



ASALH
ASSOCIATION *for the Study of*
AFRICAN AMERICAN LIFE *and* HISTORY



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS JOURNALS

The Racial Composition of the Seminole Indians of Florida and Oklahoma

Author(s): Wilton Marion Krogman

Source: *The Journal of Negro History*, Oct., 1934, Vol. 19, No. 4 (Oct., 1934), pp. 412-430

Published by: The University of Chicago Press on behalf of the Association for the Study of African American Life and History

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2714227>

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>



Association for the Study of African American Life and History and The University of Chicago Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Negro History*

JSTOR

THE RACIAL COMPOSITION OF THE SEMINOLE INDIANS OF FLORIDA AND OKLAHOMA*

The physical type of the American Negro has been very completely studied by M. J. Herskovits.¹ In his conclusions he states that 29 per cent of the Negroes in America claim to have Indian blood in their veins. His excellent genealogical charts bear out this assertion. K. W. Porter (12) has studied the problem from the historical point of view and has uncovered much evidence to support Herskovits' conclusion.

In Summer, 1932, the writer was privileged to lead the Field Party in Physical Anthropology of the Laboratory of Anthropology, Santa Fe, New Mexico. The Seminole Indians of Oklahoma were chosen for study because of their important historic contacts and because of the opportunity to study a group known to have a history of

*1 Bartram, W., *Travels through North and South Carolina, Georgia, East and West Florida* (Philadelphia and London, 1794). 2Board of Indian Commissioners, *Appendix 37. Second Annual Report, 1870* (Quoted in *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, Vol. V, No. 1, March, 1927, pp. 79-94). 3Brinton, Daniel G., *Notes on the Floridian Peninsula* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1859). 4Dawson, J. E., *The Five Civilized Tribes, Office of Indian Affairs* (Washington, D. C., 1931). 5Giddings, J. R., *The Exiles of Florida* (Columbus, Ohio, 1858). 6Handbook of the American Indians, *Bulletin 30, Bur. Am. Eth.*, Part I and Part II (Washington, D. C., 1907)—Hitchiti, p. 551; Mikasuki, pp. 860-1; Mixed bloods, pp. 913-14; Negro and Indian, pp. 51-3; Aconee, p. 105; Osceola, p. 159; Seminole, pp. 500-1; Yamasee, pp. 986-7. 7Hoffman, F. L., *Cancer Among North American Indians, Prudential Life Insurance Company* (1928). 8Hrdlicka, A., "The Anthropology of Florida," *Pub. Florida State Historical Society*, No. 1 (Deland, Florida, 1892). 9MacCauley, C., "The Seminole Indians of Florida," *Fifth Ann. Rep. Bur. Am. Eth.* pp. 481-539 (Washington, D. C., 1883-4). 10Moorehead, Warren, *The American Indian* (Andover Press, 1914). 11Nash, Roy, "Survey of the Seminole Indians of Florida," *Office of Indian Affairs* (Washington, D. C., 1932). 12Porter, K. W., "Relations between Negroes and Indians within the present limits of the United States," *Jour. Negro Hist.* XVII, pp. 287-368. 13Swanton, J., "Early History of the Creek Indians and their Neighbors," *Bull.* 73, *Bur. Am. Eth.* (Washington, D. C., 1928). 14Wissler, C., *The American Indian* (Oxford University Press, 1932).

¹ Herskovits. "Anthropometry of the American Negro," *Columbia Contributions to Anthropology*, XI, Columbia U., 1930. This book, according to the writer, is a model of scientific method leading to soundness of conclusion.

long-continued contact with Negroes. Some 300 Seminoles, of varying degrees of purity and blood-mixture, were studied in full anthropometric detail. Genealogical history was secured on 2,056 of the group, elucidating racial affinities in exact detail. The report on the anthropometry of the Seminoles of Oklahoma has been completed for publication.²

Before undertaking an analysis of the anthropometric data gathered among the Seminoles of Oklahoma it was imperative that we know the racial elements present in the national make-up. This is essential to a proper assessment of the racial import of any given physical trait. In short, we must know degree of admixture, whether with other Indian tribes, White, or Negro.

Nash (11, p. 24) in his discussion of the present day Florida Seminoles, observes "that the purest blooded Seminole of Florida is apt to be the bearer of many strains. The Spaniards were in Florida before the Seminoles split off from the Lower Creeks . . . Indians were in Florida before the Seminoles split off from the Lower Creeks, and the Seminole most certainly took to wife the Indians he conquered in battle, Yamasee and Yuchi remnants."

It is significant that Nash twice in the same sentence refers to the Seminoles as splitting off from the Lower Creeks. This viewpoint is likewise held by Giddings (5, p. 3-4) who states that in 1750 Chief Seacoffee and his followers rejected all Creek authority and set themselves up, together with the Mickasukies, as a separate tribe.³ This group later on became known as "Seminoles" or "run-aways." Bartram (1, pp. 184, 209, 462) also refers

² It has been submitted to Prof. Corrado Gini, President of the Italian Committee for Population Study, and Chairman of the International Committee for the Study of Primitive Populations, for publication by the Italian Committee.

³ Brinton (3, p. 145) holds this to be the first group of Seminoles to enter Florida.

throughout his book to the "Lower Creeks, or Seminoles."⁴

In 1791 the Seminoles stated that officially, as a tribe, they were a distinct entity apart from the Creeks, and repudiated any close relationship to them, either politically or by blood (Giddings, 5, p. 16). The State of Georgia, however, refused to recognize this, for in the "wars" and treaties attendant upon the recovery of Negro slaves, it treated Seminoles as part of the Creek Nation (Giddings, 5, pp. 23, 57, 63). In 1822 the Federal Government, in a treaty following the purchase of Florida, in 1819, officially recognized the Seminoles as a discrete entity, but in 1833, in a treaty of removal, chose to regard the Seminoles and Creeks as one group (Giddings, 5, pp. 72, 320). It is thus evident that the early history of the Seminoles is inextricably bound up with that of the Creeks. But this is only part of the story.

In 1702 the first larger-scale invasion of Florida by the Creeks began, with the crushing of the Apalachees and the Spanish by the Creeks and White settlers (Swanton, 13, pp. 121-3). With the invading Creeks were the Yamasees, of Muskogean stock (BAE II, pp. 986-7) who allied themselves with the remnants of the original Floridian tribes. They, too, suffered partial extermination and final complete assimilation.⁵ Coincident with the Creek invasion began an invasion of the peninsula on its western side. "This territory, to the promontory of Florida, was

⁴ MacCauley (9, p. 509) offers a statement of a modern Seminole (1880) as to the meaning of the tribal name. The quotation sounds like a rationalization. "I made several efforts to discover the tribal name by which these Indians now designate themselves. The name Seminole they reject. In their own language it means 'a wanderer,' and, when used as a term of reproach, 'a coward.' Ko-nip-ha-teo said, 'Me no Sem-ai-no-le; Seminole cow, Seminole deer, Seminole rabbit, me no Seminole. Indians gone Arkansas Seminole.' He meant that timidity and flight from danger are 'Seminole' qualities, and that the Indians who had gone west at the bidding of the Government were the true renegades."

⁵ As late as 1812 a small remnant of Yamasees were to be found among the Seminole and Hitchiti (BAE II, p. 987).

claimed by the Tomocos, Utinas, Calloosas, Yamasees, and other remnant tribes of the ancient Floridians and the more northern refugees, driven away by the Carolinians, now in alliance and under protection of the Spaniards, who, assisting them, attacked the new settlement, and for many years were very troublesome; but the Alachuas or Oconees being strengthened by the other emigrants and fugitive bands from the Upper Creeks,⁶ with whom they were confederated, and who gradually established other towns in this low country, stretching a line of settlements across the isthmus, extending from the Alatomaha to the bay of Apalache; these uniting, were at length able to face their enemies, and then attack them in their own settlements; and in the end, with the assistance of the Upper Creeks, their uncles, vanquished their enemies and destroyed them" (Bartram, 1, pp. 378-9).⁷

It is thus evident that, as Swanton (13, p. 181, p. 398) says, "the history of the Seminole is to a considerable extent a continuation of the history of the Oconee," and that "the Oconee Indians were a nucleus about which the Seminole Nation grew up."

The Oconee Indians, however, were a part of the Hitchiti,⁸ which among the Creeks, "was considered the head or 'mother' of a group of Lower Creek towns which spoke closely related languages distinct from Muskogee." Also included were the Sawokli, Okmulgee, Apalachicola, and probably the Chicha. All of these people called themselves *Atcik-ha'ta*, and preceded the true Muskogee in the region of the Chattahoochee River (Swanton, 13, pp. 172-8; Bartram, 1, pp. 52-3; BAE, I, p. 551).

It is evident, up to this point, "that the nucleus of the Seminole Nation was not merely a body of 'outcasts,' as

⁶Bartram consistently refers to the main group of Creeks as Upper Creeks and the Seminoles as Lower Creeks.

⁷See also Swanton 13, pp. 179-81; BAE II, p. 105; Hrdlicka 8, pp. 61-5; pp. 76-7 (quoting Brinton).

⁸The Hitchiti are linguistically identical with the Mikasuki (BAE I, p. 861; Swanton 13, 1. 405).

has been so often represented, but a distinct tribe, the Oconee, affiliated it is true, with the Creeks, but always on the outer margin of the confederacy and to a considerable extent an independent body, representing not the Muskogee, but the Hitchiti speaking peoples of southern Georgia" (Swanton, 13, p. 400; Cf. Bartram, 1, p. 462).

In 1813-14, at the conclusion of the Creek War, a great number of Creeks from the Upper Creek Country descended into Florida, increasing the population by about two-thirds, and submerging the up-to-then predominant Hitchiti (Oconee) element. This later, definitely Creek, element became identified with the Seminoles, although the "distinction between the older or true Seminoles, and the later comers was maintained for a time" (Swanton, 13, pp. 403-4).

This ultimate submergence of the earlier true Seminole is graphically seen in the linguistic divisions of the Muskogean stock (Wissler, 14, p. 407; Swanton, 13, p. 11).

Muskogean

- A. Muskogean proper
 - a. Southern Division
 - 1. Hitchiti Group
 - Hitchiti
 - Mikasuki
 - Sawokli
 - 2. Apalachee
 - 3. Yamasi ?
 - 4. Alabama Group
 - Alibami
 - Koasati
 - Tuskegee
 - 5. Choctaw Group
 - Choctaw
 - Northern Choctaw
 - Six towns Choctaw
 - Chickasaw
 - b. Northern Division

1. Muskogee proper, or Creek

Upper Creek

Lower Creek

Seminole

B. Natchez dialects

a. Avoley, Taensa

The foregoing lends weight to Swanton's (13, p. 414) assertion that the Seminoles "were at base a portion of the Atsik-hata or non-Muskogee people of southern Georgia, around whom had gathered a still more numerous body of refugee Muskogee. These latter obscured their original character to such an extent that its basal separateness was usually unrecognized, and ultimately the language of the invaders overwhelmed that of the original settlers."

There is a further bit of evidence as to the Indian affinities of the Seminole—the archaeological evidence offered by Hrdlicka (8, especially pp. 109-116).

The Florida skulls were essentially brachy- and mesocephalic, with little or no dolichocephaly. The skull was high, of good cranial capacity, the face high and broad, and the nose high and of medium breadth. Hrdlicka was, however, able to distinguish two separate, though obviously related types: a more numerous and probably older round-headed type, and a less numerous and evidently more recent "oblong-headed" type.

Hrdlicka was able to measure several Seminole skulls and concluded that these show a "general relation to the Algonquin type of skull, but often with somewhat increased breadth and generally increased height of the vault; and there are indications that this type was shared more or less by other southeastern oblong-headed people." His general conclusions are stated:

"It appears that this eastern cranial type, inclining gradually more and more to mesocephaly as well as to a high vault, reached eventually as far south as Florida and as far southwest as Arkansas and Louisiana. It is according to all indications identical not

only with the Seminoles, but evidently also with the older more oblong-headed element of the Florida population. It is a sub-type which must have belonged to a large portion of the Muskogean; it may be defined as a transitional type between the more northern one of the Algonquins and the Gulf brachycephals.

“The Muskogean confederacy was, according to the evidence we now have at hand, more than a confederacy of blood-related tribes. It was a confederacy of the Seminoles, Creeks, Chicasaws and others whose physical characteristics point more or less to the north, and of the Choctaws, Natches, Alabamais and related tribes who belonged to a different type of people, to the strong southern brachycephalic stock which included also the bulk of the Floridians.

“It would seem from the present facts that the bulk of the Muskogean people must have been derived originally from the more northern long-headed tribes; that they extended once well towards the south from the Atlantic to and beyond the Mississippi, but did not occupy, or occupied but sparsely or only in spots, the territory along the Gulf; and that then came a relatively strong invasion from the West or Southwest—possibly from Mexico—of people of a distinct type not hitherto represented east of the Mississippi; that this current overflowed the Gulf states and Florida, overcame and absorbed whatever there may have already been there, extended as far as it could northward, and in the course of frequent warfares as well as in amical relations, became extensively mingled and even admixed with the contact tribes, admixing them to a similar extent. The strongest of these contact tribes formed eventually a political union together with the main portion of the southern stock, which union was the Muskogean confederacy; and they possibly more or less accepted the language or perhaps the main language of the more highly cultured southerners.

“This hypothesis would account for the occurrence of oblong heads approaching the Algonquin among the southern tribes, including the older Floridians; it would account for the perceptible dilution of brachycephaly observable in some localities, more particularly in Florida, and it might account for the noticeable broadening and heightening of the skull of these more northern contact tribes, which included particularly the Chicasaws, Creeks, and Seminoles.”

It is apparent from the last sentence that Hrdlicka is grouping the Seminoles with the Creeks on the basis of contact *after* 1812-14, for only in this manner can the Seminoles be called a part of "northern contact tribes." It is just as apparent, however, that the archaeological evidence supports a division of the earlier Floridian peoples, and the later invaders. It is this earlier group that is the true Seminole; it is this later invading group that has also become known as Seminole, though it is basically Creek.

We may summarize the relation of the Seminoles to other Indians by the statement that basically they are derived from the Georgian non-Muskogean Hitchiti, plus the earlier Floridian Yuchi and Yamasee, and that this combination was submerged by the much later Muskogean (Creek) invasion. The Seminole today, then, especially in Oklahoma, probably has a rather high percentage of Creek blood.

We must now turn to the problem of the inclusion of White blood. Nash (11, p. 24) predicts that the Spanish very early intermarried with the Floridian Indians. Giddings (5, p. 98) hints that the infusion of Spanish blood must have been considerable: "Lieutenant Reynolds, while conducting the first party of emigrants West, in 1841, found among the Exiles persons who possessed so much Spanish blood, that he offered to leave them at New Orleans, and some of them accepted the offer. He left them in that city, and they probably pass now for Spaniards." And again (p. 315): "There are yet remaining in Florida a few descendants of the pioneer Exiles.⁹ They are intermarried with the bands of 'Billy Bowlegs,' and of 'Sam Jones,' sometimes called Aripeka; they are now mostly half-breeds, and are rapidly becoming amalgamated with the Indian race."

Bartram (1, p. 184) observed that "the manners and

⁹For definition of Exiles see Footnote 12. Giddings may mean Negro blood here.

customs of the Alachuas, and most of the lower Creeks or Seminoles, appear evidently tinctured with Spanish civilization." History tells us that cultural and physical impact go hand in hand, so race mixture is implied. The Bureau of American Ethnology (BAE I, p. 914) states that "during the Spanish domination of the S. E. Atlantic region intermixture perhaps took place, but not much."

The fact emerges, therefore, that the Florida Indians, and through them the Seminoles, very early received an infusion of White blood through the Spanish. It is impossible to assess the degree of mixture, but it is not without significance that many Oklahoma Seminole families speak of "Spanish ancestry."

If we turn now to the problem of White mixture among the modern Seminole we may speak with greater certainty. MacCauley (9, p. 479) asserts categorically (1880) that "the white halfbreed does not exist among the Florida Seminoles." This can scarcely be substantiated, for Osceola himself had White blood in his veins, through a paternal Scotch grandfather. Indeed, Osceola was often called Powell, for his mother married a white man of that name (BAE, II, p. 159).¹⁰

Nor can MacCauley's statement be invoked for the present-day Seminole in Florida. Hrdlicka (8, p. 53) observes that "those contingents of the tribe which visit the eastern coast are known to contain a good deal of admixture of white . . . blood." Nash (11, p. 24) states that among the Florida Seminoles "white halfbreeds have come to be taken almost as a matter of course," and goes on to predict that "fifty years hence . . . the number of Indian White halfbreeds, now counted on the fingers of one hand, will have markedly increased" (p. 75).

The Oklahoma Seminoles have, perforce through wider contact, mixed more with the Whites. "The Five Civil-

¹⁰ Osceola himself typifies the mixture that went on among the Florida Seminoles. In addition to the White mixture above noted Osceola took to himself an Exile (Negro) wife.

ized Tribes of Oklahoma—Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creeks, and Seminole—have a large element of White blood, some through so-called squaw-men, some dating back to British and French traders before the Revolution” (BAE, I, p. 914). This may be stated more graphically by pointing out that in January, 1931, 40.33 per cent of the Five Civilized Tribes were half-blood or less, including intermarried White citizens (Dawson, 4, p. 5; see also Hoffman, 7, p. 36).

Among the Seminoles, particularly, has the introduction of White blood manifested itself, for the descendants of Dr. John F. Brown, who married Lucy Redbeard, daughter of a chief, have constituted a veritable dynasty. We have in our detailed report considered somatic results of Indian-White mixture.

We may conclude, therefore, that White blood very early entered Seminole veins and is doing so in ever-increasing amounts. The Seminole will, in time, be absorbed into the White population.

There remains for consideration the problem of Indian-Negro mixture. That this had gone on is undeniable, for it is the very presence of escaped Negro slaves among the Florida Indians that led to their ultimate expulsion. Bartram (1, p. 184) observes that “the slaves, both male and female, are permitted to marry amongst them: their children are free, and considered in every respect equal to themselves;¹¹ but the parents continue in a state of slavery as long as they live.”

Giddings (5, pp. 3-4), in discussing the runaway slaves, says they “were by the Creek Indians called ‘Seminoles,’ which in their dialect signified ‘runaways,’ . . . and although the term has now come to be applied to a certain tribe of Indians, yet it was originally used in reference

¹¹ This is inconsistent with descent in the female line, for children follow the mother’s blood. I was told that the children of a Negro father were not tribal members, while those of a Negro mother were. A Negro might acquire citizenship by adoption.

to these Exiles long before the Seminole Indians had separated from the Creeks."¹² This introduced a conflicting factor, but for the most part, *Seminole* has stood for Indian, rather than Negro, although General Jesup of the U. S. A., during the Seminole Wars, constantly referred to the "Seminole Negroes." Giddings (5), however, retained "Exile" for Negro, and "Seminole" for Indian, at the same time emphasizing the admixture that occurred. Witness such sentences as: "There were about three hundred Exiles in the fort . . . besides thirty-four Seminole Indians" (p. 40). "The Seminole Indians had lost thirty men, who had intermarried with the Exiles . . ." (p. 46). "There were many halfbreeds, however, some of whom resided with the Indians, and others were located with the Exiles"¹³ (p. 97). So prevalent was the doctrine that Indian and Negro were more or less completely intermixed, that it was accepted in Senatorial debate that it would be difficult to induce the Seminoles to go West without the Negroes, "many of whom had intermarried with the Seminoles" (Giddings, 5, pp. 247, 279, 280).

The very number of Negroes associated with the Seminoles is almost *a priori* evidence of intermixture, for near Micasuki Lake there were several villages, "known also as Mikasuki towns, which were occupied almost wholly by Negroes" (BAE, I, p. 861; see also Giddings, 5, p. 51). We read further that "there has been much Negro admixture among the Seminoles from an early period" . . . and among the Creeks "fully one-third of the tribe have perceptible Negro admixture" (BAE, II, p. 52). Again, that the Seminole population consists, in part, of a "larger Negro element from runaway slaves" (BAE, II,

¹²Giddings uses the term Exile rather loosely. In general he means Negro runaway slaves, but at times he speaks of the Seminole Indians as "Exiles," after the signing of the treaty for removal to the West. He also refers on occasion to Spanish-Negro-Indian refugees as "Exiles."

¹³This sounds like the operation of the laws of descent. Can it be that the children of a Seminole mother "resided with the Indians," while those of a Negro father "located with the Exiles?"

p. 500). The last statement, however, does not necessarily involve admixture.

So much for the Negro element represented in the Seminole prior to removal to the West. It is self-evident that mixture did occur, and to a considerable extent.

The present day Florida Seminole "is of comparatively pure blood" (BAE, II, p. 52). MacCauley (9, p. 479) states of them that "the only persons of mixed breeds among them are children of Indian fathers by negresses who have been adopted into the tribe."¹⁴ MacCauley in 1880 listed three Negro women living as Seminole wives, and seven mixed bloods, all Indian-Negro crosses (p. 526).

Nash (11, p. 46) quotes Spencer to the effect that the Florida Seminole "draws the color line more strictly than do the Whites." Nash lists ten mixed bloods in 1930, seven Indian-Negro and three Indian-White. He states: "No Indian woman, so far as I can learn, ever accepted a Negro male as the father of her children. Under present conditions the Negro blood will shortly be eliminated as a recognizable quantity" (pp. 23-4).

Not so with the Oklahoma Seminole. The removal of the Seminole to the West made him a kindred spirit with the Negro: in the full sense of the word both were Exiles. Both still cherished, however, an ideal of racial unity. To quote Giddings (5, p. 324):

"But at no period had the Seminole Indians regarded the Exiles with greater favor than they did when moving on to the territory assigned to the Creeks. Although many of them had intermarried with the Seminole, and halfbreeds were now common among the Indians; yet most of the descendants of the pioneers who fled from South Carolina and Georgia maintained their identity of character, living by themselves, and maintaining the purity of the African race . . . and when they moved on to Creek lands they settled in separate villages; and the Seminole Indians

¹⁴ The mothers have been adopted into the tribe, the children are *ipso facto* tribal members. Hrdlicka (8, p. 53) says that the Seminoles that visit the eastern coast are known to contain "some Negro blood."

appeared generally to coincide with the Exiles in the propriety of each maintaining their distinctive character."¹⁵

Notwithstanding a mutual wish to retain racial purity, mixture has gone on. In 1908 the Seminoles "were reported officially to number 2,138, largely mixed with Negro blood, in addition to 986 'Seminoles freedmen.' A refugee band of Seminoles, or, more properly, Seminole Negroes, is also on the Mexican side of the Rio Grande" (BAE, II, p. 501). The Bureau of American Ethnology further states that "a large proportion of Negro blood exists in many tribes, particularly those formerly residing in the Gulf States. . . . The Cherokee as a body have refused to intermarry with their Negro citizens, but among the Creeks and the Seminoles intermarriage has been very great" (BAE, I, p. 914).¹⁶

Hoffman (7, p. 59) quotes the observations of an Insurance Company. After ranking the Osage and the Five Civilized Tribes as insurance risks, the Company concludes:

"The Creek and Seminole tribes rank last. Both of these tribes in the past intermarried considerably with the Negro race . . . Although in the past the Indians of the Creek and Seminole tribes have intermarried with the Negro, for the last few years it has been unlawful to do so in the State of Oklahoma."

A "representative of the Indian Bureau in Washington, D. C.," is quoted by an insurance executive as follows (Hoffman, 7, pp. 80-1):

"There are approximately 110,000 Indians in Eastern Oklahoma . . . divided among the five following tribes: Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Seminole, and Creek. The first three tribes are regarded as being the higher class, and they do not mix with the Negroes. The last two tribes named above have a good deal

¹⁵ In 1858 Giddings (5, p. 335) stated that of the Exiles "probably a hundred and fifty connected with the Seminoles now reside in the Western County, and will soon become amalgamated with the Indians." This does not agree with the quotation above.

¹⁶ See Hoffman (7, p. 48).

of Negro blood mixed with the Indian blood. There are about 50,000 Indians in the western part of the state, and it is estimated that about half of the total Indian population is of mixed blood."

Porter (12) in his excellent study of the relations between Negroes and Indians, substantiates the foregoing when he states that the Choctaws and Chickasaws "had a decided aversion" to intermixture with Negroes. Among the Creeks and Seminoles this was not true. The Creeks, especially, "had no aversion to race mixtures and intermarriage between Negroes and Indians was rather common."¹⁷ All of the Five Civilized Tribes were slaveholders prior to 1862, hence all were potentially open to admixture. Some idea of the relative number of slaves is gained by the following:

"When war broke out, the Seminoles had a thousand slaves; the Cherokees and Chickasaws each had about fifteen hundred slaves; the Creeks and Choctaws had each about three thousand slaves. In these Red nations there were less than fourteen thousand fullblooded Indians to ten thousand Negro slaves."

After the Civil War the Seminoles, and to a less extent the Creeks, granted the "Freedmen" full tribal rights. The Cherokees, Chickasaws, and Choctaws did not. The result was that "in 1907 it was said that there was then not a Seminole family entirely free from Negro blood and only two or three Creek families . . . But the Cherokees, Choctaws and Chickasaws . . . seldom . . . mixed their blood with the Negro" (12).

This statement is at variance with the official U. S. report for 1870 which states that at that time there was "only one halfbreed family in the (Seminole) nation," and that "there are four hundred Negroes having all the rights of citizens," but that "the Indians (i. e., Seminoles) and Negroes do not intermarry" (2). Porter concludes

¹⁷The Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners for 1870 quotes General Arbuckle as stating (in 1852) "That in a few years the Creeks would be all black and the Cherokees all white." (2) The Report itself refers to the Creeks as "largely amalgamated with the African."

his discussion by saying that the contact of Negro and Indian has resulted in “the Africanizing of two of the principal Indian tribes”—Creek and Seminole. Intermixture there has been surely. Complete infiltration, no. The exact extent of crossing must at the moment remain a problem.

The discussion of alien blood among the Oklahoma Seminoles (and the Five Civilized Tribes) is summarized in the following figures:

In 1913 Moorehead (10, p. 23) stated the population of the Five Civilized Tribes as below:

Cherokees	41,706
Choctaws (plus Miss. Choct.)	26,612
Creeks	18,700
Chickasaws	10,989
Seminoles	3,119
	<hr/>
Total	101,126

He offers blood percentages, including freedmen and intermarried whites:¹⁸

		<i>Per cent</i>
By blood	75,253	74.35
By intermarriage	2,582	2.55
Freedmen marriage	23,381	23.10
	<hr/>	
Total	101,216	

The official tribal rolls, tabulated from June 28, 1898, to March 4, 1907, yield the following data as to degree of blood among the Five Civilized Tribes (Dawson, 4, pp. 4-5):

¹⁸ I cannot account for the discrepancy between the figures 101,126 and 101,216. I have calculated the percentages for all the figures presented.

		<i>Per cent</i>
Full-blood	26,774	26.37
Three-fourths and over	3,534	3.48
One-half to three-fourths	6,859	6.76
Less than one-half (including inter- married Whites)	40,934	40.33
Freedmen	23,405	23.06
<hr/>		
Total	101,506	

The Oklahoma Seminole is an extremely mixed type: non-Muskogean (Hitchiti) plus Muskogean (Creek), White, Negro. These are his essential ingredients. Add to this intermixture with other Indians and the crossing and re-crossing of all the variants, and the "full-blood" becomes at best a full-blooded *Indian* rather than a full-blooded Seminole.

The discussion of the racial composition of the Seminole may well be concluded by a semi-historical chronological summary, with special reference to the events leading up to the exodus to the West.

1750. Seacoffee with a number of followers left the Creek Indians and joined the Mikasukis in the Territory of Florida to form a new and independent tribe.

1776. Congressional notice taken to the fact that many Negro slaves were fleeing to, and joining with the Indians of Florida.

1783. Treaty of Augusta. Georgia alleged to have entered into treaty with Creeks to yield all Negro slaves in return for a large grant of land.

1785. Congressional Committee drew up Treaty of Galphinton with the Creeks providing that the Indians restore all "Negroes, horses, and other property" to the citizens of Georgia.

1786-8. Creeks violated the Treaty and by the Treaty of "Shoulderbone" agreed to return all Negroes as called

for in the treaty of 1785. They honored neither Treaty, for the Negroes were their friends.

1789. Georgia called upon the Federal Government.

1790. Treaty of New York. First Congressional Treaty. Creeks received certain contested lands but were enjoined to yield all Negro slaves claimed by Georgia. The Creeks acted for the Seminoles who promptly repudiated the Treaty.

1792. U. S. agent sent to Florida to negotiate with Seminoles for return of all Negro slaves. The Spanish authorities refused to recognize the agent, in his official capacity.

1796. Treaty of Colerain. Again with the Creeks, again assuming to bind the Seminoles. Neither Creeks or Seminoles really meant to give up the Negro slaves.

1802. A law was passed by which slaveholders were secured for the price of value of any bondman who should flee to the Indians.

1811-13. Groups of Georgian malcontents invaded Florida to exterminate the Seminoles. Creeks of Lower Towns rallied to the aid of the Seminoles. The raiders were repulsed.

1816-18. First Seminole War, terminating in the massacre at Blount's Fort on the Appalachianicola River, in which nearly 300 Indians and Negroes were slaughtered, and the virtual extermination of the Mikasuki villages. The fort at St. Marks fell, and General Jackson captured some 300 Indian women and children.

1819. U. S. purchase of Florida from Spain for \$5,000,000.

1821. Treaty of Indian Spring. Creek and U. S. Principal provisions were land agreements. U. S. was assigned, for the benefit of the Creek Indians, the interest vested in the claimants to the property and persons claimed.

1822. First suggestion that Seminoles be removed, made by General Jackson.

1823. Treaty of Camp Moultrie. Land guarantee and promise of protection given Florida Indians, who were restricted to area under the guarantee.

1832. Treaty of Payne's Landing. Eight Seminole Chiefs to go to the Western Country to pick out desirable lands, the Seminoles then to be settled thereupon. The Florida Indians are to cede their land claims in return for an equal amount of land, west of the Mississippi, adjoining the Creek land.

1835-37. Second Seminole War. Opened by massacre of Dade's force. Closed, after bitter fighting, by peace treaty at Fort Dade. The Negro slaves were to have full right to emigrate West with the Seminoles and Creeks.

1837-8. War resumed, ending in 1838 with the forced emigration of a great number of Indian and Negro "prisoners." By the end of 1839 more than 2,000 individuals—Seminoles and Negroes—had been expatriated and were living in the Western Country upon Cherokee land.

1839. A treaty between the U. S. and the Indians. The Seminoles and Mikasukis still remaining in Florida were granted certain lands and permitted to stay in Florida.

1840-41. A group of 250, including 50 Negroes, and 14 Mikasukis, left Florida for the West.

1844. All the Indians removed to the West were now located on Cherokee land in Oklahoma (Indian Territory).

1845. Treaty with U. S., Creeks, and Seminoles recognizing the Seminoles as a separate tribe and granting them a specific land area.

1850-51. Wildcat and a band of about 300 Indians and Negroes fled to Mexico, settling near Santa Rosa.

1852. A group of Oklahoma Seminoles went to Florida in an attempt to persuade the Florida Seminoles to move to the West. They failed.

1893. The White population now clamored for land, so in this year Congress appointed a Commission to extinguish the tribal land title of the Five Civilized Tribes and allot the land in severalty among the tribal members.

1898. The Seminole tribe was the first to negotiate with the Dawes Commission. Soon followed Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, and Chickasaw tribes.

1898-1906. Allotments made to 101,506 persons on the tribal rolls of the Five Civilized Tribes.

1890-1932. Over 200 legislative acts—national and state—have dealt with the Five Civilized Tribes!

WILTON MARION KROGMAN, PH.D.

Anatomical Laboratory,
Western Reserve University,
Cleveland, Ohio.