The Choctaw accepted the English, who were often able to offer goods of higher quality and lower price than the French. But even more important, many Choctaws realized that they could use the intense rivalry between the English and French to their advantage. By alternating their allegiances between rival powers they ensured themselves the best possible trading relationships. Claiming themselves to be "poor" and without the "time to kill skins to buy ammunition or clothes," Choctaws offered their loyalties "if the presents" were "speedily sent." If gifts were not received they often switched their loyalty to the rival European power, claiming that their previous ally had "made large promises, but never performed them" and offering their friendship to the new power if they could supply the desired presents. Such gifts relieved many Choctaws of the need to hunt and barter skins for Euro-American goods; the value of presents was often the equivalent to the proceeds of an entire season's hunt.[9]

The Choctaws successfully employed the "play off" until 1763, when the French ceded away their North American territories. In November of that year English officer Maj. Robert Farmar met with the Choctaws at Mobile and admonished them that they must no longer "run from one nation to another to carry and receive mischievous speeches," and further warned that presents would be given only to those who "deserve them." High ranking English officials, despite contrary advice from both their subordinates and their French predecessors, sought to wean the Choctaws off the system of presents and convince them of their "dependence" on the English.[10]

But the Choctaws refused to allow the English to dictate the terms of their relationship. To help convince the English of the error of their new policy, many warriors began to assault and confiscate the goods of English traders, especially those who attempted to enforce Choctaw "debts." In 1772 the English convened an Indian congress in Mobile, the first held in almost seven years. Although the conference temporarily assuaged the Choctaws' anger, it did little to resolve fundamental problems. The speeches and promises of the officials and chiefs resembled those of previous congresses, and in a similar fashion poor relations between the Choctaw and English resumed shortly after the end of the conference. But Richard White, in *Roots of Dependency*, asserted that a new self-abasing rhetoric of dependency was noticeable in the speeches of the Choctaw chiefs in 1772. To White this was evidence that the Choctaws were becoming a dependent nation, their economy and resources having been decimated by the market forces of English trade, the end of the play off system, war with the Creeks, and the devastating effects of alcohol.[11]

The speeches of the Choctaw chiefs in the 1772 congress were certainly filled with rhetoric of dependency. Captain Ouma of Seneacha stated to the English

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

that "we are very poor and in want of ammunition," continuing that "we are ignorant and helpless as the beasts in the woods, incapable of making necessities for ourselves" and "our sole dependence is on you." Appapaye of Olitachas agreed that "our dependence is upon our Father [the English]." But this rhetoric was strikingly similar to that used by Choctaws in previous congresses. In 1765 Chief Chulust Amastabe declared to the English that he was "a poor ignorant savage, who has not even the means of subsisting his family." Such rhetoric was common even in the French era, when one Choctaw leader told the French that he hoped they would "look with pity on us and will share with us." Beginning with their earliest encounters with whites, the Choctaws used language both of self-abasement and of praise for those they were entreating. In 1540 Chief Tuscalusa sent a messenger to de Soto declaring that he—Tuscalusa—was "led captive by your perfections and power."[12]

"Good talks," as the Choctaws termed their speeches, were integral in Choctaw culture to friendly relations with the "other." Rhetoric of self-abasement and dependency was used to gain the confidence and goodwill of others, and was not reflective of an actual inability to provide for one's self or otherwise mold one's life. Oratory was a highly valued skill among Choctaw leaders, and young chiefs without such expertise were well aware of their deficiency. Choctaws were known by many Euro-Americans to be "great beggars," but most also knew that implicit in Choctaw self-abasing speeches was an assertion of responsibility on the part of the "father" to supply his "children" with presents. Implicit was the threat of conflict if the father did not fulfill his responsibilities to his children.[13] This was a threat that the English respected even while they were temporarily without apparent rivals in North America.

Richard White correctly observed that the Choctaw in the late eighteenth century were beset with a host of problems that threatened their survival, most notably alcohol. English traders, unlike the French traders before them, loaded their wagons predominantly with rum rather than ammunition, blankets, guns, cloth, knives, or other metal goods. The deerskin trade became a less effective way for the Choctaws to secure useful Euro-American goods, as liquor and chemical dependency began to be the only proceeds of the hunt for the Choctaws. White assessed the situation well, asserting that "rum controlled the pace of hunting" and "drunkenness was the final proceed of the hunt." Up to 80 percent of the proceeds of Choctaw hunts were being expended on rum, and English officials noted chronic drinking among the Choctaws, even to the point of death. Many Choctaws even found themselves in "debt" to English rum traders. Annual gifts had previously ensured that Choctaw warriors would receive at least some Euro-American products, but the English refused to convene Indian congresses on an annual basis.[14]

Chemical dependency also sparked massive overhunting of deer popula-

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

tions in the Choctaw nation. But considering the problems that were resulting from widespread alcohol abuse, a reduced deer population was likely beneficial to the Choctaws by minimizing the availability of skins to trade for rum. In any case many Choctaws compensated for the loss of deer meat in their diet by modifying their subsistence cycle. The Choctaws had always been a primarily agricultural people, with hunting serving only a secondary though important role in their subsistence system. Initially, as deer populations declined Choctaw warriors began to hunt further west, some traveling across the Mississippi on seasonal hunts in pursuit of game. The Choctaws integrated these distant hunts with horse raiding on the Great Plains, which served to enlarge their horse herds and thus further increased their mobility and range. But most Choctaws began to move away from hunting and compensated for the loss of deer by increasingly relying on agriculture and livestock herding to provide both for their subsistence as well as to generate a small surplus for trade.[15]

Choctaw leaders understood that liquor, not the Euro-American market, was the source of their problems. Choctaw Chief Mingo Emmitta, at the 1772 congress, pleaded with the English to stop the "pernicious practice" of liquor trading. In 1777 one Choctaw chief promised an English official that if he could stop the rum trade "you will well deserve to be forever looked upon as our Father and Benefactor." Despite these warnings and pleadings, however, English leaders proved unable to block the entrance of liquor dealers into the Choctaw Nation. By 1770 Bernard Romans noted that "the excess in spirituous liquors" of the Choctaw was "incredible."[16]

Even as they combated the negative effects of trade, the Choctaws continued to extract benefits from the market. Euro-American commerce continued to provide the Choctaws with useful goods including guns, ammunition, knives, blankets, and plows. Virtually all Choctaws produced at least a small surplus of cattle, agricultural products, or furs to acquire what Euro-American goods they sought. Choctaws raided for and bred horses, which were kept as a source of "disposable wealth" to be traded away or consumed during times of need. Some Choctaws even engaged in more traditionally Western economic endeavors, such as wage labor or the operation of roadside businesses that catered to white travelers.[17] Despite the contentions of Richard White there is no credible evidence of widespread impoverishment or significant social stratification among the Choctaws as a result of their exposure to the Euro-American market. "Full-bloods" as well as "mixed-bloods" participated in the changing Choctaw economy, though as historian Donna Akers has shown, such distinctions in Choctaw society based on racial purity are misleading. Though a small percentage of Choctaws began to move from a subsistence economy to an acquisitive capitalist system, they did not do so to the detriment of other Choctaws. In fact, those that acquired "wealth" often used it to help fund

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Choctaw schools or to otherwise help fellow Choctaws.[18]

A key element in understanding Choctaw resistance to Euro-American economic dependency is their refusal to become a fur trade–specialized society. Though they initially embraced the fur trade and significantly increased the pace of their hunting, agriculture continued to play the dominant role in their subsistence system. Thus when the alcohol trade and overhunting produced a scarcity of deer, the Choctaws were far less vulnerable to impoverishment and economic dependency than were other native societies that relied predominantly on hunting and gathering for their sustenance.[19] Through a variety of methods—agriculture, stock raising, horse trading, and entrepreneurship—the Choctaws gradually replaced hunting as the source of their trade goods and as their secondary source of sustenance that insulated them during times of drought and crop failure. The changing geopolitical landscape in the 1770s and 1780s furthered the Choctaws' efforts to preserve their economic independence.

The Choctaws took advantage of the American Revolution to renew the "play off" system, this time vacillating between the American-French-Spanish alliance and the English. When the English were defeated in 1783 the Indians quickly moved to play off the remaining Euro-American rivals in North America: Spain and the United States. Fueling the fears of the Spanish, some Choctaw leaders told Spanish officials about American efforts to win their loyalty but assured the Spanish they would remain loyal to their "father" if he continued to supply them with presents. Many Choctaws rejected trade altogether in favor of gifts, "defaulting" on Spanish traders from whom they had received goods but had not yet been "paid."[20]

Unfortunately for the Choctaws, the Treaty of San Lorenzo in 1795 resolved the land dispute between Spain and the United States in favor of the Americans, and an American territorial government was established in Mississippi in 1798. As long as Spanish-American tensions remained high, U.S. officials continued to court the southern Indians with regular gifts. But American officials simultaneously attempted to separate the Spanish from the Indians through a policy of trading "debt" relief and annuities for land. Many Choctaws were glad to trade little-used and overhunted land in exchange for presents, now in the form of annuities. Ironically, these annuities allowed the Choctaws to continue to benefit from these lands for many years after the date Richard White alleged the lands were rendered useless by the effects of liquor and the market economy. But the land cessions also served to isolate the Choctaws; after cessions in 1801 and 1805, Spanish influence in the region became insignificant. Without Euro-American rivals to play off, the Choctaws became vulnerable to American pressure.[21]

The withdrawal of the Spanish and the flood of white settlers into Missis-

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

sippi in the early nineteenth century changed the complexion of Choctaw-American relations. Conflicts over trade and land rights between settlers and Indians prompted the Mississippi government to press for removal, and a treaty in 1820 gave the Choctaws land west of the Mississippi in exchange for a strip of their existing land. U.S. officials hoped that most of the tribe would move west to their new lands, but few did. Finally in 1830 the U.S. government responded to increasing pressures from white settlers and the Mississippi state government by coercing the Indians, under threat of violence, into a removal treaty. Within a few years most Choctaws reluctantly removed west of the Mississippi.[22]

Richard White's story of the Choctaws ends with removal in 1830, by which time he claims they had become a destitute and economically dependent people. But this characterization after removal is no more accurate than it was before removal. The Choctaws were quick to forge a new and prosperous home in "Indian Territory." Through their noncombative relations and rhetoric with the U.S. government the Choctaws were one of the first of the southern tribes to secure territory west of the Mississippi. As such their land was excellent and well suited to their agricultural and ranching economy. The Choctaws enlarged their cultivated lands virtually every year until the Civil War, producing enough of a surplus to help feed white Arkansas settlers and even starving families in famine-ravaged Ireland. Choctaw leaders maintained friendly relations with the United States and continued to use self-abasement rhetoric in their speeches to American officials while simultaneously increasing their people's self-sufficiency and educating their children to be able to exist in white society.[23]

As historian Bradley J. Birzer has recently shown, many Choctaws became classical "Jacksonian" entrepreneurs, joining other Western racial and ethnic minorities in using the market to make substantial economic and material gains. The Choctaws successfully embraced the American market, selling cotton and corn for cash which they used to purchase metal goods and other items they could not produce internally. Some took advantage of their location along overland trails by providing services and supplies for whites migrating west. Choctaws often shifted their economic focus in response to market demands, such as the rising price of cattle in 1852, "out-competing" their white neighbors and igniting an economic "golden age" among their people. Contrary to White's assertions, participation in the market was not limited to "Americanized" mixed-bloods, though they were the leaders in the economic transformation—within twenty years after moving west nearly all Choctaws had given up hunting entirely and entered the market economy to some extent. Yet the Choctaws were not "capitalists" intent on accumulating wealth. They tempered the more destructive and volatile elements of the market by continuing to be a

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

communal and sharing society, helping others who were less "successful." Judiciously using their annuities the Choctaws invested in schools, sawmills, and blacksmith shops. Annuities had largely taken the place of gifts and presents in Choctaw society, and their government disbursed these gifts as had the chiefs previously.[24] Thus the Choctaws formed a sort of "middle ground" economy that was inclusive of but not dictated by capitalist forces.

By the late 1820s the Choctaws had all but eliminated the scourge of liquor among their people. But the stress of leaving their homeland caused many Choctaws to again resort to alcohol despite the best efforts of missionaries and some Choctaw leaders to maintain temperance. Factions and divisions over liquor arose within the Choctaws, but ultimately the temperance faction was able to successfully pass strict laws against the importation of alcohol into the new Choctaw nation. By as early as 1840, temperance meetings, the establishment of a police force to enforce liquor prohibition laws, and the expulsion of intemperate Choctaw leaders from positions of authority allowed the Choctaws to once again largely eliminate alcohol abuse. Although "grog shops" in nearby Texas and Arkansas continued to attract many Choctaws, chemical dependency by the 1850s was far less widespread among the Choctaws than was noted by Bernard Romans in 1770.[25]

According to Richard White the Choctaws were made "dependent and dispossessed" by "an intruding market system under the control of a metropolitan power." He further asserted that the Choctaws' exposure to capitalism led them into an increasingly unbalanced relationship in which exchanges were "dictated by whites." To White the market destroyed the Choctaw environment and economy, and was such a powerful force that it "rendered the Indians utterly superfluous." By the time of removal, White claimed, the Choctaws were impoverished and dependent upon the United States—a somewhat predictable ending for his declensionist narrative of economic and environmental destruction at the hands of the capitalist market.[26]

Richard White's depiction of the Choctaws as a destitute and economically dependent people obscures their long history of successful resistance as well as adaptation to new political, economic, and cultural changes. Far from being impoverished—as an historian might assume from their diplomatic rhetoric—the Choctaws in the nineteenth century were just as prosperous as they were at the turn of the eighteenth century. The Choctaws continued to secure presents in the form of annuities and continued to exploit what they could from their environment. The trade network formed by the Choctaws was not under the control of a vast "metropolitan power" but rather was dominated by individual frontier exchanges by peoples of diverse races and ethnicity, including Indians and Euro-Americans, as recent scholars have similarly concluded.

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

The Choctaws repeatedly adapted to changing frontier market conditions and prevented market exchanges from being continually dictated by Euro-Americans. When the fur trade no longer offered commercial benefits to the Choctaws they diversified their economy so as to continue to extract benefits from the market. In the absence of the "increasingly unequal exchange" alleged by Richard White, his dependency theory collapses and the Choctaws can be more appropriately viewed as an adaptive people empowered by trade and commerce just as many Euro-Americans were. The prosperity of the Choctaws was limited not by the intrusion of the market into the Choctaw economy but rather by the deadly though brief onset of chemical dependency and eventually by the destruction wrought by the American Civil War.[27] The Choctaws did not always prevail in their efforts to resist and adapt to Euro-American influence and invasion, but their actions were certainly not "superfluous" nor did they emerge from the eighteenth century an impoverished and economically dependent people. Illumination of their achievements reveals the roots of Choctaw dependency to be nonexistent.

NOTES

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

2. Ibid., xix, 94, 97, 146.

3. Ibid., xiii–xix; Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Academic Press, 1974); and Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World System II: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World Economy, 1600-1750* (New York: Academic Press, 1980). See also Duane Champagne, *Social Order and Political Change: Constitutional Governments among the Cherokee, the Choctaw, the Chickasaw, and the Creek* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992).

4. White, *Roots of Dependency*, 146.

5. According to White the Indians of the Great Lakes were only able to resist dependency while certain conditions existed, essentially the same criteria cited in *Roots of Dependency*. See ibid., xiii–xix, 146; and Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 482-86. The only direct challenge to White's conclusions regarding the Choctaws is Donna L. Akers, "Living in the Land of Death: The Choctaw People, 1830-1860" (Ph.D. diss., University of California–Riverside, 1997).

6. R. David Edmunds, "Pre-Columbian America Reconsidered," *Halcyon* 12 (1990): 13; Bradley J. Birzer, "Expanding Creative Destruction: Entrepreneurship in the American Wests," *Western Historical Quarterly* 30:1 (spring 1999): 45-63; and Daniel H. Usner,

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

"The Frontier Exchange Economy of the Lower Mississippi Valley in the Eighteenth Century," *William and Mary Quarterly* 44:2 (April 1987): 165-92.

7. A fourth argument against White's materialist thesis is that it ignores the cultural change and continuity of the Choctaws. This argument, however, has been addressed to some extent by other historians, including Donna Akers. See Akers, *Land of Death.*

8. Louis XIV to De May, 30 June 1707, in Dunbar Rowland and Albert Godfrey Sanders, eds., *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1704-1743: French Dominion*, vol. 3 (Jackson: Press of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, 1932), 3:51; De Bienville to De Pontchartrain, 20 August 1709, ibid., 3:136-37; Duclos to De Pontchartrain, 9 October 1713, ibid., 3:129; De Bienville to De Pontchartrain, 25 February 1708, ibid., 3:112; De Bienville to De Pontchartrain, 21 June 1710, ibid., 3:151.

9. For quotations, see Deposition of John Pettyerow before the Governor, 8 October 1751, ibid., 16. For competition between the French and British over prices and trade, see Regis du Roullet to Maurepas, 23 March 1733, ibid., 1:170-72; Minutes of Council of Commerce of Louisiana, 8 February 1721, ibid., 3:303; Abstract of Bienville to Maurepas, 20 April 1734, ibid., 3:670-71; Bienville and Salmon to Maurepas, 13 September 1736, ibid., 3:693; Bienville to Maurepas, 28 April 1738, ibid., 3:713-16; Bienville to Maurepas, 15 July 1738, ibid., 3:719-20; Pèrier to Ory, 18 December 1730, ibid., 4:39, 54; Kerlèrec to Pierène de Moras, 21 October 1757, ibid., 5:189; John R. Swanton, *An Early Account of the Choctaw Indians*, in *A Choctaw Source Book*, vol. 7 of *The North American Indian Garland Series*, ed. David Hurst Thomas (New York: Garland Publishing, 1985), 55; Deposition of John Pettyerow before the Governor, 8 October 1751, in William L. McDowell Jr., *Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, May 21, 1750–August 7, 1754* (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1958), 15-16; "State of the Chickesaw and Chactaw Nations," ibid., 36-38; John Highrider to Governor Glen, 24 October 1750, ibid., 38-40. For Choctaws entreating both the French and British see Bienville and Salmon to Maurepas, 13 September 1736, in Rowland and Sanders, *French Dominion*, 3:690-91. For the value of gifts, see Bethune to Cameron, 4 September 1780, in *Records of the British Colonial Office, Class 5*, part 1, *Westward Expansion* (Frederick MD: University Publications of America, 1983), reel 8, frames 612-13.

10. For quotations see Minutes of Council with Choctaws, 14 November 1763, in Rowland and Sanders, *French Dominion*, 5:296; Council with the Chactaws, by Major Farmar and Mons. D'Abbadie, 14 November 1763, in Dunbar Rowland, ed., *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1766: English Dominion*, vol. 1 (Nashville TN: Press of Brandon Printing, 1911), 87, 89; Report of Johnstone and Stuart, 12 June 1765, ibid., 187. For English policy and attitudes concerning the Choctaw see James Adair, *The History of the American Indians: Particularly Those Adjoining the Mississippi, East and West Florida, Georgia, South and North Carolina, and Virginia* (London: E. C. Dilly, 1775), 306-7, 314-15; Farmar to Secretary of War, 24 January 1764, in Rowland, *English Dominion*, 13; Extract of a letter from Lieutenant Forde at Tombeckbe Fort, 3 December 1763, ibid., 39; Memorial of Governor Johnstone to the Board of Trade, ibid., 150. For French advice to

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

the English concerning the Choctaws see Mons. D'Abbadie to Major Farmar, 4 October 1763, ibid., 35. For English attempts to convince the Choctaws of their "dependence" see Memorial of Governor Johnstone to the Board of Trade, ibid., 150; and Chactaw Congress, June 12, 1765, ibid., 228.

11. For conflict between the Choctaws and the English see Chactaw Congress, 12 June 1765, ibid., 220, 229-30; Clarence Carter, ed., "Observations of Superintendent John Stuart and Governor James Grant of East Florida on the Proposed Plan of 1764 for the Future Management of Indian Affairs," *American Historical Review* 20:4 (July 1915): 830; Memorial of Governor Johnstone to the Board of Trade, in Rowland, *English Dominion,* 150; Report of Johnstone and Stuart, 12 June 1765, ibid., 184; J. Stuart to Earl of Hillsborough, 2 December 1770, in *British Colonial Records,* 6:12-13. For the Mobile Congress in 1765 see Chactaw Congress, 12 June 1765, in Rowland, *English Dominion,* 215-55. For the 1772 Mobile Congress see "Papers Relating to Congress with Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians, 9 April 1772," in Dunbar Rowland, ed., *Peter Chester,* Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society vol.5 (Jackson: Mississippi Historical Society Press, 1925), 134-60; J. Stuart to Earl of Hillsborough, 7 January 1772, in *British Colonial Records,* 6:236-43. For White's assertions see White, *Roots of Dependency,* 78-79.

12. Papers Relating to Congress with the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians, 9 April 1772, in Rowland, *Peter Chester,* 150; Chactaw Congress, 12 June 1765, in Rowland, *English Dominion,* 224; Swanton, *Early Account,* 55; Grayson Noley, *1540: The First European Contact,* in *The Choctaw before Removal,* Carolyn Keller Reeves, ed. (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1985), 65.

13. F. B. Young, *Notices of the Chactaw or Choktah Tribe of North American Indians,* in *A Choctaw Source Book, The North American Indian Garland Series* vol. 7, David Hurst Thomas, ed. (New York: Garland Publishing, 1985), 14-15; Rowland, *Peter Chester,* 152-53; Report of William Armstrong in *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1839,* serial 354, 26th Cong., 1st sess., Sen. doc. 1, 468; also Stephen P. Van Hoak, "The Poor Red Man and the Great Father: Choctaw Rhetoric, 1700-1860," unpublished manuscript in the possession of the author. The term "father" had a different meaning in Choctaw culture than it did in Western culture. See Patricia Galloway, *"The Chief Who Is Your Father": Choctaw and French Views of the Diplomatic Relation,* in Peter H. Wood, Gregory A. Waselkov, and M. Thomas Hatley, ed., *Powhatan's Mantle: Indians in the Colonial Southeast* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989), 254-78.

14. The French initially described the Choctaw as a temperate people, but this changed with the arrival of the English. See Swanton, *Early Account,* 61; Perier and De La Chaise to the Directors of the Company of the Indies, 30 January 1729, in Rowland and Sanders, *French Dominion,* 2:613; Bernard Romans, *A Concise Natural History of East and West Florida* (New York: Bernard Romans, 1775), 69, 77; C. Stuart to J. Stuart, 4 March 1777, in *British Colonial Records,* 7:616-17. For White's assessment see White, *Roots of Dependency,* 84-85. For the figure of 80 percent see C. Stuart to J. Stuart, 26 August 1770, in *British Colonial Records,* 6:24. For deaths due to liquor see J. Stuart to

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Germaine, 14 June 1777, ibid., 7:270-71; Report of the Proceedings of the Hon. Charles Stuart, 1 July 1778, ibid., 8:45, 50-51; Cameron to Clinton, 18 July 1780, in George Athan Billias, ed., *Report on American Manuscripts in the Royal Institution of Great Britain*, vol. 2 (Boston: Gregg Press, 1972), 159.

15. For declining deer populations see Romans, *History*, 86. For the changing Choctaw economy see Daniel H. Usner Jr., "American Indians on the Cotton Frontier: Changing Economic Relations with Citizens and Slaves in the Mississippi Territory," *Journal of American History* 72:2 (September 1985): 304-6; James Taylor Carson, "Horses and the Economy and Culture of the Choctaw Indians, 1690-1840," *Ethnohistory* 42:3 (summer 1995): 499-501; Arthur H. DeRosier Jr., "Pioneers with Conflicting Ideals: Christianity and Slavery in the Choctaw Nation," *Journal of Mississippi History* 21:3 (July 1959): 179; Champagne, *Social Order*, 90-92, 128, 148-49. Some Choctaws permanently migrated westward, and by the nineteenth century more than one thousand Choctaw had made a new home west of the Mississippi. For hunting and migration west of the Mississippi see "Log of His Majesty's Galiot, La Fleche, 23 January 1793," in Lawrence Kinnaird, ed., *Spain in the Mississippi Valley, 1765-1794*, 3 parts, Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1945 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949), 3:114; Delavillebeuvre to Carondelet, 7 May 1794, ibid., 281; Sargent to Wilkinson, 16 October 1798, in Dunbar Rowland, ed., *The Mississippi Territorial Archives, 1798-1803*, vol. 1 (Nashville: Press of Brandon Printing Company, 1905), 63-64; "An Account of the Tribes in Louisiana, 29 September 1803," in Clarence Edwin Carter, *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, vol. 9 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1940), 9:63-64; Joseph Bowmar to Governor Claiborne, 15 April 1804, ibid., 9:224; "Governor Claiborne to the Secretary of War, 23 July 1807," ibid., 754; "Governor Claiborne to John Thompson, 25 July 1807," ibid., 9:758; "Gaines' Reminiscences," *Alabama Historical Quarterly* 26:3-4 (fall–winter 1964): 162; Ruth Tenison West, "Pushmataha's Travels," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 37:2 (summer 1959): 162-74; Young, *Notices*, 16.

16. For quotations, see Rowland, *Peter Chester*, 148, 150-51; J. Stuart to Germaine, 14 June 1777, in *British Colonial Records*, 7:629; Romans, *History*, 77. Not all Choctaw leaders sought intemperance—one chief requested liquor from the English at the 1765 Mobile Congress. Rowland, *English Dominion*, 248; also see *Missionary Herald* 26 (August 1830), 251. For examples of intemperance see Gaines, *Reminiscences*, 193; "An Account of the Indian Tribes in Louisiana, 8 November 1803," in Carter, *Territorial Papers*, 64; and Jerry G. Hayes, "Ardent Spirits among the Chickasaws and Choctaws, 1816-1856," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 69:3 (fall 1981): 294-309.

17. Carson, *Horses*, 504-6; Usner, *Cotton Frontier*, 304-6; Champagne, *Social Order*, 90-92, 128, 148-49.

18. For lack of distinctions in Choctaw society based on racial purity see Akers, *Land of Death*; Donna L. Akers Whitt, "Race, Ethnicity, and Identity: Choctaw People of Mixed Heritage, 1828-1880" (master's thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1994). For the

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

continued nonacquisitive nature of the Choctaw economy see Champagne, *Social Order*, 84-85, 128.

19. For a recent study of the effects of fur trade specialization see P. Nick Kardulias, "Fur Trade Production as a Specialized Activity in a World System: Indians in the North American Fur Trade," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 14:1 (1990): 25-60.

20. J. Stuart to Earl of Hillsborough, 7 January 1772, in *British Colonial Records*, 6:240-41; J. Stuart to Chickasaw and Choctaw Nations, 14 May 1777, ibid., 7:642; Congress at Mobile, 26 May 1777, ibid., 8:317; J. Stuart to Germaine, 14 June 1777, ibid., 7:631-32; Campbell to Gillivray, 28 March 1778, ibid., 7:788-90; J. Stuart to Germaine, 2 May 1778, ibid., 7:853-55; Proceedings of Hon. Charles Stuart, 1 July 1778, ibid., 8:45-55; Taitt to Board of Commissioners, 5 August 1779, ibid., 8:548-49; A Talk from the Six Towns . . . to Captain Colbert, 19 November 1779, ibid., 8:356-57; Cameron to Clinton, 15 December 1779, ibid., 8:350; Cameron to Germaine, 20 December 1779, ibid., 8:337-38; C. Stuart to Cameron, 20 December 1779, ibid., 8:340-43; Cameron to Clinton, 18 July 1780, ibid., 2:159; Bethune to Cameron, 27 August and 4 September 1780, ibid., 8:601-13; Cameron to Campbell, 18 September 1780, ibid., 8:617; Cameron to Germaine, 27 May 1781, ibid., 8:657-58; Brown to Germaine, 9 August 1781, ibid., 8:670-71; Extract of a Letter from Alexander McIntosh, 12 September 1771, in Rowland, *Peter Chester*, 105; Peter Chester to Earl of Hillsborough, 28 and 29 September 1771, ibid., 96-97, 100, 103; Carter, *Observations*, 824; Chactaw Congress, 12 June 1765, in Rowland, *English Dominion*, 221; Bucarell to Ulloa, 20 January 1767, in Kinnaird, *Spain in the Mississippi Valley*, 1:18; Juzan to Gàlvez, 11 July 1780, ibid., 1:382-83; Juzan to Ezpeleta, 19 February 1781, ibid., 1:419; Ezpeleta to Juzan, 19 February 1781, ibid., 1:420-21; Cruzat to Mirò, 23 August 1784, ibid., 2:117-19; American Overtures to the Choctaw, 1792, ibid., 3:4-8; Message of Carondelet to Choctaws and Chickasaws, ibid., 3:140-43; Lanzos to Carondelet, 25 April 1793, ibid., 3:152-53; Brashears to Gayoso de Lemos, 8 June 1794, ibid., 3:297-98; Delavillebeuvre to Carondelet, 7 May 1794, ibid., 3:282; Delavillebeuvre to Carondelet, 22 July 1794, ibid., 3:328; Jack D. L. Holmes, *Gayoso: The Life of a Spanish Governor in the Mississippi Valley, 1789-1799* (New Orleans: Louisiana State University Press, 1966), 159; Edward Hunter Ross and Dawson A. Phelps, eds., "A Journey over the Natchez Trace in 1792: A Document from the Archives of Spain," *Journal of Mississippi History* 15:4 (October 1953): 252-73; Governor Blount to the Secretary of War, 20 September 1792, in Carter, *Territorial Papers*, 4:172-74; Blount and Pickens to Secretary of War, 1 August 1793, ibid., 4:291-92; Secretary of State to Sargent, 20 May 1799, ibid., 5:58; Sargent to Wilkinson, 16 October 1798, in Rowland, *Mississippi Territorial Archives*, 64; Sargent to McHenry, 3 August 1799, ibid., 163-65; Sargent to McKee, 2 November 1799, ibid., 192; Sargent to Pickering, 10 February 1800, ibid., 206-7.

21. John D. W. Guice, "Face to Face in Mississippi Territory, 1798-1817," in *The Choctaw before Removal*, Carolyn Keller Reeves, ed. (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1985), 157-80. For the declining influence of the Spanish in the nineteenth century see Wilkinson to Claiborne, 10 May 1803, in Carter, *Territorial Papers*, 5:217.

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

22. For removal see Arthur DeRosier Jr., *The Removal of the Choctaw Indians* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1970); and Mary Elizabeth Young, *Redskins, Ruffleshirts, and Rednecks: Indian Allotments in Alabama and Mississippi, 1830-1860* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1961).

23. For postremoval period see Debo, *Choctaw Republic*, 58-79. For Irish aid see Birzer, *Entrepreneurship*, 45-63. For an example of Choctaw rhetoric see Spalding, *Kingsbury*, 167. For the Choctaws' receiving the best portion of Indian Territory see Report of William Armstrong in *Annual Report of Commissioner of Indian Affairs* (henceforth ARCIA) *1839*, 468; and Akers, *Land of Death*, 52, 62-65. For their increase in cultivated lands see Report of William Wilson in ARCIA *1851*, 367; Report of C. C. Copeland in ARCIA *1857*, 239; Report of Douglas H. Cooper in ARCIA *1859* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1860), 195. Prior to the Civil War, only during a severe drought that lasted several years in the 1850s did the Choctaws rely on annuities for their subsistence; see Report of Wilson in ARCIA *1852*, 411; Report of Cooper in ARCIA *1855*, 151; Report of Cooper in ARCIA *1856*, 149.

24. For Choctaw entrepreneurship see Birzer, *Entrepreneurship*, 45-63. Entrepreneurship is broadly defined by Birzer as using one's physical or mental labor to make a profit and thereby changing the dynamics of an economy. His approach is informed by the work of Joseph Schumpeter, Frederick Hayek, Israel Kirzner, and Gerald Gunderson. For the new Choctaw economy see Akers, *Land of Death*, 195-208, 267-67; James D. Morrison, *The Social History of the Choctaw Nation, 1865-1907* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), 16-18; Report of Armstrong in ARCIA *1837*, 541; Report of Armstrong in ARCIA *1838*, 508-9; Report of Armstrong in ARCIA *1841*, 334-35; Report of Samuel M. Rutherford in ARCIA *1847*, serial 503, 30th Cong., 1st sess., Sen. doc. 1, 878; Report of Cooper in ARCIA *1859*, 188, 195. For Choctaws' shifting their economic focus in response to market demand see Report of Wilson in ARCIA *1852*, 412. For Choctaw abandonment of hunting see Report of Cooper in ARCIA *1858*, 157. For their use of annuities see ibid., 469; Report of Armstrong in ARCIA *1840*, 310-11; Report of Armstrong in ARCIA *1841*, 334-35; Report of Armstrong in ARCIA *1843*, 409-10; Report of Armstrong in ARCIA *1844*, 457; Owen to Pitchlynn, 8 June 1845, in Peter Pitchlynn Papers, box 1, file 93, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman.

25. For an overview of Choctaw temperance efforts see Hayes, *Ardent Spirits*. For the temperance of the Choctaws after 1830 see Report of Thomas Mayhew, 1828, in Kingsbury Papers, box 4, folder 1, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman; Kingsbury to Mayhew, 28 January 1829, ibid., 8:32; Spalding, *Kingsbury*, 88; *Niles' Weekly Register* (Baltimore), 3 July 1830, 345; *Missionary Herald* 18 (December 1822): 378-79; Report of Wilson in ARCIA *1851*, 367-68; Hotchkin to Wilson in ARCIA *1852*, 419; Report of Copeland in ARCIA *1857*, 235; Cyrus Byington, "Changes in the Choctaw Nation during the Last Eighty Years," in Kingsbury Papers, 1:4; Morris, *Life Among the Choctaw*, 50. For factionalism see Spalding, *Kingsbury*, 88. A law against liquor and the vesting of enforcement authority for this law to the "light horse" were among the first

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

laws to be passed by the Choctaws under their new constitution. See *Constitution and Laws of the Choctaw Nation* (Park Hill, Cherokee Nation: John Candy, 1840), 13-14. The Choctaw police, or "light horse," had varied success stopping the whiskey trade. See Report of Armstrong in ARCIA *1838*, 509; Report of Armstrong in ARCIA *1843*, 410; Byington to Cooper in ARCIA *1856*, 153; Ainslie to Cooper in ARCIA *1858*, 163; Hotchkin to Cooper in ARCIA *1859*, 194-95. For temperance meetings see Rind to Armstrong in ARCIA *1842*, 505; Stark to Cooper in ARCIA *1856*, 164. For temperate requirement for Choctaw office holding see Report of Copeland in ARCIA *1857*, 235. For missionary efforts to secure Choctaw temperance see William L. Hiemstra, "Presbyterian Missionaries and Mission Churches among the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians, 1832-1865," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 26:4 (winter 1948-49): 462-64; Spalding, *Kingsbury*, 58, 104, 163-64, 166. The United States had a dismal record of supporting Choctaw temperance efforts, even to the extent of providing the Choctaws with liquor when it was to their advantage, such as at treaty conferences. See Hayes, *Ardent Spirits*, 296-97. After removal, Indian agents lobbied in vain for the government to take action to support Choctaw efforts against intemperance. See Report of Elbert Herring, in *Report from the Office of Indian Affairs, 1833*, serial 238, 23rd Cong., 1st sess., Sen. doc. 1, 203; Report of Cooper in ARCIA *1856*, 150.

26. White, *Roots of Dependency*, xix, 146, 351. For an analysis of White's narrative style in *Roots of Dependency* see William Cronon, "A Place for Stories: Nature, History, and Narrative," in *Journal of American History* 78:4 (1992): 1365-66.

27. Birzer, *Entrepreneurship*, 45-63; Usner, *Frontier Exchange*, 165-72.

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 03 Mar 2022 22:43:50 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms