

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Cowboys and Indians: Creek and Seminole Stock Raising, 1700-1900

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0r57q5q1>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 22(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Sattler, Richard A.

Publication Date

1998-06-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Cowboys and Indians: Creek and Seminole Stock Raising, 1700-1900

RICHARD A. SATTLER

The Creek and Seminole Indians are closely related tribes who originally lived in Georgia, Alabama, and Florida. During the eighteenth century and earlier, they occupied medium to large permanent villages and engaged in intensive riverine agriculture, supplemented by hunting, fishing, and gathering wild plants. During the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries the Creeks and Seminoles became heavily involved in the southern deerskin trade with the Europeans. They also adopted livestock raising at this time.

Scholars generally have noted that the Southeastern Indians adopted stock raising early, but primarily have viewed it as significant only later in the nineteenth century. Most see the only economic significance of livestock as first supplementing, then replacing, game in the Indian's diet during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. It is not until the establishment of large-scale commercial cattle-raising operations by some "mixed-bloods" in Indian Territory during the later nineteenth century that livestock raising is viewed generally as significant.

I would argue that stock raising had greater social and economic significance from the beginning. Its role in the domestic

Richard A. Sattler is assistant professor of Native American Studies at the University of Montana. He has conducted extensive ethnographic and ethno-historical research on the Seminole and Creek Indians, and is currently focusing on their articulation to the European world economy and sociopolitical transformations.

economy as a source of meat was, as generally noted, increasingly important during the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. It is the role of livestock in the export economy and in the internal political economy of the Southeastern Indians during the same period and earlier that largely has been ignored. Within this arena, livestock raising played simultaneous roles in both maintaining older sociopolitical patterns and introducing change through class formation. Further, differences in patterns of social change among the Creeks and Seminoles were partially linked to differences in the ways in which livestock raising was integrated into their societies and economies.

EARLY LIVESTOCK RAISING, 1700-1800

While livestock raising became important to all of the Creeks and Seminoles by the late eighteenth century, this practice was adopted at different times and through different channels by the various groups. The Lower Creeks on the Chattahoochee River in western Georgia and eastern Alabama adopted livestock first, while the Upper Creeks on the Coosa, Tallapoosa, and Alabama rivers in northeastern Alabama acquired this practice later and from different sources. The Seminoles acquired livestock raising from the Lower Creeks.

Cattle and horse raising were already established among the Lower Creeks in 1717.¹ Cattle-raising practices were clearly introduced among the Creeks by incorporated Apalachis, who acted as herdsmen for the Creeks. The Apalachis worked on Spanish cattle ranches in Florida from the 1630s until the destruction of the Spanish missions in 1704 to 1705. In the process, they acquired knowledge of Antillean Spanish methods of free-range ranching. These techniques remained conspicuous among Creek and Seminole cattle raisers throughout the eighteenth century.² Horses may have been introduced somewhat earlier, but also from the Spanish in Florida.³ Importantly, the decision to adopt livestock raising was indigenously initiated among the Lower Creeks and Seminoles prior to the advent of widespread resident traders and European assimilation policies.

The Upper Creeks, comprising the Coosas, Talapoosas, and Alabamas, adopted stock raising much more slowly and somewhat later. Horses were widely accepted and apparently

entered the region from the American Southwest via the Choctaws by the 1750s. Upper Creek horses were larger than those of the Lower Creeks and Seminoles, and resembled those of the Choctaw.⁴ The Upper Creeks, however, initially resisted the introduction of cattle and frequently complained of white traders who brought the animals into their territory.⁵ Despite this early resistance, the Upper Creeks widely adopted cattle, hogs, and other livestock by the 1760s, at least partially owing to the efforts of British Indian agents.⁶ When the proto-Seminole settlers from the Lower Creek towns moved into northern Florida in the 1720s and 1740s, they brought stock raising with them. Fairbanks has even suggested that the presence of large herds of feral cattle in Apalachee and Alachua served as a major impetus to Seminole settlement in those regions.⁷ Descriptions of Seminole settlements in both regions from the 1750s on all remarked on the large numbers of cattle, horses, and hogs kept by the Indians.⁸

By the end of the eighteenth century, stock raising was well established throughout the Creek and Seminole territories. The Indians acquired livestock through trade and gifts and by raiding European settlements, as well as through the natural increase of their herds.⁹ But, while livestock raising was widespread, it was not universal or evenly distributed. The Upper Creeks generally owned fewer cattle than the Lower Creeks and Seminoles. Likewise, not all towns among the latter two groups possessed livestock.¹⁰ Much of the impetus toward cattle raising among the Creeks and Seminoles derived from the existence of external markets for cattle, beef, and hides. Thus, in part, the differences between groups in livestock ownership reflected different ecological and economic conditions.

The Lower Creeks, closest to the British and American settlements, suffered the greatest land losses and most pressure on their hunting territories. They also had almost equal access to Spanish livestock markets and British and American deer-skin markets, contributing to a balanced strategy of stock raising and deer hunting which developed there. The Seminoles in Florida, in contrast, held extensive hunting territories, but had fewer markets for deerskins than for cattle and horses. The location of their hunting territories at some distance from their settlements also reduced competition between livestock and deer for forage. These factors, along with the presence of large herds of feral cattle and low population densities, encouraged greater horse and cattle production in this region.

The Upper Creeks also held extensive hunting territories, but located relatively near their towns. As a result, livestock competed more directly with deer for forage and often drove away the latter. Likewise, the Upper Creeks experienced little direct pressure on their lands until late in the eighteenth century, though these lands were circumscribed by competing claims from other tribes. Because they lacked significant markets for livestock prior to 1763, the Upper Creeks largely resisted the introduction of livestock until then.

Cattle and hogs provided both meat and a trade commodity for the Creeks and Seminoles. Importantly, raising livestock did not conflict with established economic pursuits, but rather complemented them. Since men owned and raised most or all of the cattle and horses, the most important activities in this regard were male hunting and farming. The Creeks and Seminoles primarily hunted between October and March. During this time men might be absent from the villages for months at a time hunting deer at distances of as much as a hundred miles or more from home. These hunts provided the bulk of the year's meat, most of which was smoked and dried.¹¹ Spring to fall comprised the agricultural season. Men were prohibited from hunting at any distance from the villages during this time and fresh meat could be scarce. Creek men participated in farming, but peak labor demands occurred only at field clearing in March, planting in early May, and harvest in late September to early October.¹²

The Antillean free-range cattle-herding practices adopted by the Creeks and Seminoles fitted neatly into this schedule. Cattle largely roamed free and were rounded up only during the spring, between the March clearing and May planting, and in the fall, either before or after the harvest. During the spring roundup, calves were branded, castrated, and penned near the villages or at more remote cattle camps. Some culling for sale or slaughter also occurred at this time. The remainder of the cattle were turned into the cane brakes along the rivers to graze. During the autumn roundup, the herds were culled and then turned into the upland forests to graze for the winter. The cattle were largely untended while grazing, but their locations in the cane brakes during the summer and in the uplands during the winter placed them in maximal proximity to the areas of men's other activities, which facilitated supervision.¹³

Livestock as a source of meat became particularly important during the late eighteenth century. At that time, repeated

land cessions, encroachment by white settlements, and over-hunting by Indian and white hunters made game less plentiful.¹⁴ Livestock also provided an important source of fresh meat during the agricultural season, when long-distance hunting was prohibited. Much of the trade in Indian livestock remained largely undocumented prior to 1800, but there are indications that it was significant. It is difficult to document this cattle trade, in part because British and American interests focused on the deerskin trade, which provided the greatest profits. Also, factors, or brokers, often did not distinguish between cattle they raised and those they purchased. Likewise, much of this trade was clandestine as the factors often traded on their own behalf, to the detriment of their employers.¹⁵ White traders in Indian country shipped live cattle, preserved meat, and cowhides, some of which they purchased from the Indians, to the white settlements at least from the 1760s on.¹⁶ There are also direct references to trade in Indian livestock later in the eighteenth century.¹⁷ Most of the cattle and meat ultimately were shipped to the West Indies.¹⁸

Horses provided both improved transportation and a trade commodity. As riding and draft animals, horses increased the efficiency of deer hunting by allowing hunters to travel greater distances in less time and with less effort and by allowing more efficient transport of greater amounts of skins and meat than could be transported by human porters. Pack horses also constituted a central element in the Creek and Seminole deerskin trade by reducing transportation costs to the primary entrepôts on the Atlantic coast, since there were no river routes from the Creek and Seminole countries. Throughout the eighteenth century Lower Creek and Seminole horses enjoyed a high reputation among European colonists.¹⁹ Lower Creeks sold horses to the Spanish at St. Augustine as early as 1717,²⁰ and Georgia traders made frequent trips into Alachua to purchase Seminole horses by the 1750s.²¹ The Upper Creeks also routinely traded horses at Pensacola from the 1760s.²²

Livestock ownership also affected the conduct of warfare. Prior to the introduction of the horse, warfare largely consisted of large-scale engagements involving hundreds or even thousands of warriors, along with relatively minor border skirmishes.²³ Horses made possible quick raids over longer distances than would be possible on foot and thereby encouraged more small-scale raiding. Horses and cattle also provided a new valuable form of plunder for warriors. Certainly, livestock

raiding became a new and increasingly popular mechanism for young men to acquire both war honors and wealth. From the 1760s until the 1810s, livestock raids became a standard feature of Creek and Seminole culture. Such raids became increasingly important for young men as their primary means for acquiring status and wealth at a time when the Indian slave trade was dying out and larger scale conflicts had been suppressed.²⁴ Town chiefs owned most of the livestock, particularly cattle, prior to the American Revolution. This provided them with an additional source of wealth and a means to fulfill obligations of generosity and in feasting visitors and the people of their own towns. As a trade commodity, cattle and horses also gave the chiefs greater access to European trade goods which likewise buttressed their positions.²⁵

MATURE LIVESTOCK ECONOMY, 1800-1840

After the American Revolution, cattle became more widespread among the Creeks, especially among the mixed-blood children of Tory traders and among Indian factors working for American and Spanish traders. The chiefs, however, still owned larger herds than most Indians, particularly the Upper Creeks. Among the Seminoles, the chiefs and their families largely retained control over livestock until after removal to Indian Territory.²⁶

During the early 1800s, the livestock trade became much more visible, especially in Spanish Florida. The decline in the deerskin trade increased the value of livestock to traders at this time. As a result, the Indian trade, important for diplomatic purposes, became closely linked to the cattle trade. Increased demand for meat in St. Augustine and Pensacola, by the Spanish military and others, also greatly expanded the local markets following the American Revolution.²⁷ During this period, the Seminoles in Alachua became the primary suppliers of beef to St. Augustine,²⁸ while the Mikasuki in Apalachee supplied the Spanish at San Marcos.²⁹ Indian traders in Apalachee and among the Upper Creeks also supplied Pensacola with large numbers of cattle,³⁰ and the Seminoles regularly drove herds of cattle to the northeastern border of Florida to sell to settlers there or in Georgia.³¹ The volume of this trade is indicated by the fact that individual Indians sold as many as 1,000 head annually and single transactions in

excess of 1,500 dollars were recorded.³²

Some Creeks and Seminoles had very large herds by the early 1800s. Herds of 1,000 to 2,000 cattle were recorded among some Lower Creek and Seminole towns, and herds of several hundred were not uncommon in the late 1700s and early 1800s.³³ Individuals such as Kinnard, Paine, Bowlegs, and Menawa owned herds comparable to those of the largest southern stock men in the United States.³⁴ A number of the largest stock owners among the Creeks also engaged in other mercantile operations and became quite wealthy in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. These men included Alexander McGillivray, David and Alexander Cornells, Jack Kinnard, "the Bully," William McIntosh, the Perrymans, Menawa, and the Barnards. By the 1820s this group, concentrated among the Lower Creeks, constituted the core of an emergent bourgeoisie which would challenge and ultimately transform the traditional sociopolitical order among this group.³⁵ The traditional system was based on a set of ranked, primarily hereditary statuses or estates. These statuses consisted of the "royals" or chiefly clan (*mikkaki*), nobles (together with the "royals," *hathakaki*), the honored (*isti-achakaki*), commoners (*chilokaki*), and slaves (*salafkaki*). These statuses, linked to clan membership, regulated access to political and religious offices, prestige, and economic opportunities. In large part, differences in wealth within Muskogee society traditionally derived from the prerogatives of hereditary rank and office.³⁶

In pursuing their own interests, the new mercantile class among the Creeks sought to invert the established order by deriving power and prestige from acquired wealth. Many, but not all, of these early entrepreneurs were of royal or noble clans and used their market-derived wealth to enhance their position within the existing political order. This group soon developed a collective identity, particularly among the Lower Creek towns, and succeeded in getting laws passed by the Creek Nation which protected their interests and secured mixed-blood children in the property of their white fathers.³⁷ The second generation of these entrepreneurial families did not share their fathers' elite status in the traditional system, but rather shared a common economic orientation and social identity. With this transition, a true economic class with class consciousness emerged. The emergent Creek classes during the first half of the nineteenth century consisted of a shrinking Native aristocracy, an expanding mercantile class or bour-

geoisie, a large body of peasant producers, and slaves. Creek economic fortunes declined following the collapse of the deer-skin trade and the cessation of warfare following the Creek War of 1813 to 1814. In consequence, most members of the Native elite, other than actual office holders and their families, merged economically with the commoners to constitute the peasant producers.³⁸

In contrast to the new mercantile class, the Native aristocracy relied on traditional political structures for their power and drew on tribute payments and *corvée* labor as sources of wealth, but increasingly engaged in livestock raising and mercantile activities as well. Annuity payments paid to the Creeks by the U.S. government, controlled by the town and tribal officials, also constituted an important source of wealth for this group. The peasant producers practiced a diversified subsistence agriculture, which produced small surpluses as an emergency reserve, for tribute payments to Native elites and for sale to merchants operating in the Creek nation.³⁹

Events followed a markedly different course among the Seminoles. The ability of the Seminole chiefs to exclude resident traders from their villages and to encompass most of the livestock raising to their own benefit prevented the emergence of an entrepreneurial class in Florida. Similar conditions which led to alterations in the Creek social order conversely strengthened the Seminole aristocracy and helped perpetuate the traditional ranking system.⁴⁰ Livestock, primarily cattle, constituted a critical element in this process of class formation among the Creeks. Cattle provided an essential mechanism for storing wealth and for primitive capital accumulation, which were otherwise lacking in Creek society. Creek entrepreneurs had access to European and American money, but could do little more than hoard it.⁴¹ Cattle, in contrast, increased naturally with little effort or investment beyond the purchase price. By investing in cattle, Creek traders were able to increase their wealth and hedge against the steadily declining and always volatile deer-skin and fur trade.⁴²

The deerskin trade, which had declined steadily after the American Revolution, virtually vanished by 1820. Cattle raising provided an alternative source of European goods for Creek and Seminole men at this time. This was vital for the Native Seminole elite. Their position in the highly lucrative St. Augustine cattle trade gave them access to an important source of wealth and allowed the maintenance of a much larger aris-

ocracy than was possible among the Creeks.⁴³ It also allowed many former factors and traders to make the transition from the now defunct deerskin trade to commercial agriculture in the early nineteenth century.

INDIAN TERRITORY

After their forced emigration to Indian Territory in the 1830s and 1840s, both Creeks and Seminoles quickly reestablished stock-raising operations. By 1845, virtually every Creek and Seminole family had some horses, cattle, and hogs. Their much more constrained territories and a lack of significant markets for skins and furs reduced the importance of hunting after removal.⁴⁴ Livestock raising increasingly supplanted hunting as a source of food and foreign goods during this period, but never entirely replaced it.⁴⁵ Many Lower Creeks brought their livestock with them. Other Creeks received 50,000 dollars in stock animals from the United States after removal. Many Seminoles likewise requested live cattle from the United States in place of the government-issued beef ration following removal. All of these Indians actively acquired stock, increasing their herds each year.⁴⁶

A number of the Lower Creeks, many of mixed ancestry, engaged in large-scale commercial agriculture and stock raising in the Arkansas River valley, and owned thousands of cattle by the late 1830s. Some Upper Creeks, generally full Indians, also engaged in large-scale cattle raising along the Canadian and North Canadian rivers.⁴⁷ The largest cattle raisers among the Seminoles in the 1850s owned herds of 20,000 animals and herds of 10,000 were not uncommon.⁴⁸ These large-scale agricultural and ranching operations primarily relied on slave labor, but also provided wage labor for some Creeks and Seminoles as ranch hands. Town chiefs and other Native aristocrats apparently relied in part on traditional labor levies. For the most part, mercantile operations apparently employed either junior members of the entrepreneurial class or whites hired in neighboring states and slaves.⁴⁹ In consequence, no significant Native proletariat emerged prior to the American Civil War. The Civil War proved a major setback for the Creeks and Seminoles. During the war, they were forced to abandon their homes, and most of their stock was killed or driven off. To add insult to injury, commissary agents for the

Union Army knowingly dealt in stolen Indian cattle, which they then sold back to the loyal Indians who had taken refuge in Kansas.⁵⁰ Following the end of the war, however, the Indians returned to their homes and reestablished their herds.

By 1872, the Seminoles had 2,400 horses, 10,400 cattle, and 25,000 hogs. That same year the agent reported that the Creeks owned 15,000 horses, 30,000 cattle, and 100,000 hogs.⁵¹ The Indians continued to increase their herds throughout the nineteenth century. By 1884, the last year for which statistics were provided, the Seminoles owned 4,000 horses, 40,000 cattle, and 10,000 hogs. The Creeks owned 20,000 horses, 150,000 cattle, and 50,000 hogs. That same year, the Seminole Nation had a population of about 3,000 and the Creeks had about 14,000 people.⁵² This represented a ratio of 13.33 cattle, 1.33 horses, and 3.33 hogs per person among the Seminoles and 10.7 cattle, 1.4 horses, and 3.6 hogs per person among the Creeks at that time. These figures exclude resident whites, who had little access to tribal grazing lands.

While stock raising had become universal among the Creeks and Seminoles by the 1870s, marked disparities existed in the numbers owned. The average Indian owned only one or two horses, as many as fifty cattle, and ten to twenty hogs. In contrast, large ranchers owned from 1,000 to 20,000 cattle and hundreds of horses.⁵³ In the Creek Nation, most of these large owners belonged to the mercantile class and were often of mixed ancestry. Their families often had operated American-style plantations in the East prior to removal. Among the Seminoles, there were few mixed-bloods, but a few families, mostly from the Native aristocracy, also dominated the cattle-raising industry.⁵⁴

The associated processes of class formation and the transition from a system of ranked estates to one of economic classes proceeded slowly but steadily among the Creeks throughout the nineteenth century. As in the case of the European transition from feudalism to capitalism, however, the process developed unevenly and remained incomplete by the end of the century. The transition was most advanced among the Lower Creek towns on the Arkansas River and least among the Upper Creeks on the Canadian River, though it varied in both areas by tribal town.⁵⁵ Thus, while class formation was progressing and some classes were well established, the Creeks as a whole could not be considered a "class society" by the end of the nineteenth century, though some localized segments may have

warranted that label.

The emancipation of Creek and Seminole slaves following the Civil War produced significant realignments in the emergent class system. Most former slaves joined the peasant producers. Others, however, worked for wages as ranch and farm hands and in commercial operations. Together with a small but growing number of Indians, they formed a weakly developed, emergent Native proletariat. Most hired labor in the Indian Territory, however, was supplied by whites recruited from neighboring states. While some of these became permanent residents, most stayed only temporarily. In consequence, the development of a true Native proletariat was greatly retarded.⁵⁶

Livestock provided a commodity for both large and small producers. The Indians sold many of their livestock to resident traders or shipped them to outside markets. The California gold rush provided a particularly providential market, as the southern route to the gold fields led along their southern boundaries. Creeks and Seminoles also sold many of their cattle on the American markets, which became even more important after the entry of railroads into the Creek Nation in 1871-72. The Indians sold large numbers of cattle to be shipped east by 1876, and livestock had become their largest export by 1883.⁵⁷

The railroads intensified differences within the Creek Nation. The tribe became divided among small farmers, large ranchers, and entrepreneurs leasing pastures to Texas cattlemen. Each of these groups represented a set of competing but overlapping interests and played a significant role in Creek politics during the late nineteenth century. These political and economic conflicts shaped the laws which governed economic activities and relationships to land, as well as patterns of inheritance. By forging collective identities and oppositions around essentially economic factors, these conflicts also promoted class formation and the emergence of class consciousness.

The small farmers, mostly full-blood social conservatives, constituted the peasant producers and the majority of the population. Traditional town chiefs and other members of the Native elite often owned larger herds numbering in the hundreds. Unlike the large ranchers and pasture operators, such midsize cattle producers relied primarily on older free-range practices, like those of the small producers. The Native aristocracy therefore generally aligned politically with the peasant

producers, who dominated the National Council, while the other two groups, generally more acculturated and often mixed-bloods, dominated the executive branch.⁵⁸

Both small and large stock raisers sought to regulate and tax the herds belonging to Texas cattlemen, while those renting pastures opposed such measures. Several of the Texas cattle trails passed through the Creek Nation following the Civil War. Competition for pasturage, damage to fields by livestock, and appropriation of Indian cattle by passing drovers led to conflicts with Texas cattlemen. The introduction of Texas fever, a cattle disease, and rapid increases in the numbers of Texas cattle traveling through after the establishment of rail depots in the Creek Nation exacerbated these conflicts. In 1868 and again in 1871, the Creek Nation levied a twenty-five cents per head tax on cattle transported through the Nation. In the 1880s, the council passed laws regulating the introduction of Texas cattle during the summer and instituted the office of Stock Superintendent to enforce regulations.⁵⁹

The small farmers also sought to limit the amount of communally owned land which could be enclosed by a single individual, a particular problem after the introduction of barbed wire. The pasture operators and large ranchers, who often controlled 30,000 to 68,000 acres, obviously opposed such measures. The small farmers were partially successful in restricting individual holdings and taxing larger pastures. The large operators, however, evaded the intent of these laws by forming cattle companies and corporations which constituted legal beings entitled to enclose pastures in their own right. These corporations also provided a method by which noncitizens could gain access to Creek grazing lands in partnership with Native cattle men. By the late nineteenth century almost a third of the Creek nation was fenced for the benefit of sixty-one individuals and companies, mostly Creeks.⁶⁰

The railroads also increased the economic differences between large ranchers and small farmers, as well as the pasture operators. The large operators seized the opportunity to import large numbers of cattle from Texas, feed them on the lush pastures of the Creek Nation, and ship them to market. They could also afford to purchase stock of improved breeds, which increased the market value of their stock. Some, such as F. B. Severs, sold as many as 20,000 cattle per year. Pasture operations could generate as much as 25,000 dollars in annual income. Small farmers, in contrast, generally raised native

scrub cattle, relied primarily on the natural increase in their herds, and sold only a few animals at a time, mostly on the local market. As such, they benefited little from improved transportation facilities. The time and expense of transporting the animals to the railheads were prohibitive for those selling only a few animals. Small producers therefore normally sold cattle to local traders or to itinerant cattle traders, who then transported the animals to the railheads.⁶¹

The Seminoles did not experience the kinds of political conflict that plagued the Creeks. Much of this difference derived from the smaller size of the tribe and the few persons involved in large-scale ranching, as well as the smaller size of their reservation. As in the case of the Creeks, the large ranchers tended to dominate the executive branch of the tribal government. The dominance of social conservatives on the Seminole National Council, however, was greater than among the Creeks. As a result, large operators could not fence in grazing lands as they had among the Creeks, and so some of the large cattle producers among the Seminole joined partnerships with Creek cattlemen to gain access to Creek grazing lands for their herds.⁶²

Marked economic differences did emerge among the Seminoles as the few large ranchers became wealthy. The Brown family, including Principal Chief John F. Brown, also actively engaged in mercantile operations and had an effective monopoly on trade in the Seminole Nation during the late nineteenth century. Other large Seminole cattle owners included Caesar Bruner, town chief of one of the Black Seminole towns, and the Factor family.⁶³ Because of the small number of such persons, however, class formation was limited among the Seminoles. Likewise, as this group only emerged among the Seminoles after the Civil War, this process had little time to proceed. Also in contrast to the Creeks, most of these large Seminole cattle men belonged to chiefly families and remained at least partially imbedded in traditional social and political relations.⁶⁴

The situation of the Seminole entrepreneurs illustrates the difficulty of applying a purely tribal perspective on the phenomenon of class formation in Indian Territory during the nineteenth century. While true economic classes never formed among the Seminoles during this time, these entrepreneurs clearly participated as self-conscious members of an emergent bourgeoisie in Indian Territory generally. Through business, political, and marriage ties, this larger group forged ties among

all five major Indian tribes, as well as with whites in neighboring states.⁶⁵

The General Allotment Act and Curtis Act ultimately doomed the emergent elites within both tribes. After allotment and incorporation into the state of Oklahoma between 1900 and 1907, the majority of the wealthy Creeks and Seminoles faced financial ruin. Without access to large tracts of free land, they could not maintain their large ranching operations, and most lacked sufficient capital reserves to compete with well-financed real estate companies in purchasing land. In this regard, they resembled the Texas cattlemen of a generation earlier, most of whom could not survive the closing of the open range.⁶⁶ By 1931, only 171 individuals out of the 28,000 Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes whose property was held in trust had estates in excess of 100,000 dollars.⁶⁷

CONCLUSIONS

Livestock raising played an important role in Creek and Seminole societies, both maintaining and transforming them. While providing an alternative to hunting for most Indians when hunting became less productive, it also contributed to class formation and the emergence of a new economic elite. This process was more complete among the Creeks than among the Seminoles. Initially, stock raising was dominated by traditional chiefs. Livestock provided an economic resource to compensate for their loss of control over external trade after the collapse of the sixteenth-century chiefdoms and the emergence of the European deerskin trade. Livestock could be redistributed to followers either alive or at feasts and also provided an additional source of trade goods, which also could be redistributed.

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, other individuals became heavily involved in livestock production among the Lower Creeks. These were largely mixed-blood descendants of English traders or factors working for such traders and were also heavily involved in trading operations. They focused primarily on commercial production for sale. This group, along with some of the chiefs, formed the nucleus of an emergent economic elite only loosely tied to the older hereditary elite.

After removal to Indian Territory, most Creeks and Seminoles shifted to livestock raising, owing to a scarcity of

game and a lack of markets for skins and furs. Stock raising, particularly under free-range conditions, required relatively few cultural compromises and provided a reliable supply of meat. At the same time, market-oriented Creeks expanded their ranching operations. During the remainder of the nineteenth century the cultural and economic gap widened between them and traditional tribesmen. This new economic elite used their wealth and knowledge of Anglo-American culture to assume positions of power and to transform Creek society. Among the Seminoles, traditional leaders retained control over most livestock until after the Civil War. Conditions after the war, however, both undermined the authority of the traditional chiefs and contributed to the emergence of a new economic elite. While this elite was able to assume positions of power within Seminole society, its numbers were too small and its position too recent to accomplish major transformations of Seminole society.

NOTES

1. Mark F. Boyd, ed., "Documents Describing the Second and Third Expeditions of Lieutenant Diego Pena to Apalachee and Apalachicola in 1717 and 1718," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 31 (1952): 116, 125-26.

2. John H. Hann, *Apalachee: The Land Between the Rivers* (Gainesville: The University Presses of Florida, 1988), 126-59; Terry G. Jordan, *North American Cattle Raising Frontiers: Origins, Diffusion, and Differentiation* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1993), 106-08.

3. Boyd, "Documents Describing," 125-26; William Bartram, *Travels of William Bartram*, ed. Mark van Doren, reprint of 1775 edition (New York: Dover Publications, 1958), 136.

4. Bartram, *Travels of William Bartram*, 136; James Taylor Carson, "Horses and the Economy and Culture of the Choctaw Indians, 1690-1840," *Ethnohistory* 42 (1995): 495-513; Kathryn E. Holland Braund, *Deerskins and Duffels: The Creek Indian Trade with Anglo-America, 1685-1815* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), 76-77.

5. Tobias Fitch, "Tobias Fitch's Journal to the Creeks, 1726," in *Travels in the American Colonies, 1690-1783*, ed. N.D. Mereness (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1916), 190; David Taitt, "Journal of David Taitt's Travels from Pensacola, West Florida, to and through the Country of the Upper and the Lower Creeks, 1772," in Mereness, 508; James Adair, *History of the American Indians*, ed. Samuel C. Williams, reprint of 1775 edition (New York: Promontory Press, 1930), 138-41; Braund, 51.

6. Thomas Campbell, "Thomas Campbell to Lord Deane Gordon: An

Account of the Creek Nation, 1764," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 8 (1930): 157-60.

7. Charles H. Fairbanks, "The Ethno-Archeology of the Florida Seminole," in *Tacachale: Essays on the Indians of Florida and Southeastern Georgia during the Historic Period*, eds. J. T. Milanich and S. Proctor (Gainesville: The University Presses of Florida, 1978), 168.

8. Mark F. Boyd, ed., "Apalachee During the British Occupation," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 12 (1934): 118; Anonymous, "Some Account of the Government of East and West Florida; with a Map of the Country, according to the Limits laid down by the Royal Proclamation," *The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle* 33 (November 1763): 552-53; Bartram, *Travels of William Bartram*, 120; Bernard Romans, *A Concise Natural History of East and West Florida* (New York, 1775), 92-94.

9. Braund, 77; Campbell, 160; Angie Debo, *And Still the Waters Run: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1940), 53; Adam Gordon, "Journal of an Officer who Travelled in America and the West Indies in 1764 and 1765," in Mereness, 384-85; Benjamin Hawkins, "A sketch of the present state of the objects under the charge of the agent for Indian affairs South of the Ohio, 8 December 1801," in *American State Papers: Documents Legislative and Executive of the Congress of the United States, Class II, Indian Affairs* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1801), 647; Benjamin Hawkins, *Letters, Journals and Writings of Benjamin Hawkins*, ed. C. L. Grant (Savannah, GA: The Beehive Press, 1980), 523; Indian Commissioners, "Report to the Secretary of War, New York, 20 November 1789," in *American State Papers: Documents Legislative and Executive of the Congress of the United States, Class II, Indian Affairs* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1789), 79; John T. Juricek, ed., "Georgia Treaties, 1733-1763," in *Early American Indian Documents, Treaties and Laws 1607-1789*, Vol. 11, ed. A. T. Vaughn (Frederick, MD: University Publications of America, 1989), 158, 309; James Seagrove, "Letter to the Secretary of War, St. Mary's, 24 May 1793," in *American State Papers: Documents Legislative and Executive of the Congress of the United States, Class II, Indian Affairs* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1793), 388; Taitt, 512; Helen H. Tanner, "Pipesmoke and Muskets: Florida Indian Intrigues of the Revolutionary Era," in *Eighteenth Century Florida and Its Borderlands*, ed. S. Proctor (Gainesville: University of Florida Presses, 1975), 22-23.

10. Boyd, "Apalachee During the British Occupation," 118; Hawkins, *Letters*, 1-29; Hugh Young, "A Topographical Memoir on East and West Florida with Itineraries of General Jackson's Army, 1818," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 13 (1934): 83-88.

11. William Bartram, "Observations on the Creek and Cherokee Indians," *Transactions of the American Ethnological Society* 3 (1853): 47, 69, 55-60; Alexander Spoehr, Unpublished fieldnotes, *Seminoles, 1937-1939*, Alexander Spoehr, *Southeastern Ethnography*, A-9, Archives, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago (n.d.).

12. William Bartram, "Observations," 59, 69, 115-8, 146-9; Alexander

Spoehr, Unpublished fieldnotes.

13. Anonymous, "Some Account of the Government of East and West Florida," 552-53; Bartram, *Travels of William Bartram*, 120-21, 141; Braund, 76-77; Campbell, 157-60; Jordan, 108; Romans, 92-94.

14. Campbell, 158; William Bartram, "Observations," 47; John Innerarity, "Journal of John Innerarity, 1812," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 9 (1930): 73; Hawkins, "Sketch of the Present State," 647.

15. Susan R. Parker, "The Cattle Trade in East Florida, 1784-1821," Manuscript prepared for the St. Augustine Historical Commission (1992): 8.

16. J. Leitch Wright, Jr., *Creeks and Seminoles: Destruction and Regeneration of the Muscogulge People* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986), 67; Braund, 50.

17. Indian Commissioners, "Report to the Secretary of War," 79, 648; Bartram, *Travels of William Bartram*, 118; Mark F. Boyd and Jose Navarro Latorre, "Spanish Interest in British Florida, and in the Progress of the American Revolution, I: Relations with the Spanish Faction of the Creek Indians," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 32 (1953): 105-06, 112; Wright, 67; Caleb Swan, "Position and State of Manners and Arts in the Creek, or Muscogee Nation in 1791," in *Historical and Statistical Information Respecting the History, Conditions, and Prospects of the Indian Tribes of the United States*, ed. H. R. Schoolcraft (1857), 254, 261; Parker, 14.

18. Jordan, 119; John S. Otto, *The Southern Frontiers, 1607-1860: The Agricultural Evolution of the Colonial and Antebellum South* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1989), 39-44.

19. Bartram, *Travels of William Bartram*, 136.

20. Boyd, "Documents Describing," 125-26.

21. Joseph Blyth, "Affidavit of Joseph Blyth, 24 November 1756," *Colonial Records of the State of Georgia* 7:1 (1916): 427-28; William Wilkins, "Affidavit of William Wilkins, 24 November 1756," *Colonial Records of the State of Georgia* 7:1 (1916): 429-30; Anonymous, 552-53.

22. Gordon, 1916; Taitt, 512.

23. Chester B. DePratter, *Late Prehistoric and Early Historic Chiefdoms in the Southeastern United States* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1991), 39-56.

24. Gordon, 384; Taitt, 512; Tanner, 22-23; Hawkins, *Letters*, 149-50; George Perryman, "Letter to Lt. Sands, 24 Feb 1817," in *American State Papers: Documents Legislative and Executive of the Congress of the United States, Class II, Indian Affairs* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1817), 155. Carson has made a similar argument in regard to Choctaw warfare. W. H. Secoy, *Changing Military Patterns on the Great Plains* (Seventeenth Century through Early Nineteenth Century), Monographs of the American Ethnological Society, Vol. 21 (Locust Valley, NY: J. J. Augustin, 1953) has also documented the impact of the horse on Plains Indian warfare.

25. Boyd, "Documents Describing," 125-26; Juricek, 158; Hawkins, "Sketch of the Present State," 647; Campbell, 160; Bartram, *Travels of William Bartram*, 121, 161-62; Braund, 75-77. See particularly Marvin T. Smith, *Aboriginal Culture Change in the Interior Southeast: Depopulation during the Early Historic Period*

(Gainesville: University Presses of Florida, 1987), and DePratter for discussions of the bases for sixteenth-century chiefly power and their control over trade.

26. Swan, 254, 261; Lawrence Kinnaird, ed., "Spain in the Mississippi Valley, 1765-1794: Translations of Materials from the Spanish Archives in the Bancroft Library," American Historical Association, *Annual Report 1945* 2-4 (1945): 239; Hawkins, *Letters*, 523; Mark F. Boyd, ed., "Horatio S. Dexter and Events Leading to the Treaty of Moultrie Creek with the Seminole Indians," *Florida Anthropologist* 11:3 (1958): 89, 92; W. H. Simmons, *Notices of East Florida*, facsimile reproduction with introduction and index by G. E. Baker, original edition 1822 (Gainesville: University of Florida Presses, 1973), 75; Clarence Carter, ed., *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, Vols. 22-25, *Florida Territory* (Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956), 668-70; John T. Sprague, *The Origin, Progress, and Conclusion of the Florida War* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1848), 318; Braund, 79, 130, 184-85.

27. Parker, 7, 15-16.

28. Parker, 7-8; Carter, 644.

29. F. C. Luengo, "Defense of F. C. Luengo, Commandant of St. Marks, Pensacola, 14 May 1818," in *American State Papers: Documents Legislative and Executive of the Congress of the United States, Class IV, Public Lands* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1818), 566; Young, 83.

30. Innerarity, 79; Edmund Doyle, "The Panton, Leslie Papers: Letters of Edmund Doyle to John Innerarity," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 17 (1938): 54, 312; Edmund Doyle, "The Panton, Leslie Papers: Letters of Edmund Doyle to John Innerarity," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 18 (1938): 62-63; Mark F. Boyd, ed., "Events at Prospect Bluff on the Apalachicola River, 1808-1818: The Letters of Edmund Doyle, Trader," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 16 (1938): 260-61.

31. Parker, 8, 14, 19-20.

32. Swan, 261; Simmons, 75; Parker, 8, 20.

33. Campbell, 160; Swan, 261; Kinnaird, 239; Frederick T. Davis, ed., "United States Troops in Spanish East Florida, 1812-1813," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 9 (1930): 273; Andrew Jackson, "Letter to Calhoun, 20 April 1818," in *American State Papers: Documents Legislative and Executive of the Congress of the United States, Class V, Military Affairs* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1818), 700-02; Robert Butler, "Letter to Brig. Gen. Daniel Parker, Ft. Gadsen, 3 May 1818," in *American State Papers: Documents Legislative and Executive of the Congress of the United States, Class V, Military Affairs* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1818), 703-04; Boyd, "Horatio S. Dexter," 89, 92; Adam Hodgson, *Remarks during a Journey through North America in the Years 1819, 1820, and 1821, in a Series of Letters: with an Appendix Containing an Account of Several of the Indian Tribes and the Principal Missionary Stations, &c* (1823), 269.

34. Swan, 261; Kinnaird, 239; Simmons, 75; Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 76; Jordan, 178.

35. Braund, 76-79, 130, 181, 184-85; Michael D. Green, *The Politics of Indian Removal: Creek Government and Society in Crisis* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska

Press, 1982), 39-41, 54-56, 59, 69-71; Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 76, 95.

36. All of these groups, except the honored, were hereditary and linked to clan membership. The Hathakaki-Chilokaki distinction, interpreted by Swanton (John R. Swanton, "Social Organization and Social Usages of the Indians of the Creek Confederacy," in *Bureau of American Ethnology, Annual Report* 42:156-166) and others as moiety divisions, makes more sense as part of a ranking/estate system (similar to that recorded for the Natchez), as the former controlled all political and religious offices. The honored (*isti-achakaki*) were commoner titleholders rewarded by the town chiefs for personal accomplishments in war or other endeavors and also included clan heads (*achulaki*). See Richard A. Sattler, "Siminoli Italwa: Sociopolitical Change among the Oklahoma Seminoles from Removal to Allotment, 1835-1905," Ph.D. dissertation (University of Oklahoma, 1987), 276-345; and Sattler, "Remnants, Renegades, and Runaways: Seminole Ethnogenesis Reconsidered," in *History, Power, and Identity: Ethnogenesis in the Americas, 1492-1992*, eds. Hill and Whitten (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press), 36-69, for more detailed discussions of this system in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. DePratter has an extensive discussion of the system at an earlier period.

37. These laws related to trade, personal property, and inheritance. The latter were the most innovative in allowing patrilinear inheritance in a matrilineal society. The new laws also provided that white traders must leave all accumulated property to their Creek children (if any) when they left the nation. Green, 45-74.

38. Braund, 182-88; Debo, 72-108; Green, 45-74, 149-151.

39. Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 110-12, 264, 285-8, 295-6, 304-5; Grant Foreman, *The Five Civilized Tribes: Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, Seminole* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1934), 153-4, 170-1, 186-7.

40. The shift from the deerskin trade to the cattle trade strengthened the chiefs' control over external trade and gave them greater access to European trade goods, which could be used to reward supporters. Sattler, "Siminoli Italwa," 78-80, 93; Sattler, "Remnants, Renegades and Runaways."

41. Creek factors, traders, and chiefs often kept substantial stores of coin, but had little to spend it on and could not invest it locally. Swan, 261; Pope (1792), 49, 64; Boyd, "Horatio S. Dexter," 92-94.

42. In this regard, the course of the Creek entrepreneurs resembles that of the early Carolina settlers, who followed a similar strategy of capital acquisition. Coverse D. Clowse, *Economic Beginings in Colonial South Carolina, 1670-1730* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press for the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission, 1971).

43. Many scholars have attributed this collapse to overhunting and decimation of deer populations. The available evidence, however, indicates that the collapse was at the other end, in the European markets. Young, 91, 99-100; J. G. Forbes, *Sketches Historical and Topographical of the Floridas, More Particularly of East Florida* (New York, 1821), 137; Benjamin Hawkins, "Trade and Intercourse of the Southern Indians, 14 March 1816," in *American State Papers: Documents*

Legislative and Executive of the Congress of the United States, Class II, Indian Affairs, Vol. 2 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1816), 34, 42, 47, 50, 54; John Forbes and Company, "Claim of John Forbes and Company, 21 February 1799," in *American State Papers: Documents Legislative and Executive of the Congress of the United States. Class: Public Lands* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office), 86-8. Regardless, there are no indications that the Indians' diets were impacted by any decline in deer populations.

44. Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 110.

45. Hunting for food remained important, at least as an adjunct, until the introduction of state hunting regulations in the twentieth century. Commercial hunting and trapping also has continued on a limited scale into the present.

46. William Armstrong, "Report of Acting Superintendent, Western Territory, 30 September 1841," in *Senate Document 1, 27th Cong., 2nd Sess.*, Vol. 1 (1841), 337; William Armstrong, "Report of the Superintendent of the Western Territory, 10 September 1842," in *Senate Document 1, 27th Cong., 3rd Sess.*, Vol. 1 (1842), 450; Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 112; Thomas Judge, "Letter to William Armstrong, 22 June 1843," Correspondence of the Office of Indian Affairs (Central Office), letters received 1824-1881, Southern Superintendency (Washington, DC: National Archives Microfilm Publications, 1843), M 640; Commissioner of Indian Affairs, *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1844), 476; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1858), 128, 153; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1859), 183; Commissioner of Indian Affairs 1869, 416-17.

47. Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 110-12.

48. William W. Savage, "Indian Ranchers," in *Ranch and Range in Oklahoma*, Jimmy M. Skaggs, ed. (Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Historical Society, 1978), 34.

49. Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 110, 113-15, 140, 287-9; George W. Grayson, *Creek Warrior for the Confederacy: The Autobiography of Chief G. W. Grayson*, ed. W. David Baird (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988), 126-7.

50. Annie Heloise Abel, *The American Indian Under Reconstruction* (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark Company, 1925), 73-97.

51. Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1872), 403.

52. Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1884), 308-09.

53. Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 285-86, 305; Antoinette S. Constant, "Seminoles, Earliest Missionaries, Missions and Schools among the Seminole Indians," Oklahoma Historical Society, Oklahoma Indian Archives, Section X: *Missions and Missionaries*, Folder 1, Ms. (n.d.), 11; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1872), 240; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1886), vi.

54. Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 285-86, 335-43; Debo, *Still the Waters Run*, 15.

55. Foreman, 186-7.

56. Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 110-11, 198, 264, 290, 304-5.

57. Marcellus P. Duvall, "Letter to William Medill, 4 June 1849," Correspondence of the Office of Indian Affairs (Central Office), *Letters received, 1824-1881, Seminole Agency* (Washington, DC: National Archives Microfilm Publications, 1849), M 640; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1858), 128, 153;

Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1859), 183; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1869), 416-17; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1876), 62; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1883), 90; Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 263, 285-86.

58. The Creek government at this period was partially modeled on that of the United States and consisted of a bicameral legislative branch (House of Warriors and House of Kings) and an executive branch. The latter included the Principal Chief, Second Chief, and various appointive administrative officials, including the Native judiciary. Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 317.

59. Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 188, 198, 260-64, 317; H. Craig Miner, "The Dream of a Native Cattle Industry in Indian Territory," in *Ranch and Range in Oklahoma*, ed. Jimmy M. Skaggs (Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Historical Society, 1978), 19.

60. Debo, *Still the Waters Run*, 15-16; Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 317, 335-43; Miner, 28-29.

61. Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 285-86, 317, 335-43.

62. Debo, *Still the Waters Run*, 115-16; Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 285-86, 317, 335-43.

63. Edwin C. McReynolds, *The Seminoles* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1957), 332-33; Art Gallaher, "A Survey of the Seminole Freedmen," Master's Thesis, (University of Oklahoma, 1951), 24-5; Alexander Spoehr, Unpublished fieldnotes, *Seminole, 1937-1939*; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1967), 383; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1868), 361; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1871), 580-81, 588; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1873), 212; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1876), 63, 228-29; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1878), 250-51; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1882), 332-33; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1883), 290-91; Commissioner of Indian Affairs 1890, 99; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1892), 257; Commissioner of Indian Affairs (1895), 162; Henry Breiner, "Letter to Eli Parker, 30 May (1871), Correspondence of the Office of Indian Affairs (Central Office), *Letters received, 1824-1881, Seminole Agency* (Washington DC: National Archives Microfilm Publications, 1871), M 640; Henry Breiner, "List of Traders in the Seminole Nation," Correspondence of the Office of Indian Affairs (Central Office), *Letters received, 1824-1881, Seminole Agency* (Washington DC: National Archives Microfilm Publications, 1872), M 640; Bruce Carter, "A History of Seminole County," Master's Thesis (University of Oklahoma, 1932), 93.

64. Sattler, "Siminoli Italwa", 276-345.

65. Debo, *Still the Waters Run*, 15; Debo, *Road to Disappearance*, 285-6; Grayson, 126-7; McReynolds, 332-3.

66. A lack of liquid capital is a consistent problem in the livestock industry, which was compounded by overproduction and the ecological incompatibility of the Texas-Antilean system, also followed by the Creeks and Seminoles. Jordan, 236-240, 267-275. They also resemble many contemporary Western cattlemen, who apparently cannot survive without the use of extensive tracts of federal lands leased at a fraction of market value.

67. Debo, *Still the Waters Run*, 127.