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As in evidence from the title of this article, we the authors have set a purpose for ourselves that is difficult, to say the least, to do to justice in one article. We are looking at one hundred and forty years of social and cultural history of five different peoples, from the time of their resettlement in the Indian Territory to modern day. What we would like to do in this article is to abbreviate our job somewhat by taking the Cherokee as a type case of the Five Civilized Tribes and then comparing the other four tribes to the Cherokees. We feel we can do this because the social and cultural processes among all of the Five Tribes during this period show a great deal of similarity.

We feel we can take the Cherokees as a type case not only because of the similarities with processes in the other four tribes but because Cherokees are a people in which these processes began earlier than in the rest of the four tribes. That is to say, the American frontier first butted up against the Cherokee territory before it reached the other four tribes. The Cherokees were involved in a very intense period of frontier warfare between 1776 and 1794. In a more intensive way and earlier than any such war-
fare in the other five tribes. Secondly, the Cherokees were much earlier in feeling social body blows such as social disorganization and population dislocation during this period of warfare and in the early eighteen hundreds. Thirdly, certain acculturative influences such as intermarriage and the taking over of white technology began earlier and in a more intensive manner among Cherokees than in any of the four other tribes.

Of course in all honesty we must admit that one of the reasons for our taking the Cherokee as a type case is that we are both more familiar with the Cherokees that the other four tribes. Both the authors of this piece have done extensive field work as anthropologists among modern Cherokees. And our contact with the other four tribes has been much more casual. Thus the body of our material will be an examination of those social and cultural processes among the Cherokees and at the end of this article we will do a comparison of the similarities and differences of the other four tribes to the Cherokees case.

Before we get in to the main body of our material it will be necessary for us to critically examine and discard two very prominent misconceptions about change among the Five Civilized Tribes, and particularly the Cherokee. One such misconception is that the Cherokees simply modeled after Euro-American society and took over wholesale institutions and customs from this neighboring people. Nothing could be farther from the truth however. In the first place it would be unlikely any people would be able to take over into their social and cultural body institutions and customs developed
In another society without some very destructive consequences, in fact we know of no such case in the world. But the data is clear in the Cherokee case, for instances, that the reforms in Cherokee life, particular between the 1800's and 1830's, took place over a generation of time and involved some degree of painful experimentation and adaptation.

The Cherokee tribal government, of which Cherokees were so proud in the last century, and which the American whites knew as an accomplishment, was created in small, carefully considered steps with much adaptation. This took place between the end of the wars with the whites in 1794 and 1827 when the Cherokee Constitution was formally adopted. One only has to look at one feature of this reform to see such an adaptation and evolution taking place. The principal of clan revenge was successively reformed from 1797 on. This took place in some five major pieces of legislation until it was finally abolished around 1820. And there is some evidence that the principal of clan revenge lasted in Cherokee society until the 1840's on an informal, subrose level but a principal never-the-less.

We can here recommend a recent publication tracing the evolution of Cherokee legal forms, "The Fire and Spirits" by René Strickland, which goes into detail as to what we are calling an evolution. We believe in fact that one could say that if Cherokees were oriented towards American governmental forms it was certainly a development toward the goal of becoming a modern state rather than to simply imitate the governmental apparatus and procedures of white neighbors.

In fact all though Cherokee history, as will become clear in this paper, Cherokees were evolving, changing and adapting their govern-
mental forms and dealing with the tensions which will precipitate in the creation of a nation-state apparatus of the nineteen century variety for tribal life.

The second misconception about Cherokee history is that the Cherokee Tribe was guided in the Cherokee Reform by a wealthy, educated, mixed-blooded elite. That is to say that this misconception in its most vulgar terms says that there were a set of enlightened people of wealth and education and a great deal of white blood, who led their more backward tribal members along the path of civilization. Now probably in these times no qualified historian would see Cherokee development in such gross and vulgar terms, but the general misconception is still very much alive and even in this decade surfaces in scholarly works, even those like Strickland's, work which is of the finest quality.

Now let us examine this notion. It appears that we have ignored factors which qualify one for leadership. The first of these factors is wealth, and the other is membership in an elite. What we would like to do in this article is simply take each one of these factors and look at the record between 1300 and 1827; in that period in which Cherokee society of the nineteenth century was created. It is clear that by 1830 most of the reforms in government, and generally in Cherokee life, was a accomplished fact. If we look at this period between 1300 and 1330, and look at leadership, we can then ask ourselves whether in fact wealth seems to be important in leadership. And indeed it does seem to be important. Many of the government officials in this period among the Cherokees were wealthy. In fact it almost
seems to be a prerequisite for leadership. Perhaps not because of status reasons but more for the fact that only a wealthy man could devote so much time to government. Or perhaps only a wealthy man would be able to be generous enough in this sharing with poor Cherokees to be considered qualified for a chiefly position. In any case, however, as one looks over the record it is clear that wealth is correlated with leadership between 1800 and 1830. McKinney reports of an instance in the life of Major Ridge, a prominent Cherokee leader, which would illustrate the importance of wealth. Ridge related that when he was first elected, or selected, to sit on the Cherokee National Council to represent his home community of Pinelog in northern Georgia, he was young and very poor. When he went to the National Council many of the younger chiefs shunned him because of his lack of appropriate, fine clothes. It was only when the older chiefs greeted him, as a fellow, in spite of his appearance, did the younger chiefs come to accept him. There may have been regional differences in the Cherokee area in the importance of wealth, but there is no doubt that it was important. Parenthetically the value of wealth, to Cherokees, has changed over the years. For instance by the 1850 it appears that wealth was not necessarily seen by Cherokee as an unqualified good. And that wealth was seen as legitimate only when it contributed to the welfare or the Cherokees. That is to say, if a prominent wealthy Cherokee shared with his neighbors and used his wealth for the common good. Today wealth has become further devalued and many Cherokees today are not certain but that wealth itself is a corrupting influence to be shunned. But it seem clear that in much of the Cherokee Nation in the 1800's
wealth was a value in and of itself and seemed to be a prerequisite for leadership or, at a minimum, wealth is strongly correlated with leadership.

Now let us take the second factor, education and look at that factor in the years between 1800 and 1830. It is extremely hard to find evidence of education at all, or to any great extent, among Cherokees in this period. We are able to locate with certainty only six or perhaps eight men who had any modicum of formal schooling. Anyone, of course, would expect this. The conditions in the Cherokee Nation between 1776 and 1794 was one of perpetual hostility with neighboring Americans. Even if a Cherokee, or a white married to a Cherokee, wanted to get formal schooling for his children, he would probably have found it very difficult to send his children to schools in white areas outside the Cherokee Nation. And he certainly would have found it impossible to import a teacher, a white teacher, to live in the Cherokee Nation to teach his children.

In fact it appears that there were only two men with education who are very prominent in this period. One is Charles Hicks, whose father was white, and who sent him to school in Virginia in the late 1860's and the early 1870's. Hicks was a mature man in his fifties and sixties during this time of Cherokee reformation. The other Cherokee of prominence in Cherokee affairs who was also educated was John Ross. Ross was also educated in the "States", at a private school financed by his white father, but after 1794. John Ross was a very young man to have been involved with Cherokee affairs during this time. In fact if one looks over the treaties signed in this period, one finds very few Cherokee chiefs who were
able to signs their name in english. Usually they signed with an X.
If there were six or eight Cherokees with some modicum of formal
education there were probably perhaps that many who were able to
sing their name in english but no more. And as we have stated of
those six or eight with some formal education very few were involved
with Cherokee affairs, perhaps only two intimately: Hicks and Ross.

In the later stages of Cherokee development, after 1820, some
other educated Cherokees were involved intimately in Cherokee affairs.
Like Ross, the were men who had been educated after 1824 as teenagers
or adolescents in school in the "States". As these men came to
maturity around 1820; they took their place in Cherokee affairs.
Ross was anomaly having been involved with Cherokee affairs since
1817 as a young man in his middle twenties.

One cannot find a correlation between education and leadership,
even if one looks at the Treaty of 1835. This treaty, seen by
Cherokees as the "False" Treaty of New Echota, was signed by the
leadership of the Treaty Party; presumably the most acculturated
and educated people among the Cherokees. Eleven men signed with
an X and only nine signed were able to sign their name. This of
course took place after the time period which we are considering;
between 1800 and 1830. In 1835, when the treaty was signed a larger
percentage of educated Cherokees. But even here the majority of
leadership was unable to sign their name in English. It is clear
from looking at this period between 1800 and 1830 that the older
traditional leaders were in control of Cherokee affairs, and that
they used the very few younger, educated Cherokees, plus Cherokees
who were worldly and sophisticated, to be resources in the reformation
of Cherokee society.

Now let us look at the third factor which many people feel is correlated with Cherokee leadership, mixed-bloodedness. That is to say, this view holds that most Cherokee leaders were the product of recent intermarriage of whites to Indians. In this case of the Cherokees this intermixture usually took place with white men and Indian women. White men who were traders or soldiers or government officials residing in the Cherokee country. In fact this was such prevalent pattern that the intermarriage of Cherokee men to white women was such a rarity as to be commented on by outside observers. It appears from what we can glean from Cherokee history in the 1700's is that, even at this early date, an there was extensive amount of intermarriage. Impressionistically it appears that intermarriage between white men and Indian women reached its peak between 1750 and 1770. Of course during the wars between Cherokees and whites, between 1776 and 1794, intermarriage was, needless to say, less common. And it appears that in the first part of the 1900's intermarriage became less and less common. However it had been so extensive in the 1700's. that in 1810 the agent to the Cherokees from the federal government estimated that fifty percent, or more, of the Cherokees were mixed-blood. According to the census of 1810 something over eleven percent of the household in the Cherokee Nation contained one white parent: Usually in this case a white man. Eleven and a half percent household is a fairly high number and if one looks at Cherokee history one sees this percentage declines until the 1930's and 1990's when intermarriage shoots up again drastically. If intermarriage had slacked off by 1910 it must mean that intermarriage was extremely heavy in the years that I am indicating were a peak, i.e. 1750 to 1770. So if
Indeed there was a mixed-blood elite which guided the Cherokee they were certainly not the only mixed-bloods, in the Cherokee Nation.

In 1808 and 1809 the National Council of the Cherokees decided to appoint a committee of thirteen people, familiar with the ways of whites to regulate the affairs of the Nation. And in those times a great many of the Nation affairs was in fact dealing with the developing American society. The Council appointed thirteen men to this committee most who appeared to be selected from the body of the Council itself. Of this thirteen, eight have European patronyms and five do not. We could conclude therefore, with some margin for error that eight of the committee were mixed-bloods and five were fullbloods. In 1811, if we once again look at the committee, six of the twelve members have American patronyms and six do not. We would conclude roughly that about half of the committee were mixed-bloods and six were fullbloods. In 1819, the proportion was the same, six people with white patronyms and six people without. Further if onw looks at the composition of the National Council in 1819 the vast majority are people without white patronyms.

Furthermore, it is clear that many of the people with Indian style patronyms are influential, powerful people in Cherokee affairs. By 1827, the Cherokees had reformed their government organization so that they had a upper-house and a lower-house, somewhat on the model of the American government. The lower-house was called the Council and the upper-house was called the Committee, analogous to the House of Representatives and the Senate. If one looks at the
upper-house, which consist of fewer members that the lower, mixed-bloods, that is people with white patronymns tend to predominate. If one looks at the lower-house, in which it appears local leaders were elected, the majority have Indian patronymns. If one looks at the Cherokee National government in 1840, after Cherokee society had undergone a severe factional split, the proportion of people in the government with Indian patronymns both in the lower-house and the upper-house increases significantly.

Thus if one looks over the membership of Cherokee government itself one can find very little correlation between mixed-bloodedness and leadership. In fact the Cherokees selected a Constitutional Convention, in the middle 1830's, to draw up the Cherokee Constitution, which was adopted the next year. One would have expected that the Cherokees would have selected their most acculturated and educated people for this job: certainly the most sophisticated. And ergo one must expect that here would be a great many of these people who had white fathers. Certainly knowledge about white society would be furthered if one had a white father, or so it would seem. However if one looks at the composition of the Constitutional Convention the preponderance of mixed-bloods does not appear. A majority of the people have white patronymns. That is to say of eighty people selected fifty had white patronymns and thirty had Indian patronymns. However if one looks at two districts, one in northern Georgia and one in North Carolina, in which lived thirty to forty percent of the population of all Cherokees, and was a traditionally conservative Indian area, the majority of the delegates here have Indian style patronymns. We can only conclude from this
that there was only a slight tendency for the Constitutional
Convention to be weighted toward mixed-bloods.

The situation becomes less clear if one looks at the Cherokees
in Arkansas in the 1820's and later in the early 1830's in the
Indian Territory. A simple listing of Arkansas Indian chiefs
prominent in this period shows that of thirty-three names listed
twenty-four are men with white patronymics and nine are men with
Indian patronymics. In other words, almost three-fifths of the
Arkansas Cherokee chiefs between 1820 and 1835 are of mixed-
background, probably with a white father or at least a white grand-
father. This is a group of people which historians universally
agree were a very conservative group. It does not appear, in fact,
that mixed-bloodedness is correlated with leadership, nor even
acculturation, or even a orientation toward white culture.

This is not to surprising if we take into consideration
that the Cherokees were a very strong matrilineal society and the
socialization of the child was strictly the affair of the lineage
of the wife. Furthermore some white fathers of Cherokee children
were transient and had little if any influence on their Cherokee
offspring. But even in what would be called substantial homes the
preponderance of the influence of the wife and her family must
have meant much less acculturation than has been assumed. In fact
where in the record are the terms mixed-bloods or fullbloods
used by Cherokees in this period between 1800 and 1830. In fact
this term only comes into current use among Cherokees, when speaking
English in the period after the Civil War. At that time the term
which signifies differing social participation, language use, and
general orientation. That is to say, the term fullblood meant someone who is part of the traditional Cherokees society, uses Cherokee in the home, and is generally not oriented toward American society. And of course the term mixed-blood had simply the opposite characteristic.

Now having examined these three factors wealthy, educated, and mixed-blood, let us look at the notion of elite, and its correlation with leadership. There does appear to be some concentration of Cherokees prominent in the Cherokee government near to the capital, New Echota. That is to say some of the wealthier leaders of the Cherokees began to develop plantations, or large farms, or simply homes in this general area. However this is a tendency and certainly some of the most prominent Cherokee leaders in that period did not live close to the capital but in outlying rural areas. What material one can get about marriage patterns of Cherokee leaders suggests that there appears to be an tendency toward an elite class. Of course the material is sparse in this regard but what material there is does not show such a tendency. In fact base on what we know of Cherokees, it seems to be unlikely that a leite would form. The famous biologist Bartram describes the Cherokees in the middle 1700 as the jealous people of personal liberty which he had ever encountered. Further, if one can judge by modern Cherokee society, Cherokees do not have well sanctioned authority relationships. Loasers today in Cherokee society are expected to be generous and giving of their time and what material assets they have. But at the same time they are not allow to separate themselves from the local Cherokee community nor are they the kind of men who would be
able to exercise sanctioned authority. There certainly is no such relation as a patronage relation as one see in Latin America. Where by virtue of generosity the patron is given loyalty and thus is able to exercise power of authority. Such a notion is foreign to modern Cherokee thinking. And one would imagine given Bartram's description in the 1700's and other Cherokee behavior in the 1800's an elite simply would not be tolerated. In fact it is the contention of this paper that the ejection of elites from the main body of Cherokees society has been one of the major social process in Cherokees history in the period of 1840 to 1930.

Now since we have examined each of one of these factors: wealth, education, mixed-bloodedness, and leite group, let us turn now and see if any of these factors correlate one with the other. We have tried to demonstrate that except for wealth there appears to be little correlation between these factors and leadership. But let us see if there is correlation, one to another, of these factors. Let us take wealth to begin with. Although wealth correlates with leadership, it appears not to correlate with the rest of the factors mentioned. This seems a little surprising. There are educated wealthy people and uneducated wealthy people. Mixed-blooded wealthy people and fullblooded wealthy people. And certainly wealth did not have a tendency to separate one from the community in a class of elites. So wealth does not correlates well with any of the other factors. In spite of what appears to be the logic of the situation, one would expect that the more formal education the more wealthy. One may even expect that wealth would correlate with being a mixed-blood since many of the whites resident in the Cherokee Nation were
traders and involved in many other kinds of business and thus were able to pass on the wealth to their sons. It is true that in fact white men did pass on their wealth on to sons. But wealth was achieved in many ways by Cherokee beside inheritance. Some Chiefs in the early day of this period before 1810 used their position as Chief to increase their wealth. Other men simply seemed to have been "self-made men." They took advantage of large amounts of undeveloped lands in Cherokee hands to make themselves wealthy. Or perhaps they did so by building a ferry across a river or perhaps opening a store or tavern. So wealth does not correlate well with the other factors.

If one looks at education we have already demonstrated that it does not correlate with wealth. There appears to be some correlation between mixed-bloodedness and education in this period between 1800 and 1830, which is in this case what one would presume logically. White men did tend to send their Cherokee children to school in the "States", if possible. That is at least a few white men did so. Cherokees with Indian fathers tended not to be sent into foreign territories for any reason. So there is some correlation here between education and mixed-bloodedness in this early period.

Now let us take the factor of mixed-bloodedness and see what kind of correlation we can get with these other factors. We already said that there not appear to be a correlation with wealth, but there is a correlation with education. There appears to be a slight tendency for the Cherokee leadership, concentrating around New Echota, to be people of mixed-blood. If in fact one could call this an elite it is not a large segment of the Cherokees leadership but
there is some slight tendency for the mixed-blood to be predominant in this group of people.

Now we have examined each factor relative to leadership and each factor relative one to another. We hope that we have demonstrated to the reader by this kind of analysis that the proposition that the Cherokee tribe was led in its attempts to reform and innovation by an elite class of wealthy educated mixed-bloods to be false. And we hope we have already convinced you that the other proposition that the Cherokees modeled after and simply took over items and institutions from white culture to also be false. The question remains however why certain responsible and even insightful historians tend to give lip-service to at least this latter notion of the wealthy, educated, mixed-blood elite. We suspect, and this is only an hypothesis, that perhaps the perception of whites who are recording in this early period has given students of Cherokee history this impression. If one looks at material form this era, one finds it is written down primarily by white officials, missionaries and the like. Such people tended to come into most contact with people whom they felt were like themselves. Primarily mixed-blooded Cherokees oriented toward white culture and perhaps wealth. If one simply looks at official government records or records left by missionaries, it is this kind of Cherokee that appears most often. One gets the impression reading these records that it was these kind of men who were in the center of the action in the Cherokee area and the more traditional non-English speaking people were on the periphery. But this is only an impression. If one looks more closely at the Cherokee government, how decisions were made, who
made them, and under what conditions this impression is shown to simply not be correct. Further it appears that whites, officials and missionaries were overestimating the influence of the people with whom they most came into contact. We imagine that it would be very easy thus for qualified historians to get this impression.

We suppose it behooves us at this point to explain a little more about the Cherokee situation in the 1830's so that the dynamics of Cherokee leadership will come through to the reader more clearly. One of the things about the Cherokee Nation in the 1830's that must be noted was the tremendous regional diversity one could find there. It is probably correct that one could contrast the Cherokee in the more northern sections of the Cherokee area with the ones in the southern along a great many axes. For instance, most of the Cherokees in the northern section of the Cherokee Nation lived in undisturbed communities. That is, they had not been pushed out of their community into other areas as was the case of most Cherokees in Alabama and Georgia. Thus they were by-in-large more traditional, less disturbed, and more cohesive as communities. This area was also a much poorer region in terms of the possibility of development of plantations and so forth. And the inhabitants were much poorer. The area was much more isolated as well as being poorer, and people had less education. Also in this area there was less intermarriage so you have far fewer people of mixed-blood. In this more northern, mountainous section of the Cherokee Nation. However, this area was the area of the heaviest population, holding probably between thirtyfive and forty percent of the total Cherokee population. There are other areas or at least one other area, that resembles this
section: The communities along the river Etowah in the extreme southern part of the Cherokee Nation. At least they resembled the Cherokees of the mountains in that they were much more traditional and cohesive.

A large part of the Cherokee population lived in east Tennessee in what were called Overhills towns on the Little Tennessee River. This section of Cherokee Nation contained New Echota, which was the capital of the Cherokee area. Thus it was the center of what could be broadly speaking, called the government. This section was also the more warlike section of the Cherokee tribe, it was that part of the Cherokees who most warred with more northern tribes. This was the richest area of the Cherokee Nation, it also appears to have had the greatest amount of intermixture. After 1776, it was the Overhill towns that bore the brunt of the fighting with the Americans. It was the people of the Overhill towns, or at least the young men of the Overhill towns, who withdrew into the rough Cumberland mountainous area west of Chattanooga to set up military bases and to continue a war that lasted almost twenty years with the incoming American whites. It was also the people of the Overhill towns who filtered slowly, family by family, into northern Georgia and Alabama as well as immigrating Arkansas. Thus this area of the Cherokee Nation in Georgia and Alabama carried the tradition of the Cherokee government, had been the most war-like, were the most mixed-in blood, had been the most disorganized as social groups and were more individualized than the extreme southern part of the Cherokee area or the northern section of the Cherokee country.

We would recommend to the reader that it is this regional difference
and the special character and experience of Cherokees from communities along the Tennessee River, in what is now eastern Tennessee, which must be understood to understand much of what was happening in the Cherokee Nation at that time. We are saying that the situation was much more complicated than simply one of wealthy, educated, mixed-blooded elites leading the mass of the Cherokee people through a time of great reform.

Now we have said so far in this article that a great many scholars have presented Cherokee history in just such a light and we have tried to give reasons why we think well-trained scholars would make such an error. However, there is another reason for such an error, and that is that this notion of Cherokee progress is very much a part of southern thought about Cherokees. This is particularly strong of course in the state of Oklahoma. We are suggesting at this point in our article that this is not simply a matter of mistaken scholarship but this is a mythology important to the social system of Oklahoma. The first time such a notion appear in print was in the 1890's, particularly in the Cherokee Advocate, in which Cherokee history is represented as a group of enlightened, educated people leading the more conservative Cherokees for their own good. Now of course in the 1900's, for the first time in Cherokee history, the more acculturated Cherokees had gained control of the Cherokee government. This was almost a revolution in Cherokee affairs and a tremendous shift of power. Both political power and social power in the Cherokee Nation. Of course it is not unknown for a group upon acquiring new political power to rationalize its acquisition of power by reinterpreting history. It is our contention that this
is precisely what happened in the 1890's in the Cherokee Nation as the mixed-blood party got control of the Cherokee government and control of the Cherokee Advocate. Later this became an official sanction in the state of Oklahoma. For a society that had integrated mixed-bloods at a high level, this became rank level into its social body while the more traditional, fullblood Cherokee were held in a low rank semi-caste position. What started out as a rationalization for a newly acquired power became the sanction for differential power of social groups within the general Oklahoma social system. This prevalent myth among lay-people plus the inadvertent slanting of records makes it understandable why so many competent historians have tended to believe that which we are now telling the reader is in error.

By this point in our article hopefully we have convinced the reader that Cherokees did not simply imitate and take over items wholesale from American culture nor were Cherokees guided in this process by an elite consisting of wealthy, educated mixed-bloods. Now the question becomes of course for us to get to the major body of our paper and present what we think were indeed the social processes among Cherokees in the period from 1840 to 1930. The first major social process in this period were dealing with were the effects of the removal to the Indian Territory. There was considerable disorganization and great loss of life in the removal. A great many older people died. They were the repositories of Cherokee traditional knowledge and their loss had disastrous effect on the local institutional structures of the Cherokee tribe.
To some degree the innovations of the Cherokee government had already removed some functions from the local community or at least formally by 1833, before the removal itself, chiefs were no longer selected from local communities by district. Although informally the candidates form the district represented significant local communities this was not on a formal basis. However most communities in the Cherokee Nation in the east still retained a local temple in the center of their community, performed Cherokee ceremonial, which varied according to different parts of Cherokee Nation, they had some semblance or a local priesthood. When Cherokees settled in the Indian Territory, after the removal, this local institutional form was not revived. In fact the only formal institutional form left to local Cherokee communities were what is called the Free Labor Society. The formalized community work force and organization for "charitable" work. Much of the dynamic on the local level for Cherokees was the rebuilding of an institutional structure because of the effect of the removal.

The second major process which was taking place in Cherokee life on the local level were continuations of processes that started before the removal. For instance, in many parts of the Cherokee Nation the form of a loyal kin organization was changing. Before 1775, our best evidence tells us that Cherokees lived as part of matrilineages; extended families which traced descent through the woman, residence pattern where men went to the homes of the wives, a system in which women "owned" the houses and the fields. Much of the Cherokee local political-ceremonial organization was build upon the matrilineages during the period between 1776 to 1794.
These matrilineages were broken apart in a large part of the Cherokee population due to the warfare and population movement. Many people moved into north Georgia, not as whole communities retaining their matrilineages, but as nuclear family households or at most extended family. The removal to the Indian Territory simply accentuated this change which started on doubt in the 1700's in many parts of the Cherokee Nation and has continued up to the present. The trend started then was for the Cherokee kin organization to become what we call in anthropology a generational system with a group of brothers being the core social and economical unit. We will say more about this later in our article.

The second process started before the removal which Cherokees were dealing with at the time of the removal and continued to deal with all through the period we are talking about, is the containment of destructive individualism. That is to say, things like the signing of treaties without sanction by individual chiefs or the promotion of warfare by individual chiefs without sanction. Both of these kinds of actions of course endangered the Cherokee survival vis a vis the powerful now and growing American society. And Cherokees were trying to handle this both on a structural level by trying to contain this kind of individual structurally and also by trying to develop an ethic which denigrated such actions.

The third main process which the Cherokees dealt with between the 1840's and at least until 1900, was the continuation of institutional creation on the tribal level, i.e., on the "national" level this process was sparked by two motivations. One was to protect Cherokee society against external threats, in this case the white
society. Another was simply to play out the Cherokees notion that they were a civilized people, with a strong sense of propriety and a sense of law, in a world of diverse peoples who could only be regulated by law. We are using "law" here in a broad sense to include not only formal secular law but sacred or natural law as well. These two motivations are best seen in the erection of the Cherokee school system after 1840 and the further refinements in the Cherokee government, law and the court system. These innovations aimed at protecting Cherokee society and playing out this conception of being a civilized people. However the process also set up certain tensions internally within Cherokee society which Cherokees are yet dealing with. We will speak further about these tensions in Cherokee society later in this article. Suffice to say that Cherokee society is yet dealing with such tensions.

The fourth process were the steps that Cherokees had to take to deal with certain internal threats to Cherokee society. By virtue of the manner in which Cherokee reformed their society, it had tended to create an acculturated people who began to conceive of themselves as an elite class. When Cherokees as a whole began to see such a conception forming among acculturated people, Cherokees ejected such people from the body of the Cherokee tribe, the social and cultural body of the Cherokee tribe. This process took place several times in Cherokee history. But although acculturated elites were ejected socially and culturally the Cherokees were never able to politically eject such elites.

Another internal threat to the Cherokee life has been the control of deviance. This of course is a common problem for most societies.
However it becomes more of a problem when a society is under stress or in fear of cultural and social oblivion as has been the case for Cherokee all through the period which we are considering. Cherokee society can stand a great deal of deviation and we will discuss this later in the paper. But when individuals become too deviant Cherokees take steps to control such deviance. It is very hard to get an idea exactly how this process takes place from looking at written records of the past. However one can get certain hints about this process is one knows the means by which modern Cherokee society deals with such errant persons. Cherokees first try to resocialize such deviance by marriage and then intensive resocialization by the deviant person's kin with the help of the family in which he is married. Another important resocialization technique is "turing" the person by Indian medicine and ritual. If these techniques do not accomplish the task Cherokees withdraw from such individuals and if the individual persists in his behavior he will be shunned, somewhat in the manner of the members of the Palatine Sect. such as the Amish, though perhaps not in as formalized or extreme a manner.

The fifth major process which one sees in Cherokee life is the break up of Cherokee communities. This involves the consolidation of some individuals into other Cherokee communities and the loss to particularly the white society of others individuals of such a community. This process has been particularly important from 1890 to the present. As Cherokee society has become geographically overwhelmed by white society. The individual Cherokee remains part of Cherokee society usually as long as he is a member of a cohesive
Cherokee community. When that cohesiveness breaks down acculturation is apt to proceed very rapidly. That is to say, if a people of another culture geographically live in a Cherokee community in any numbers, Cherokees have no mechanism to hold the inevitable relationships at arms lengths or to counter what is being learned in such relationships. Therefore children particularly of Cherokee in such circumstances are sometimes very quickly acculturated. So after the cohesion of a Cherokee community is broken, one sees Cherokees moving to other Cherokee communities or perhaps remaining in the area, coming like whites in behavior, marrying whites, and intergrating in to white society.

All processes are important in Cherokee life, and by amplification, by the rest of the Five Civilized Tribes. Most of these processes have been important throughout the hundred and forty year period about which we are writing. However different periods emphasize certain processes and we will divide up this hundred and forty year time-span of Cherokee history in to some five periods. The first period is from 1840 to 1860 from the removal to the beginning of the Civil War. The main body, the majority of the Cherokee tribe, was removed in the years, 1830 and 1839. However there had been Cherokees migrating west since 1794. These first migrants west were primarily from what was called the Chickamauga, the Cherokee area most hostile to whites and engaged in very severe military confrontation with the American society. People from this area moved into Arkansas form 1794 to 1823. In 1823 they were removed to the Indian Territory into what is now eastern Oklahoma, the area of the Cherokee Nation. Some of their number had separated
from the main body of the tribe in Arkansas in approximately 1813 and had gone to Texas. But they were driven into the Indian Territory in the 1830s by the forces of the New Republic of Texas. In the mid 1830s most of what was referred to as the Treaty Party migrated to the Indian Territory. These were relatives, and political followers, of the men who had signed the Removal Treaty of New Echota in 1835. Unlike the Arkansas Cherokee they were probably the most acculturated segment of the Cherokee population.

All this migration of both the Arkansas Cherokees and the Treaty Party appears to have been accomplished by moving as extended family groups, nuclear family groups or even as individuals. This is in contrast to the forced migration of the main body of the Cherokee tribe, the Ross Party. After the mass of Cherokees remaining in the east had been placed in concentration camps in 1839, preparatory to removal, the Cherokee officials became convinced by solid evidence that if American officials managed the removal the conditions would be atrocious. Therefore they consented to remove themselves at this point. And they moved as a total social body, using a Cherokee local institution as a building block in this migration. In almost every Cherokee community there was a formal organization which undertook communal labor and 'charitable' activities such as taking care of the sick, cutting wood of the indigents, house raising, and the like. Most of the men in a Cherokee community participated in such activities. The formal head of this institution was called, in Cherokee, what is translated as captain or war-chief. War had become a denigrated activity among Cherokees by this period, but the war-chief still functioned
to manage the communal work and charitable activities of primarily the men within the Cherokee local settlement. Therefore the Cherokee officials divided the Cherokee population of some thirteen thousand in the concentration camps into detachments of perhaps a thousand apiece. These detachments tended to represent geographical areas. That is to say, the majority of a thousand were from the same geographic area. One head captain was appointed for each detachment with one or two assistants within a body of a thousand there were probably represented at least four kin-group communities. And these subunits within a detachment were under the management of the captain or the "little captain" as he became to be called in this period.

Thus the Cherokee tribe, the main body of the Cherokee tribe, removed to the Indian Territory with some intact social wholeness. However there was a great loss of life. Some authors have estimated that one-fourth of the Cherokee population died in the removal. A great many of the deaths were among the elderly, as one would expect, so that Cherokee society was dealt a severe blow with the loss of these repositories of social and cultural knowledge. The Cherokee detachments came into the Indian Territory at certain designated points at which the United States army was issuing rations. The "little captains" of each communities explored the area from this base of the main camp. Finally selecting an area in which their community could settle. Most of these communities were place along a side stream in this eastern Oklahome area. This was the Ozark region and not significantly different from the southern Appalachian country from which the Cherokee had been removed.
Cherokees built log-houses in a loose community arrangement. These communities varied in population from a hundred to four hundred people in some thirty to fifty households spread over along a Ozark creek. It was at this time that Cherokees developed a lifestyle which was to last until comparatively recent times. This lifestyle not significantly different from the they had lived in the southern Appalachians and included a heavy dependence on gardening and hunting, small kin-base communities, and extended families residing in a series of log houses almost within shouting distance of one another.

However, as stated above, Cherokee communities lost a large part of their institutional structure during this forced removal. There was no small temples built or dance grounds in these small communities in 1840. Nor was there a local chief or priesthood. Many of these small communities tried to continue their ceremonial life in an attenuated form. Holding ceremonies at the houses of different people rather than in a temple or plaza as formerly the case. The only major institution functioning was the Free Labor Society under the direction for the "little captains". Some few communities began to build churches but this church served not simply their own local community but a region. The first Cherokee Baptist Church was established in what is now central Adair county. It was called by the Cherokees, The Big Shad, and thought of as the mother church of most of the Cherokee Baptist Churches. There were of course Indian doctors functioning in Cherokee communities but their role was not heavily institutionalized and they were no longer a part of a local priesthood.
Cherokees from local communities did participate in the Cherokee National Government but as members of districts rather than simply from a local area. There were schools established by the Cherokee National Government in many parts of the Cherokee area. But there was rarely a school for each community, rather, a school served several communities. These schools were part of the institutional apparatus of the National government. And further in this period these schools were in English so that most of them could not really be considered local institutions although they were Cherokee institutions.

Cherokee kin-organization became more generational than in the east. Probably most of the communities in Georgia and Alabama were already organized on the basis of generation. While the communities in the mountains of Georgia and North Carolina appear to have been primarily organized on the basis of matrilineal lineages. The removal created a leveling process so that this variation was not evident in Cherokee communities. As a whole traditional tribal Cherokees were becoming organized on the basis of generations with a group of brothers as a core structural unit. However, Cherokee society never became completely generational nor is it completely generational today.

In the 1840's, women still owned a great deal of property, sometimes owning the home and many times owning cattle. Residence was beginning to be officially patrilocal; that is to say when a woman married she went to the house of her husband. However if one looks at Cherokee society today there is little more than a tendency towards patrilocal residence and in fact considerable
matrilocal residence still exists. Furthermore the function of the mother's brother as general moral guide and disciplinarian has never disappear from Cherokee life. If one looks at the terms by which Cherokees refer to relatives, one see a general generational pattern. That is everyone in one's own generation is called brother and sister and everyone in one's grandparent's generation is called grandfather or grandmother. However, in the generation ascending everyone is called father or mother except mother's brother, who is still called uncle. Thus showing the importance of mother's brother in Cherokee life. Furthermore in most Cherokee families the house is still conceived of as the woman's, as well as is the garden. And children "belong" to the mother.

Cherokees as a whole were still dealing with the problem of containment of destructive individualism in the 1840's. Certainly from the Cherokee viewpoint, the Treaty of New Echota was the epitome of individualism gone wild. That is to say, that one would have a group of a responsible men sign a treaty against the wishes of the majority of the Cherokee people. By-in-large however, Cherokee's had begun to structurally contain individualism. The ethic of peace and law, which devalued in the extreme individualism, began to develop to its extreme by Cherokee's in this period. For instance, there was a great Peace Council held in Tahlequah in 1843, which brought together most of the tribes in the Indian Territory and eastern Kansas for the proposal of reiterating this ethic of peace and law and setting up regular relationships among tribes so that this ethic of peace and law could become functional.

Furthermore the Cherokees continued, as was stated above,
to remodel their national institutional structure in order to protect themselves against external threats; in this case the general American society. They also remodeled in order to play our their notion of themselves as a civilized people with a sense of law and propriety. The Cherokee school system was formed thus in the early 1840's before this period in the Cherokee Nation in the east, Cherokees had to depend primarily upon differing mission groups for schooling. From this period on most Cherokee children attended schools of their own. However, this school was not a local institution but a national institution which simply maintained the school in an area.

The New Echota Treaty of 1835 had been signed without the sanction of either the mass of the Cherokee people nor the official Cherokee government. And of course for the majority of Cherokees the removal was a horrendous experience. Cherokees saw the acts of men who had signed the Removal Treaty as a example of the most destructive individualism. And further began to see that it was the feeling of elitism on the part of the Treaty Party leaders which gave them the sanction to commit the Cherokees to such a course without Cherokee approval. In this period Cherokees forcibly ejected the Treaty Party from social and cultural life as well as exacting vengeance upon them. This ejection took the form of a minor civil war between the Ross Party and the Treaty Party. This war took place between 1833 and 1846 at which time a tenuous peace was made. By 1846 the Treaty Party was firmly out of Cherokee life in all ways except politically.

Cherokee communities during this time had retained their stability
and cohesion. However, certain cultural forms disappeared during this period, probably in order to maintain cohesion within the community and between communities. Cherokee stickball, the southern form of Lacrosse, which is played between villages, was very popular with the Cherokees before removal and after. However, it began to disappear in this period probably due to the fact that acts of violence and black magic began to be associated with the ball-play. And of course, such acts of violence and black magic would certainly damage relationships between communities and possibly even within communities.

At the end of this first period, by 1850, it was becoming clear to traditional Cherokee leaders that the Civil War was approaching. The Treaty Party was still a political threat to Cherokee survival as well as a cultural and social threat to some degree. Leaders could see that traditional Cherokees had to formally exercise more control over Cherokee affairs. Cherokees started meeting in various parts of the Cherokee Nation. They soon organized what they referred to as a Society and called it the Katoowa Society. Cherokees simply revived the old removal organization as the organizational form of their efforts, but instead of a head captain with two assistants for each settlement, there was a head captain and two assistants for each district. The "little captains" from each community, was the delegate form his community to the general meetings of the Katoowa Society and there was an elected, or perhaps selected, chairman of the whole society.

The Katoowa Society wrote a constitution in which it stressed that the organization was being formed to insure Cherokee survival.
It also stressed that the Society was at the services of the Chief of the Cherokee Nation. This last was probably stressed because of the coming Civil War. Further stressed within the body of the constitution were the old values of sharing and cooperation among Cherokees and the need to be watchful in continuing Cherokee traditions generally.

This Society preformed a number of functions. It made formal the Free Labor Society at the local community level and gave it another function. In some sense it was a counter to the Cherokee national government which, as an organization, ignored local communities. It certainly made firm its rejection of the Treaty Party and certain acculturative tendencies within even some of the leaders of the Ross Party.

When the Civil War broke out, the Keetoowa Society, which was the voice of the majority of the Cherokee tribe, the traditional tribal Cherokee who lived in local communities, people who were coming to be called the fullblood Cherokees, was sympathetic to the Union. This was probably due to a number of factors, Georgia, after all, was a southern state. The Treaty Party followed the general life style of a moderate wealthy southern planters. And the Cherokee Nation, after all, did have a treaty with "Washington".

The Cherokee Nation under the leadership of John Ross officially declared for the south and entered into a new treaty relationship with the Confederacy. However the fullblood Cherokees, along with the Ross family, soon abandoned this alliance and fought most of the war as members of the Union army. In fact to some degree, the Civil War in the Cherokee Nation was simply a reival of the
internal Cherokee Civil War of the early 1840's. The Treaty Party remained steadfast allies of the Confederacy and the leader of the Cherokee Confederate troops, Stand Watie, became the general of all Indian Territory troops and ended the Civil War with the rank of brigadier general. Furthermore, most of the more acculturated members of the Ross Party, many of them people who did not live in Cherokee communities but as extended families, people who were moderate wealthy, fairly well educated, and who provided administrative skills in the national government for the mass of the Ross Party, remained loyal to the Confederacy and cut their ties with the majority of the Ross Party. The majority of the Ross Party being the traditional Cherokee-speaking fullbloods who lived in local communities.

In fact, there had been some intermarriage between the members of the Treaty Party and the more acculturated members of the Ross Party. Once again this was not simply the choice of the more acculturated members of the Ross Party but another ejection of a forming elite. This is not to say that all of the more acculturated or sophisticated leaders of the Ross Party were ejected in this matter. Certainly the Ross family itself fought in the Union army and the children of Chief John Ross were members of the Keetoowa Society.

At the end of the Civil War, the Cherokee people were once again in a prostrate condition, much like after the removal. There was a great population loss both from casualties from the war and from disease. At least a third of the Cherokee population appears to have perished. The population loss among the fullblood Cherokees
was greater than among the Southern Cherokees. Nearly all the Cherokee homes had been burned by one or another army. There were many Cherokee orphans for the first time in Cherokee history and life was in a very disorganized state.

It is at this point that we enter our second phase of Cherokee history in the period of 1866 to 1890. In a very few years, Cherokees made a remarkable recovery and probably by 1863, affairs in the Cherokee Nation were back to normal. The formalization of the Ketoowa Society certainly had given more power to the local Cherokee community. It had strengthened the Free Labor Society and given it a new political and cultural function. Moreover the Ketoowa Society controlled the politics of the Cherokee Nation to the end of this period until 1900. By 1870's, Cherokee political parties had sorted out into the National Party and the Downing Party. The National Party represented the interests of the fullblood Cherokees and in fact the Ketoowa Society and the National Party were almost one and the same organization.

During this period of 1866 to 1890 the Ketoowa Society was able to alleviate some of the tensions, at least among the fullblood Cherokees, which had arisen with the creation of the Cherokee national state. The Cherokee national state divided the Cherokee, into districts which tended to represent no natural social unit. Further, candidates were elected by individual voters by secret ballot and by majority rule. All of these mechanisms create tension in Cherokee society. Certainly the ignoring of the local community causes such tensions, even though it helped to contain destructive individualism by containing the power of local chiefs or local
leaders. Secret ballot, majority rule and individual voting is extremely ungenial with the Cherokee way of maintaining relationships. Cherokees prefer to make decisions in open meetings by unanimous agreement without offending the minority viewpoint. Since the kekowoa Society had literally written the Treaty Party and others more acculturated Cherokees out of the tribal body of Cherokee society, they no longer had to take them into consideration. Therefore when they met as a party they could select candidates by unanimous agreement or perhaps sometimes with the advice of a spiritual leaders like medicine men. Then Cherokees could go vote. Cherokee fullbloods could vote as a block in the national election for their candidate without offending their fellows since they no longer felt the Treaty Party to be their fellows.

There were also further strengthenings of the local community. By 1860 most Cherokee communities had their own small Baptist Church with their own deacons and their own preachers, so that nearly all communities now had a religious institution firmly within their grasp. The service was in the Cherokee language, the Bible was in Cherokee, hymns were in Cherokee and the local community Cherokee Baptist Church was indeed just that: a Cherokee Baptist Church, a native Christianity. This is something that one also very rarely finds in North America.

In this period from 1860 to 1899, Cherokees also undertook to create other tensions to counteract those which had been created by the erection of their national institutional structure. For instance, Cherokee schools became bilingual in this period rather than just English speaking. This was not only a reform of part of
their national institutional structure by made the school in fact much more of a local institution.

By the end of this period however there was some new features appearing in Cherokee society. The Cherokee national institutional structure had been literally created and completed. There was no more Cherokees could do in erecting organizational buffers between themselves and white society. In fact, the inroads of white society into Cherokee life had changed rather than pressure for removal or acculturation pressures railroads began to enter the Cherokee Nation. After the Civil War, by treaty, Cherokee agreed to give rightaway to railroads across the Cherokee Nation. Other economic interests were pressing hard on the Cherokee Nation. It was in this time that Cherokees most made use of maintaining an almost permanent lobby in Washington and the pressing of a variety of court cases. In other words, it was during this time that Cherokees used one part of the American institutional structure to control another part of American society and thus protect Cherokee social, political and cultural autonomy.

After the Civil War most of the Southern Cherokees, as they were now becoming to be called (that coalition of the Treaty Party and the more elitist minded members of the Ross Party who had remain loyal to the Confederacy), began to move into the western part of the Cherokee Nation, out of the Ozark region, into the prairie country of that area that very much resembles eastern Kansas. Most of them were no longer plantations owners, but ranchers. There were a few, small fullblood Cherokee kin-group communities in this region. Over the years with the inundation of the area
by the Southern Cherokee, or the mixed-bloods as they were coming to be called, these communities were beginning to break-up. Some individuals remained in the area and became part of the general mixed-blood society west of the Grand River. But probably the majority moved out of the area, east, into the Ozark Region of the Cherokee Nation. Here they integrated into the more stable full-blood Cherokee communities.

It is at this point in 1835 that we enter what we call the third period of Cherokee history, from 1830 to 1905. This is a span of time which brought about a revolution in the life of most Cherokees. It was a time in which most Cherokees had grave doubts about the possibility of the social and cultural and political survival of the Cherokees as a group of people. In 1830, for the first time in Cherokee history, the traditional Cherokees lost control of the Cherokee national government. The Downing Party came into power; the mixed-blood party. Over the years the marriage with whites and with internal increase, the mixed-bloods west of the Grand River had increased in number much more so than had the fullblood Cherokees who lived primarily east of the Grand River. The Downing Party had also made an alliance with the black citizens of the Cherokee Nation. These were people who had been former slaves of Cherokees and admitted to citizenship in the Cherokee Nation after the Civil War. Furthermore there were many integrated whites who had Cherokee citizenship who were living in mixed-blood homes. So that in gross number of votes the Downing Party, the mixed-blood party, had become very powerful.

To further weaken the political picture for fullbloods it was
by now apparent that the American Government meant to dissolve the Cherokee Nation by one means or another. In the 1830's the Dawes Commission came to the Cherokee Country to try to convince the Cherokees to dissolve the holding of their lands in common, to allow the Government to allot their lands and to become citizens of the United States. Most Cherokees in Cherokee communities were well aware of the Dawes Commission negotiations going on in Tahlequah. Furthermore in the nineties the United States authorized a survey of the Cherokee Nation as a preparatory move to the allotment. This survey became a symbol of white attempts to destroy Cherokee autonomy in almost every Cherokee community. And of course finally in 1889, the Curtis Act was passed. It called for dissolution of the government of the five tribes, of their institutional structure and of their schools and courts. It also provided for entry into the Union; i.e. while in the interim it extended federal law to the Five Civilized Tribes.

After the Curtis Act as could be expected settlers began to come into the Indian Territory in large numbers. But settlers had began coming in, to some degree, to the Cherokee Nation in the early nineties. By 1935 the allotment was a accomplished fact. By the end of this period, Cherokees were beginning to lose their now individually owned lands. The response of the Five Tribes to these conditions was the organization of general resistance movement called the Four Mothers Society. This Society consisted of representatives of the traditional fullblood Indians of all of the Five Tribes. To the Cherokee case the Keetoowa Society undertook a revival of the Cherokee religion under the leadership of Redbird Smith.
And within the space of a short time, in 1903, there were some twenty-two "fires" in the Cherokee Nation. Each fire had a local priesthood, as was the case before 1833 in the southern Appalachian Region. Furthermore the fires served a larger population unit than simply a local community; they usually served two or more small kin-groups. Thus twenty-two fires means that most of the Cherokee fullbloods were members of this revival. Only one area in southern Adair county seems to have been aloof from this general movement among the fullblood Cherokees.

This of course meant a reorganization of the Ketoowa Society. Rather than the Free Labor Society being the building block of the Ketoowa Society it was now the local priesthoods which were the building blocks of the Ketoowa Society. But this meant also that now there was an additional institutional form within the local community. The Free Labor Society was usually structurally integrated into the organization of the fire. But as a structural unit it retained some autonomy of its own as an institution.

The Ketoowa Society, the fullblood Cherokees, simply withdrew from participation in the tribal government. This certainly resolved the tensions that had been set up in Cherokee life. Now that fullblood Cherokees participated only in their own local institutions, or perhaps of the Ketoowa Society at a national level, there no longer existed the republican form of mechanisms to disrupt any Cherokee relationships. This does not mean that Cherokees, fullbloods, ceased to think of themselves as a civilized people governed by law. It was simply that there was more of an emphasis now on sacred law and sacred institutions rather than on secondary law and secondary institutions.
Once again a forming elite was ejected from Cherokee society or better put, perhaps now, "Cherokee fullblood society". The National Party had regulated Cherokee affairs up to the period of the 1830's. In this process, and also because of the bilingual school system, there developed considerable number of educated fullblooded Cherokees. And a considerable number of those educated had filled administrative post in the Cherokee government. Some of these families, particular the ones who settled near Tahlequah, Oklahoma, were unable to cut their ties with the rest of Cherokee Society as had the fullblood Cherokees. They tended to try to function as fullblood spokesmen to the tribal government and federal authorities. In the process some Cherokees were once again ejected from the main body of fullblood life. Some of these families have moved to other parts of the area of the country. Some went into the Bureau of Indian Affairs in western states, etc. Probably the mass of the administrative class of the National Party returned to Cherokee communities and remained a part of Cherokee fullblood life.

Local communities not only had a new institution, the local priesthood and fire, but Cherokees also began to try to protect the integrity of Cherokee communities by narrowing the field of deviance. That is to say, the definition of who was a Cherokee in fullblood life began to be more restrictive. It began to be hard for a Cherokee to be tangentially hinged onto a local community. It became a prerequisite that one became part of a Cherokee community. Education began to be looked at suspiciously by Cherokees, as well as was too much wealth. Particularly wealth which was not put at the
services of the Cherokee fullblood people as a whole. Furthermore the social and cultural definition of who was a Cherokee began to be restrictive. To be a fullblood Cherokee, or a Cherokee as most fullbloods saw it, one had to have two parents who were Cherokee speaking people, preferable four grandparents, but certainly two parents. In this way one had a minimum of kin-ties outside of Cherokee society. Speaking the Cherokee language in the home was an absolute prerequisite. In fact anyone who had to much contact with whites or mixed-bloods began to be, by the nature of the case, defined as someone who must have blood-ties with white society and therefore not a real Cherokee.

Of course in the final analysis the return of the fullblood Cherokees to the Cherokee religion did not halt American Imperialism. By 1907 the new state of Oklahoma was admitted to the Union with Cherokees among its citizenry. To this fourth period of the Cherokee history we are assigning the dates of around 1905 to 1960. Of course in this period the Cherokee Nation was dissolved. Cherokees were integrated into the general citizenry of Oklahoma. They were now a minority in their home areas with a great many whites living not only between Cherokee communities but sometimes within the geographical areas of the Cherokee communities. A great deal of land was lost in this early period between 1907 and 1920. And the Cherokees were fairly impoverished by the 1920's. The mixed-blood Cherokees integrated in with the general white population, leaving the only structurally separate part of the former Cherokee population to be the fullblood communities along the side of streams in the Ozark region.
The Cherokees continued their policy of withdrawal. In this case not simply from just the tribal government but now from the state of Oklahoma, its general institutions of government, law, courts, etc., and from whites in general. Cherokees tried to insulate their communities from contact with whites. As time went on more and more confrontation was expected for those people living in Cherokee communities. Tensions must have increased in this period, particularly from 1907 thru the 1920. For this was a time when Cherokees lost land, became impoverished, went down in level of education, and sophistication, and so forth. Cherokees focused, during this period, on preserving the life of the local community. Possibly because of the tensions several features of Cherokee life was discontinued: square dancing, corn stalk shootings, and those games which because of competition would disharmony within the Cherokee social body. The only Cherokee game left functioning was a "marble" game which is played in a minority of Cherokee communities even today. But gambling games, dances, and competitive athletic events were discontinued.

In this period the Cherokee fires, the ceremonial grounds, were discontinued in the majority of the Cherokee communities and the priesthood was disbanded. In this sense some of the local Cherokee institutional structure eroded in this period. In some instances, when the fires had been revived churches had been abandoned in the local community. In other communities there was still a church and a fire. Those communities which in the 1920's replaced their fire with a church did not lose a local institutional structure.
But those communities which had bout a fire and a church lost a segment of their local institutional structure.

Furthermore in the 1930's Oklahoma Cherokees experienced the dust bowl and the Depression as did most people in Oklahoma. Since Cherokees were now among the poorest of the poor this was a further blow to Cherokee culture. It was during this period, that the most tenuous of Cherokee local institutions, the Free Labor Society began to decay. After World War II, as Cherokees began to be pulled into the wage-labor economy and stopgap subsistence farming, this kind of cooperative work almost ceased. In fact, even "charitable" cooperative work ceased to a large degree in some Cherokee communities.

Toward the end of this period, after World War II, there appears to be a household as a significant unit emerging in Cherokee life. Up until World War II, the local community kin-group was the smallest institutional form. There was really no such thing as a nuclear families. The marriage tie itself was not important in Cherokee life. Since World War II however, the households as a unit has become important as the marriage tie progressively becomes more important. One can see a reflection of this in modern Cherokee terminology. No longer are what would be in English "cousins" called simply brother and sister. Now they are second brother and sister, to differentiate them from those brothers and sisters within the household. The casual marriage arrangements of previous Cherokee life has become, more and more, frowned upon since World War II.

During this time there was also anothe period of the break up of communities as there had been in the 1930's. In those sections
on the edges the fullblood Cherokee country, for instance, the just to the west of the Grand River, just at the edge of the Ozarks, and perhaps in the southwestern part of the Cherokee Nation, Cherokee households in Cherokee communities were quite widely spread. After 1900, whites began to move into the area, so that if one were living in a Cherokee household in the areas mentioned there would be a great many more white families nearby than Cherokee families. This set up a lot of interaction and use of English with white neighbors. Several Cherokee communities disappeared during this time, with the usual patterns of individuals reintegrating into more established Cherokee communities and other individuals integrating into white society.

Furthermore there was land loss by virtue of dam building activities or military activities of the federal government, which moved some Cherokee communities. Some of these communities moved while others fragmented and were never able to reconstitute themselves. And once again some individuals went to more established communities and other moved into white society. By-in-large however during this period, Cherokees tried to shore up the defenses of a local community by doing away with games which might threaten social harmony, by expecting more conformity in life in a Cherokee community, by devaluing education, devaluing any contact with whites and generally withdrawing from contact with white society.

Our fifth period is from 1960 to 1990. This is a time period which begins with the opening up of the fullblood Cherokee area. Up until 1960 the Ozarks of Eastern Oklahoma had been very isolated from the rest of America. But after 1960, America literally fell-in
on the heads of fullblood Cherokees. Roads were built in all but
the most inaccessible sections. The area became dotted with man-
made lakes. Tourists began to come into the region. State game
rangers began to patrol the area, along with state police. New
people began to move into the area to take advantage of the tourist
trade. And the Cherokee general policy of withdrawal from whites
began to be reoriented. For one thing, the Cherokee economy, sub-
sistence farming with heavy reliance on hunting, had been eroded
considerably. Most Cherokee families now relied upon wage-labor
as the mainstay of the Cherokee economy although there was some
gardening and hunting. These areas of life are very important to
Cherokees symbolically. But they were not the underpinnings of
the Cherokee economic life at the beginning of the period. If one
looks at Cherokee policy in the 60's it appears to be a series of
revolts. Perhaps non-violent or non-confrontational but revolts
nevertheless. Cherokees protested interference with what they felt
to be their fishing rights with a series of large fish-ins and turned
to protecting their hunting rights by hiring lawyers to go to
Federal Court. Soon they were using lawyers to try to protect and
recover what few land resources were left to them. Other groups of
fullblood Cherokees were battling with the newly reconstructed,
white controlled, Cherokee tribal government.

In the 70's Cherokees became much more active and now not simply
by participating in what we are referring to as revolts; i.e. sporadic
brushes with the white establishment over Cherokee rights and in-
justices. By the 70's they were working on the development of
Cherokee communities internally. Some churches have recently tried
to revive the old communal working efforts in Cherokee communities. By-in-large, those ceremonial fires which are still functioning in the Cherokee area, are gaining more and more adherence among Cherokees. The United Ketoowee Band, a organization that was founded by the federal government in the late 1930's, has gained a great deal of allegiance among fullblood Cherokees. They are not simply jostling with the Cherokee tribal government but are trying to literally take over that institution or take over its power. At the same time the Cherokee communities are becoming more active internally and less withdrawn from the general society.

Cherokee tribal life seems to be in another period of community breakup and loss of individuals. In recent years there has been a terrific migration of individual Cherokees out of the Cherokee area. Some have settled in communities not too far distance from home, enough to commute to kith-kin on weekends. Some are settled in colony-like arrangements in the Fort Worth/Dallas area. But most are scattered as individuals in places like California. It is doubtful that at least the people who are scattered as individuals will return to the Cherokee tribe.

The tremendous rate of growth of the Cherokee population has however made up for the loss of membership. A very gross estimate would be that there are now in the Ozarks of Eastern Oklahoma some twenty-thousand (20,000) people living in rural full-blood Cherokee communities probably more than at anytime in Cherokee history. However many Cherokee communities appear to be on the verge of breaking up as social units. There are two great "glots" of Cherokees, one in the northern part of the Cherokee area, in
the Spavinaw Creek region, and the other in what is southern Adair county. Those two heavy concentrations of Cherokees must number together some nine thousand people. In those areas one finds few whites.

For the past fifteen years, other areas in the Cherokee region, one finds Cherokees scattered as a minority; even in those areas where there is a Cherokee community or social group. Therefore there has been much interaction of Cherokee children with white children both in schools and in that time not spent in schools. In many of these communities in Sequoyah county and Cherokee county, Oklahoma, there appears to be a severe language loss. Many Cherokees in these areas prefer to speak English to Cherokee. Many are more comfortable in English than in Cherokee, and some only vaguely understand the Cherokee language. It is doubtful that a Cherokee community can maintain itself as a series of scattered English speaking Cherokee families. For one thing, these families will be cut off from institutional life and interactions in other Cherokee areas. Some ministers in the Cherokee Baptist Association are now even encouraging the use of English in Cherokee churches.

One would tend to predict therefore that over the next thirty years or so the Cherokee population in such areas as Sequoyah county and Cherokee county will either move into a more heavily populated Cherokee section or will simply be absorbed into white society. In fact, one could imagine that in the future the Cherokee tribe will centered in the two areas of population concentration: southern Adair county and further north in the drainage of Spavinaw Creek and Delware and Saline counties. Probably there are all together,
some fifteen thousand members of Cherokee speaking communities.
Still a large tribe by American Indian standards.

It is our contention in this paper that the Five Tribes in
Eastern Oklahoma significantly resemble one another, particularly
in terms of the social and cultural processes which we have been
Illustrating by Cherokee data. Certainly there are differences in
the Five Tribes, significant differences. For instance, there seem
to be less sanctioned authority in Cherokee life than among the
other four tribes. One only has to go to a Cherokee ceremonial
ground or a Cherokee church and contrast it with the same institutions
among the Creeks. Cherokees are very wary of telling another
Cherokee what to do, leadership simply does not have that sanction
among Cherokees. Cherokees probably more resemble the Central
Algonquin tribes, like the Mesquakie and the Potawatomi, in this
regard than they resemble the other four Civilized Tribes. The
other four of the Civilized Tribes are able to operate with san-
tioned authority in the hands of leaders almost to the degree that
one finds in the modern Pueblo Indians in the Southwest. In fact,
Choctaw Indians seem willing to go along with policy made by Chiefs,
who have legitimate authority and who even approach being part of
an elite class. For instance, many Choctaws at the time of allotment
felt betrayed by their own Chiefs in this time. Feeling that they
had trusted them and in the end they had been betrayed.

Choctaws and Cherokees share the characteristic of appearing
to be bery open to innovation, while Creeks and Seminoles are very
conservative. Creeks and Seminoles tend to be very traditional,
probably among the most traditional of North American Indians. Further, Seminoles and Creeks still have a warrior-tradition which one can certainly see acted out in their stick-ball games in the autumn of each year. And generally Creeks and Seminoles appear more aggressive and open in personality structure, than do Cherokees and Choctaws. Cherokees and Choctaws are much more "low-key" people than are the Creek and Seminoles.

However, regardless of these differences in what might be called national character, the similarities in the social and cultural processes among the Five Tribes are striking. But after all, these tribes did come from the same general culture area, have many customs and institutions in common, tended to respond similarly to white pressure, and so forth.

Now having said that one finds a general similarity among the Five Tribes and that our Cherokee data illustrates the process generally let us discuss in what ways the other of the four tribes differ from Cherokees in these general social and cultural processes. First the Creeks, Seminoles, and Chickasaws seem to not only by more conservative generally as people, but also we find cultural and social processes appear later in the history of the Creeks, Chickasaws, and Seminoles than among the Cherokees and Choctaws. Possibly part of this is because Cherokees and Choctaws are more innovation while the Creeks and Seminoles particularly are not only more conservative but, as mentioned very much more traditional. So that process come to fruition among Cherokees, for instance, one will see that same process happening among Creeks some twenty-five years later.
The Creeks and Seminoles lost less of their aboriginal institutions in the removal than the other three tribes. This is in some degree because of the nature of those institutions. Creeks and Seminoles have hereditary local communities, hereditary towns, in which one inherits membership through the female line. And since Creeks and Seminoles are more traditional, they have tended to keep alive the aboriginal religion and its institutional counterpart, the ceremonial grounds.

Furthermore there had probably been less of a loss of individuals to white society because of community break-up among the Creek and Seminole tribes. For the reason just stated, this is the nature of the local institutions and the traditional bent of Creeks and Seminoles. In fact, one could make argument that the Creeks are among the most traditional of the American Indians. This does not mean that some Creek and Seminole communities have not eroded. Certainly those areas or communities originally called the Lower Towns along the northern part of the former Creek Nation are in rather weak social shape, although there appears to be some revival going on now among the Creeks and some revitalization of these communities.

The Creeks and Seminoles felt more tension between their national republican-form institutions and their local institutions than did any other of the Five Tribes. Once again this is probably because of a heavy formalization of institutions with aboriginal mechanisms still present conflicting with the more republican-form governments on the national level. It is true that the Creeks tried valiantly to be creative and to make a place for the local community in
Creek governmental structure. But the mechanisms of government were even more uncongenial than they were to fullblood Cherokees. The famous Green Peach War among the Creeks in the 1830's was not only the Creeks civil war between the fullbloods and the mixed-bloods but was also a protest on the part of the traditional Creeks against what they felt to be socially destructive governmental mechanisms operating in the Creek national government.

Creeks and Seminoles and Chickasaws also faced an entirely new ecological area when they were removed to their present territories. Certainly this was much less the case with the Cherokee and Choctaws. The Ozarks is very much like the soils of the Appalachians and the southeastern Oklahoma is not significantly different from east central Mississippi though perhaps a little more mountainous. By contrast central Oklahoma does not in any way resemble the ecology of central Alabama or Florida or northern Mississippi. So the Creeks, Seminoles, and Chickasaws were thrust into a extremely different natural environment. The Creeks and Seminoles solved this dilemma by becoming more idealjical and less responsive than most tribal groups to an ecological area. Most tribal groups are so responsive to ecology that when they are moved they will completely revamp their life way. Creeks and Seminoles may have already in the southeast, by virtue of their very high development, been less attuned to the natural environment than other tribes. Certainly when they moved to central Oklahoma, they appear not to have been as responsive as one would have expected of a tribal group. Creek and Seminole life did not undergo tremendous changes during that period. They simply became very conscious, very aware, very con-
servative, and very traditional about their culture, customs, and institutional life. In the same way though perhaps not to as great a degree, as did white pioneers who seemed able to move though a myriad of natural environments without significant adaptation.

The Chickasaw seem to have fared less well than the Creeks and Seminoles. They did not make the same kinds of adaptation in terms of ideological orientation and awareness. And in modern times the Chickasaws have been more fragmented, since the Second World War, by events in their area. Therefore they may be in some social and cultural danger, perhaps drastic social disorganization or even massive acculturation.

Creeks and Seminoles do not seem to be in such danger! They are some tensions in Creek and Seminole life by virtue of the heavy ideological bent, turn of mind, and conseratism in Creek and Seminole life. For instance, one inherits one's town membership though the mother. Yet a great many Creeks do not live in their mother's home community. Their mother may have moved to their father's community. Therefore one is born in a geographical area of their father's community, and many have to worship at their father's ceremonial ground, while at the same time one is really a hereditary member of mother town and ceremonial ground. So that now there is a tremendous tension in Creek life which had not been resolved. That is, people do not live in the geographical area of their hereditary towns so that becomes politically clumsy, and they do not worship at their hereditary ceremonial ground and that becomes religiously clumsy. Of course those communities that are basically Christian, Seminole and Creek communities do not show tension.
Whatever the case, the Five Civilized Tribes come from a very similar area. They are southeastern Indians, their customs and their institutions reflect the southeast and a common culture in that sense. They faced a common enemy and common problems. Therefore it is not surprising that regardless of the difference in national character perhaps, and a difference in the particulars, the cultural and social processes are very similar among all the Five Civilized Tribes. Therefore we feel that our presenting the Cherokee case does not do violence to these other four important tribes.

In conclusion, we would like to put the history of the Five Civilized Tribes in the context of what happened generally in North America. In a large sense, the Five Civilized Tribes are unique in North America. These five tribes were perhaps the only peoples who were able the have a large degree of political autonomy after contact with European whites. And this political autonomy lasted until around 1900, much later than any other tribe in North America.

This political autonomy continued after a very intense contact with whites. It may therefore explain certain differences in the social and cultural processes of the Five Tribes that one does not see among other peoples. For instance, except for the Pueblos and the Papagos, the Five Civilized Tribes are the only such people who developed a native Christianity. However, the Papagos and Pueblos were able to develop a native Catholicism primarily because incoming Spaniards had a tradition of allowing a folk Catholicism at the local village level. In the case of the Five Civilized
Tribes, these tribes simply had the autonomy to develop a native Christianity, in this case a native Protestantism.

The Five Civilized Tribes are of course the only people who were able to develop a functioning republican form of government with court systems, schools, etc. And regardless of how much tension it set up internally within these societies, and how much they grappled with these tensions, they were workable governments. This is quite a contrast to tribal governments in other areas of North America or even some of the governments of newly emerging nations.

The Five Civilized Tribes were never on a reservation, they never had the control exercised over their life by a federal bureau as did other tribes. Further, when the members of the Five Civilized Tribes became citizens of the state of Oklahoma, they simply withdrew from white society and although they were progressively shorn of their resources this was a fairly acceptable adaptation. Certainly on a federal reservation one cannot withdraw from the federal government.

Since the Five Tribes had social, political, and cultural autonomy before 1907, and some degree of benign neglect after 1907 the Five Civilized Tribes communities are in a extremely healthy social condition today. One does not see such destructive behavior as violence, family break up, juvenile delinquency and alcoholism that one sees in many other Indian communities around North America. Further one does not see directed acculturation attempts which have left people confused and inconsistent in behavior, thinking and self-conception. Before 1907, the Five Civilized Tribes were able
to control their own destiny. After 1907, they were able to at least insulate themselves from a society bent on not only taking their resources but their survival as peoples as well. The Five Civilized Tribes are probably one of the areas in North America where the native languages are strongest. This is probably correlated with a stable insulated community. Further by-in-large, the Five Civilized Tribes are a fairly traditional people; certainly the Creeks and some of the Seminoles are among the most traditional peoples in North America. The Choctaws, who are committed Christians and have neither ceremonial grounds or ceremonies, are known for their skill in Indian curing. They have a surprisingly large numbers of non-English speakers. In fact, sophisticated Indian observers are impressed by the "Indianess" of rural Choctaws in southeastern Oklahoma. In this case, Indianess means the quality of interaction, ways of thinking, and ways of being.

The Five Civilized Tribes are known for their "civilization" their republican form of government, their school systems, and their prosperity. However, as social scientist, we would recommend perhaps other features of the Five Civilized Tribes' life in the twentieth century which are remarkable: The development of a native Christianity, their preservation of their languages, an extremely stable and rewarding community life. Equally remarkable in the case of the Seminoles and Creek is their over cherishing of traditional culture. While amongst the Five Civilized Tribes in general we find the covert cherishing of traditional culture. The Five Tribes have survived under very trying conditions as whole, unique, conservative Indian social groups. There is much to be learned
about social and cultural dynamics; community and cultural persistence; the importance of a strong notion of peoplehood and so forth, from the history and present condition of the Five Civilized Tribes.

If we were making a prediction about North American Indians, we would say that if there are American Indians who will survive in a stable satisfying community and a way of life as fairly traditional Indians, speaking an Indian language, they will be the Five Civilized Tribes. The Five Civilized Tribes are not civilized because they perhaps remodeled Euro-America institutions to fit their lives but because they indeed are civilized Indian North Americans who have continued and carried the torch forward of a "civilization" as old as North America itself.
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