
Salvation and Indian Removal

JAMES W. VAN HOEVEN

I am honored to contribute to this issue of the *Reformed Review* celebrating the distinguished career of Professor Osterhaven. Through the years one has many teachers, but very few mentors. He was one such mentor for me. He was among the first to inspire in me a love for history and theology, to point out to me the social implications of Calvin's thought, and to model for me what it means to love God with your mind, body, and spirit. I am profoundly indebted to him for encouraging me toward a career in Christian scholarship.

Those who have studied under Professor Osterhaven will remember his excursions, those wondrous times in every class session when he strayed from his notes to talk about this or that. I always appreciated those moments/minutes/hours, which became for me the "fine print" of his theology, and I generally bracketed them in my own notes. The topics varied, and I share a scrap and a shard of them from old class notes I recently retrieved from my attic: the communist takeover in Hungary; concern for Dr. Hromadka; a canoeing experience, and then another, and still another! problems with Barth's theology (here I disagreed with him); Hope College football; a story about Albertus Pieters; van Ruler's doctrine of the Holy Spirit; U.S. treatment of the American Indian. The point, as I learned it from Professor Osterhaven, is that everything is under the sovereign lordship of Jesus Christ and is subject to theological reflection—and often action.

My paper brings together issues of theology and politics as these interacted in the Reformed Church in America in the nineteenth century, particularly in the person of the Rev. John F. Schermerhorn.

Who is this John F. Schermerhorn? What distinguished and eminent service has he rendered the Republic that his *ipse dixit* should stand . . . ?¹

So asked Major William M. Davis who was present at New Echota, Georgia, on December 29, 1835, when Indian Commissioner John F. Schermerhorn successfully concluded a treaty of removal with a portion of the Cherokee Nation, obligating the entire tribe to emigrate. Schermerhorn's treaty was later ratified by Congress and on May 23, 1836, President Andrew Jackson signed it into law. It required the Cherokees to leave their ancestral homes in Southern Appalachia within two years for new land across the Mississippi River. Because the vast majority of the Indians refused to emigrate, the government imposed the treaty's terms by force. Consequently, from 1838 to 1840, approximately four thousand Cherokees, nearly one fourth of that nation's citizens, died as they were marched westward across the "Trail of Tears" to their new homes beyond the Arkansas Territory.

That tragic episode in American history is well known and has been rightly condemned by scholars of United States Indian relations.² Less well known, however, is that John F. Schermerhorn, the Indian Commissioner who negotiated the treaty of removal was a minister in good standing in the Dutch Reformed Church.³

Schermerhorn was born in Schenectady, New York, on September 24, 1786. His forebears were part of the original settlement in Schenectady, and Schermerhorn's family was both influential and rich in land holdings.⁴ It also was active in the First Dutch Reformed Church in Schenectady, where John F. was baptized and confirmed.

In 1805, Schermerhorn enrolled at Union College in Schenectady, determined to prepare himself for the Christian ministry. Union was a natural choice for the young scholar because his church, "Old First," had given the college its first buildings and substantial financial support. A Liberal Arts college, Union was sponsored by several ecclesiastical bodies in the Mohawk River area, including especially the Dutch Reformed, Presbyterian, and Congregational. The school was ecumenical, as the name implies, and unambiguously evangelical.

Schermerhorn graduated from Union College in 1809, and in the same year entered Andover Seminary in Massachusetts. Andover had been established a year earlier, in 1808, as a Calvinist bastion against a developing liberalism in New England theology.⁵ Andover's origins also touched the spring of the missionary impulse of the new century. One of the school's principal donors, for example, John Norris (a wealthy merchant of Salem who had made his money in the East Indian trade), gave ten thousand dollars on the condition that the school train students for foreign missionary work.⁶ Andover therefore was a good place for the young Schermerhorn to do his seminary studies, satisfying both his background in Calvinist theology and his interest in the missionary movement.

As things developed at Andover, the students for the most part assumed the task of implementing the missionary goals of the seminary, and with profoundly impressive results. They formed mission societies for prayer and Bible study, and examined and shared information on foreign mission fields.⁷ Samuel Mills was an important leader in all of this, as were Adoniram Judson, Samuel Nott, Jr., and Samuel Newell, each of whom became pioneers in American foreign missions. Schermerhorn also shared in the missionary excitement of this group, and his letters to his fiancée, Catherine Yates of Schenectady, reflected the tension of trying to decide between mission work and marriage. "Perhaps it is not the pleasure of the Lord," he wrote Catherine in 1810,

that I should be settled . . . among civilized people. But to send me to carry the gospel to the poor heathen who sit in the shadows and valley of Death. Perhaps like Paul to spend my life in labours and sufferings and at last be cruelly martyred by them, to whom I have carried the glad tidings of peace and salvation. And what would you say were I called to undergo all this? Would you endeavour to persuade me from it? Or like a sincere Christian, full of the Holy Spirit, animate me to the work of the Lord, by a humble acquiescence to the will of God and by a willing resignation of all those dreams of earthly happiness with the man you love?—Ah, could I refuse to suffer all that human nature can suffer, to promote the interest and glory of my Redeemer who died that I might live? And who has expressly said; that he who hateth not father and mother and sister and brother and wife and houses and land and yea even his *life*, for my sake, is unworthy of me. My Dear, I know not that I shall be so highly favoured as to be called to so glorious a work. But I write this, that if such a time should come, you may be prepared for it.⁸

A year later, in 1811, there was still evidence that Schermerhorn's indecision concerning marriage or foreign missionary work was not resolved, for he wrote Catherine, "Were it not for you this country could not contain me in its bosom twelve months longer, for I should sail for Hindostan and spend my latest breath in preaching the Gospel of Salvation to the poor heathen."⁹

Along with ten other students Schermerhorn graduated from Andover Seminary in the spring of 1812.¹⁰ Shortly thereafter, on July 3, he and Samuel Mills went on an extended tour of the western frontier for the Connecticut and Massachusetts Missionary Societies. The purpose of the tour was "not only to perform missionary services but to inquire particularly into the religious and moral state of that part of the country."¹¹ The first leg of their journey took them through Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, and into Nashville, Tennessee, "Where we put with Mr. (Gideon) Blackburn, a Presbyterian minister."¹² A routine report describes the next phase of their tour:

We consulted with Mr. Blackburn on the expediency of pursuing our course down the river to New Orleans. He advised us to go, and assisted in making the necessary preparations. General (Andrew) Jackson was expecting to go in a few days with about 1500 Volunteers to Natchez. Mr. Blackburn introduced us to the General, who, having become acquainted with our design, invited us to take passage on board his boat. We accepted the invitation; and after providing some necessary stores for the voyage, and making sale of our horses, we embarked the 10th of January 1813. We came to the mouth of the Ohio the 27th, where we lay by three days on account of the ice. On the 31st we passed New Madrid; and the 16th of February arrived at Natchez.¹³

Unknown to Schermerhorn at that time, his introduction to General Andrew Jackson in 1812-13 was his *entrée* into national politics. The relationship between the young missionary and the future President of the United States, which began on a Natchez-bound steamboat, matured into a friendship that would last until Jackson's death. Schermerhorn would later become an active campaigner in New York in behalf of General Jackson in the national elections of 1824 and 1828. And Jackson would in 1832 appoint Schermerhorn, then an evangelical minister in the Dutch Reformed Church, to the prestigious position of Indian Commissioner to the West and later, in 1835, to the important task of commissioner to negotiate a treaty of removal with the Cherokee Nation of Indians. But in 1813, both men had other work to do—Jackson to prepare for war and Schermerhorn to organize "a Bible Society for the benefit of the destitute in the Mississippi Territory."¹⁴

Schermerhorn and Mills left Natchez on March 12, 1813, and traveled first to New Orleans, and then eastward across the Mississippi territory through the western parts of Georgia, Carolina, and Virginia, until finally, on July 6, 1813, one year and three days after beginning the tour, they returned to Andover, Massachusetts.

Schermerhorn's report of the journey totalled forty-five printed pages, and was published by the sponsoring missionary societies as *A Correct View of that Part of the United States Which Lies West of the Allegheny Mountains with Respect to Religion and Morals*.¹⁵ The report included statistics covering the population of each Territory, the number of Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist ministers and churches, a listing of other "sects" performing missionary work in the region, including the Roman Catholics, and an analysis of the religion and

morals of frontier society. The report remains an important source of information on frontier society in the early nineteenth century.

Schermerhorn completed his report on December 10, 1813, and shortly thereafter he departed for Schenectady and his new bride, Catherine Yates, whom he had married several months before. During the next several years he worked the family farm and sought ordination within the Dutch Reformed Church.

That proved to be a difficult task, however, because in those years the Dutch Reformed Church was reluctant to accept students not trained at New Brunswick Seminary. In 1813, the General Synod of the Dutch Church ruled that unless a candidate for the ministry "prosecute (his) studies in the institution under the care of this church," he would be required to obtain a "special act of indulgence" to preach and administer the sacraments.¹⁶ Consequently, before Schermerhorn could become an ordained minister in the Dutch Reformed Church he was obligated to appear before a proper judicatory and give evidence that his faith and piety were in accord with the standards of the denomination. That process took nearly three years, and finally, on Sunday, November 3, 1816, Schermerhorn was formally ordained and installed by the Classis of Montgomery as minister of the Reformed Dutch Church of Middleburg, New York.¹⁷

Schermerhorn served the Middleburgh Church with distinction for thirteen years, from 1813 to 1826. Recognized particularly as a "very good business man,"¹⁸ Schermerhorn was also a distinguished preacher and good pastor. Under his leadership the church substantially increased its membership, made significant and necessary renovations in its buildings and grounds, and met its annual budgets.¹⁹ Schermerhorn was also active in the affairs of Montgomery Classis, and served that body as stated clerk, 1819-1826, and concurrently as president, 1821-1822. During much of that time the classis was troubled by serious theological disputes, and as a leader Schermerhorn was thrust into the middle of those controversies.

The most celebrated of the disputes resulted in a secession. In 1822 a small number of ministers and churches in the Montgomery Classis seceded from the Dutch Reformed Church and subsequently formed a new sect. They charged the Reformed Church, and particularly the Montgomery Classis, with false doctrine and failure to remain true to the theological standards of the church. The main accusation was that the Reformed Church held to Hopkinsian doctrines of New England theology which modified the classic Calvinist doctrine of election.²⁰

The initial spark for this controversy was ignited in July, 1818, and again in May, 1819, when the consistory of the church at Owasco, New York, served by the Rev. Conrad Ten Eyck, appealed to the Classis of Montgomery to investigate into the theology of their minister, particularly as it related to the doctrine of election. The specific charge was that Ten Eyck had declared that he "did not believe that Christ had atoned for any man... but for sin."²¹ This issue was not merely hair-splitting for hyper-orthodox Calvinists. If Christ died for sin generally, and not only for "his chosen," then anyone could be saved if he merely confessed his sin and accepted the work of Christ. This, in effect, made one's salvation dependent upon his own initiative, which was essentially the "Hopkinsian" position, and not upon God's prior act of grace in election, which was fundamentally the orthodox Calvinist position.

Schermerhorn was appointed to a committee of classis to "look into the grievance." In October, 1819, nearly a year after the issue first surfaced, the Montgomery Classis approved the committee's report which stated that Ten Eyck's theology was "not inconsistent with or contrary to the Word of God and the Standards of the Church." The committee suggested, moreover, that the controversy was "not of such a nature" as to destroy "the peace, harmony, and fellowship of Christian brethren" and advised that the entire issue be dropped.²²

Several dissenting ministers in the Montgomery Classis thought differently, however, and in June and October, 1820, appealed the decision to the General Synod. The Montgomery Classis designated Schermerhorn to speak at synod on its behalf.²³ The chairman of the "State of the Churches" committee at the General Synod publicly mentioned the "unhappy distractions, keen animosities...and serious divisions" existing in the Montgomery Classis and recommended that a day of "humiliation, fasting, and prayer" be set aside for reconciliation in that body.²⁴ After a long and acrimonious debate, which carried over into the October, 1820, session, the General Synod approved the rather imprecise theological formulations of Mr. Ten Eyck, and sustained the decision of the Montgomery Classis.²⁵ The decision resulted in the secession of the dissenting ministers and churches of the classis, who, together with Dr. Solomon Froeligh, minister of the Hackensack and Schraalenburgh Reformed Churches in New Jersey, organized themselves in 1822 into the "True Reformed Dutch Church in the United States of America."²⁶

In 1826 Schermerhorn resigned his parish in Middleburgh to become a missionary agent for the American Home Missionary Society with primary responsibility in western New York State. He held that position for two years and then, in November, 1828, he left it to become General Agent for the Northern Agency of the Missionary Society of the Dutch Reformed Church. In this new position he was responsible for visiting all the churches in the Albany Synod, organizing new congregations and raising money for mission programs—"in short, to excite a missionary spirit in our churches."²⁷ It was an important position, the first such assignment in the history of the Dutch Church in America. The position, however, had its peculiar problems. It had been created in an atmosphere of political and theological tension between the northern and southern sections of the church, all of which exploded in 1830 when the Missionary Society summarily fired Schermerhorn and abandoned the Northern Agency.²⁸ That provocative decision again pushed Schermerhorn into the middle of a church-wide conflict.

The rationale for the board's action in 1830 is difficult to determine. Its published reason for dismissing Schermerhorn was "because far less money than (his) salary was returned into the treasury."²⁹ This appears strange, however, particularly because during the period Schermerhorn worked for the board he annually raised far more money for benevolent causes than in any previous year. Schermerhorn gave two other reasons for his dismissal. He claimed that he was "rudely assailed" by members of the board "on the score of the want of orthodoxy."³⁰ The "conservative" controlled mission board apparently identified Schermerhorn with its adversary, the northern "liberal" wing of the church, in the battle of 1830. Schermerhorn defended his orthodoxy and called the attacks by the board "Indian warfare, assaults in the dark...by the straightest sect in the church," which were unfounded and untrue.³¹

The second reason Schermerhorn gave for his dismissal concerned the board's mission policy. It was well known in the church that Schermerhorn wanted to extend its borders into the burgeoning frontier regions of the United States. He proposed this in sermons before congregations and in the form of resolutions before classes and synods, urging the church "to occupy the important central stations of our country."³² Schermerhorn claimed, however, that the board consistently rejected this policy. In a published statement following his discharge he asserted that the board was "alarmed at the (idea) of the extension of our church, to which they were opposed, and are still opposed, and if possible are determined to prevent."³³

Following Schermerhorn's dismissal in 1830, the battle lines between the northern, Albany Synod and the southern-based Missionary Society became tightly drawn. Both pulpit and press in the Reformed Church referred to it as the conflict between the "extreme liberals"³⁴ in the north, and the "high ultras"³⁵ in the south; or, "the friends of innovation"³⁶ in the north, and "the little aristocracy"³⁷ in the south. And, in effect, this deep controversy between the north and south in the church focused on Schermerhorn.

The north declared him "the St. Paul of America,"³⁸ an "active, laborious, indefatigable...fast friend of the church,"³⁹ indispensable for the future of the denomination. The south, on the other hand, spoke of him opprobriously as "the Pope's legate," and indeed, even "his supreme holiness himself,"⁴⁰ and thus a man whose influence must be stilled. When the smoke of this conflict began to clear in 1831, the Reformed Church terminated its relationship with the mission society and established a new mission board under the General Synod. And this new board employed Schermerhorn as its first missionary agent.⁴¹

Following this appointment, Schermerhorn again plunged into the work required of the church's General Agent, visiting churches, preaching every Sunday, raising money, and finding new fields to extend the church westward. But the criticism from the south upon his person and work continued unabated. Consequently, in November, 1831, Schermerhorn took the issue to the General Synod. At a special session of that body, Schermerhorn requested that a committee be formed to "investigate into the matter of my work and theology in order to ascertain if those things be true whereof (the *Christian Intelligencer*) charges me."⁴² Schermerhorn told the Synod he would resign if the charges were found to be accurate. If not, however, he asked the synod to do what they thought "necessary and proper" with those who maligned him.⁴³

The General Synod responded to Schermerhorn's statement by saying it did not "consider the charges or insinuations" to which he alluded to be of sufficient character to warrant an investigation.⁴⁴ It noted further, unanimously,

that the Synod have the same confidence in the General Agent that they had at the time of his appointment in June last, and recommend him to the confidence of the Churches.⁴⁵

In June, 1832, the General Synod reappointed Schermerhorn as General Agent of the church for the third successive time.⁴⁶ At the same meeting Schermerhorn expressed gratitude "for the renewed expression of your confidence," but he added "that an imperious sense of duty will not permit me again to accept of your appointment."⁴⁷ Schermerhorn told the synod that the reasons for his resignation were not weariness in "my Master's service," nor "disappointments or opposition." Rather, he believed the purposes for which he originally

entered the "Agency have already in a great measure (been) accomplished." He added he had felt for some time that his work, "which has separated me from my family, at least ten months in the year, was incompatible with the duty I owed them."⁴⁸

In its response to Schermerhorn's resignation, the General Synod unanimously gave its "thanks to the late General Agent" for the "able and faithful manner in which he has discharged the duties of his trust." The synod concluded by invoking the "blessing of the Great Head of the Church" upon his "future labors."⁴⁹

Schermerhorn had already determined what his "future labors" would be. For some time he had been involved in New York politics, and especially in the presidential campaigns of 1824 and 1828, when he had worked for the election of Andrew Jackson. Since 1830, moreover, he had also been in correspondence with both President Jackson and Secretary of War Lewis Cass, expressing his views on the issue of Indian removal, and telling them of his availability for the proposed new position of Indian Commissioner to the West.

The issue of Indian removal west of the Mississippi River had been very controversial in the late 1820s and particularly after Jackson's election in 1828. President Jackson strongly favored Indian removal, and made it one of the major goals of his administration. The Christian community was divided on the issue, and the opposition to it was led by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Headquartered in Boston, this powerful and well-organized religious society had been a pioneer in programs for Indian civilization and had sponsored most of the missionary stations then in operation within the Indians' territory. Speaking with knowledge and conviction in Indian affairs, the American Board worked tirelessly among eastern and northern church groups against Jackson's removal policy.

President Jackson was sensitive to this formidable opposition from religious leaders which, in effect, inferred that his removal plans were immoral and unchristian. To counter the influence of the American Board and its friends, and to give his own cause moral legitimacy, Jackson sought out allies among the churches to arouse religious response in favor of removal. Rebuffed in this by the Episcopalians and Presbyterians, Jackson found his support in the Missionary Society of the Dutch Reformed Church.⁵⁰ Through the efforts of Thomas L. McKenney, the head of the government's Office of Indian Affairs, these Dutch Church leaders organized and funded the "Indian Board for the Emigration, Preservation, and Improvement of the Aborigines of America," with the "exclusive object" of promoting the government's Indian removal policy. The board's constitution pledged its members to cooperate with the federal government in its conduct of Indian affairs, promised to afford emigrating Indians all the necessary instruction in the arts of life and the duties of religion, and invited all citizens of the United States without respect to religion or party to join in its support of the removal program. The board's influence in the removal question, however, was largely ineffectual, and its membership remained almost exclusively within the Dutch Reformed Church of New York City.⁵¹

On October 22, 1832, Secretary Cass informed Schermerhorn of his appointment "as a Commissioner on the part of the United States, to carry into effect the Act of Congress of July 14, 1832."⁵² That act, which had been initiated by Jackson to implement his removal policy, authorized the appointment of three commissioners "to settle tribal disputes over

boundary lines and treaty obligations" west of the Mississippi River.⁵³ In his letter, the Secretary instructed Schermerhorn to "repair...to Fort Gibson without any unnecessary delay," to meet with the other commissioners.⁵⁴

On the same day Schermerhorn accepted his appointment "with much pleasure," noting its importance both to the country and to "the future welfare and prosperity of the Indians." He informed the Secretary that as early as 1812, on his missionary tour to the West with Samuel Mills, he had been persuaded that "the preservation and permanent improvement" of the Indians, required their removal to the West. "And," he added, "I have seen no reason for changing my opinion." Schermerhorn hoped his efforts would help carry out "the benign and philanthropic views of the Government," and secure the Indians' "future incorporation as a state in the federal union."⁵⁵

In November, 1832, Schermerhorn departed Schenectady with his wife and eight children for Fort Gibson, situated at the intersection of the Verdigris, Neosho, and Arkansas Rivers in what is now Oklahoma, to begin a new career as a United States Indian commissioner. *En route* he studied the important documents on United States-Indian relations sent him by Secretary Cass. One of these documents was the secretary's detailed instructions to the commissioners.

"In the great changes we are now urging (the Indians) to make," the secretary told the commissioners, "it is desirable that all their political relations, as well among themselves as with us, should be established upon a permanent basis beyond the necessity of future alteration."⁵⁶ Cass specified the political issues he believed required the commissioners' particular attention: settling territorial conflicts between the Creeks and Cherokees and providing sufficient land for the eventual removal of the eastern remnants of those tribes, examining and allocating suitable land for the Chickasaw and Seminole Tribes with whom emigrating treaties had already been signed, reserving adequate space for various tribes from Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and Missouri with whom the government was then involved in removal negotiations, relocating the Osage Indians in order to allow a contiguous territorial arrangement between tribes with similar language and habits, investigating the claims of the Pawnee Tribe concerning its right to country already assigned the Delawares, and finding some way to control the "hostile and predatory incursions" of the Comanches.⁵⁷ "You will perceive," the secretary wrote,

that the general object is, to locate all (the Indians) in as favorable position as possible, in districts sufficiently fertile, salubrious, and extensive, and with boundaries, either natural or artificial, so clearly defined as to preclude the possibility of dispute.⁵⁸

In addition, Cass instructed the commissioners to submit suggestions for the improvement of the government's educational and agricultural operations among the Indians. The commissioners were also told to report a detailed plan for the Indians' government and security in the Western Territory. Regarding this, the secretary said, "your report...will be laid before Congress, and will probably become the foundation of a system of legislation for these Indians."⁵⁹

Schermerhorn arrived at Fort Gibson in December. There he met his colleagues on the commission, Henry Ellsworth, a former Congressman from Connecticut, Governor

Montfort Stokes of North Carolina, and Col. Samuel Stambaugh, the commission's secretary. During the next two years, from 1832 to 1834, the commissioners worked tirelessly and generally independently to complete the program outlined by Secretary Cass. For the most part they were successful in this, and the Secretary commended the commissioners for "devoting themselves to their important labors with great judgment, zeal, and industry."⁶⁰

For his part, Schermerhorn proved to be a competent, albeit stern and uncompromising, negotiator in all of this. He also proved to be stubbornly pious, often berating his colleagues for their profanity, for their gambling and drinking habits, and for not properly observing the Sabbath, all of which he dutifully reported to Secretary Cass. This behavior made him a very unpopular member of the commission; his colleagues called him "bigoted and opinionated,"⁶¹ claimed that he "took his pulpit"⁶² into the negotiating room, and frequently accused him of making the commission into a "Missionary Association."⁶³ In spite of these and other differences, however, the commissioners completed their final report on February 10, 1834, which later became the basis for important new legislation in United States-Indian affairs.

Schermerhorn left Fort Gibson for Washington in the Spring of 1834, where he remained without work until February, 1835, when President Jackson appointed him to negotiate a treaty of removal "with the Cherokee Indians East of the Mississippi River."⁶⁴

The Cherokee Indians resided within the boundaries of Georgia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Alabama on lands which they had held for centuries. These Indians were not uncivilized nomads. They had a developed agricultural economy, able political leaders, and laws patterned after those of the whites. They also had an abiding attachment to their lands and, by the late 1820s, they were determined to hold these at all costs and to oppose all federal and state measures aimed at removing them. John Ross, the nation's Principal Chief and the President of its National Council, was the leader in this opposition. In 1827, the Ross-led Cherokees adopted a constitution modeled after that of the United States and declared themselves an independent nation with an absolute right to land and sovereignty within their boundaries.⁶⁵ By this act, which asserted their autonomy with respect to the states they inhabited and their independence from the federal government, the Cherokees dramatically declared they would never cede another foot of their soil.

But Cherokee soil was what the white man wanted. This was especially true in Georgia where, in the 1820s, large cotton planters, their seaboard lands exhausted, began encroaching upon Indian territory and demanding their removal from the state. Georgia became more aggressive when, in 1827, the Cherokees adopted their Constitution and, in 1828, gold was discovered on their land. Responding to these events, the Georgia legislature in 1828 and 1829 enacted a series of laws that distributed the Cherokee territory to several counties and declared that after June 1, 1830, Georgia law would be enforced within this territory, thus rendering all Indian customs null and void. These laws also denied Indians the right to testify in cases involving whites and punished any person or group who tried to prevent Indians from emigrating from the state.⁶⁶ The time lag, intended to give the federal government opportunity to persuade the Cherokees to remove west of the Mississippi, was an expression of confidence in the new President, Andrew Jackson, whose Removal Bill was subsequently signed into law in 1830.

By 1830, the Cherokee removal issue had become a *cause celebre* in the nation. Many interpreted it as conflict pitting a small Indian tribe against the combined power of the State of Georgia and the federal government. Support for the Cherokee cause came principally from the Northeast, where both pulpit and press attacked Georgia and condemned the President. In addition, numerous churches held meetings throughout New England, at which memorials to the White House and Congress were drafted protesting Jackson's removal policy and urging Congress to defend the national honor by protecting the Cherokees.

The State of Georgia, refusing to succumb to this humanitarian pressure, gradually enforced its laws over the Indians. Even the Supreme Court decision of February, 1832, which declared the whole "system of legislation lately adopted by the legislature of Georgia in relation to the Cherokee Nation repugnant to the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States," failed to stop Georgia's greedy encroachments upon the Cherokees' land.⁶⁷ Indeed, in 1832, the state openly defied the Court's decision by announcing a gigantic lottery in which the Cherokee land was raffled off in individual lots. Subsequently, thousands of whites poured into the rich Indian territory to seize and secure their newly acquired property. And President Jackson refused to stop Georgia's encroachments upon the Cherokees.⁶⁸

By 1833 a few Cherokee leaders, notably Major Ridge and his son John Ridge, realized that the Indians' conflict with Georgia and the federal government would inevitably end in removal and that a treaty under the best possible terms was the tribe's only recourse for survival. Consequently, these men organized a determined faction against John Ross and the large contingent of Indian leaders still adamantly opposed to emigration. Throughout most of 1834, both of these factions bitterly debated their differences before their own people and in Washington. Unquestionably, however, John Ross and the party opposed to removal had the overwhelming support of the Cherokee people.⁶⁹

Early in February, 1835, the two rival factions, one headed by John Ross and the other by John Ridge, arrived in Washington to argue their respective positions before members of Congress. On February 11, 1835, Secretary Cass delegated Schermerhorn to interview the Ridge party "and to discuss with them the principles and details of the contemplated (treaty) arrangements."⁷⁰ Against Ross' strong protests Schermerhorn completed these negotiations on March 14, 1835, and the treaty's first article declared that it would not be binding "unless approved by the majority of the Cherokee Nation, in full council."⁷¹

Following these negotiations, in April, 1835, President Jackson appointed Schermerhorn to negotiate the proposed treaty with the Cherokee Nation. Shortly thereafter, Schermerhorn departed Washington for the Cherokee country, arriving in Georgia on July 10. During the next several months he set plans with the Ridge faction against John Ross, visited missionaries in the region in an effort to gain their support, and spoke throughout the Cherokee country on the virtues of the treaty. His efforts, however, proved ineffectual, and at the council of Running Waters, held in early October, the Cherokee people overwhelmingly voted against the proposed treaty.⁷²

Undaunted, Schermerhorn intensified his work in an effort to "turn the screws"⁷³ on John Ross and the Indians and force their submission to the treaty's terms. For example, he called out the feared "Georgia Guard" to maintain "peace and order," to protect the

property and person of those Indians favoring the treaty, and generally to harrass Ross and his friends.⁷⁴ He also wrote and circulated leaflets impugning the character of John Ross, received assurances from the governors of Tennessee and Alabama that they would "prevent the Cherokee government from exercising any authority in their respective states,"⁷⁵ and sought by bribery the support of the missionaries in his cause.⁷⁶

As might be expected, Schermerhorn gained few friends in the Cherokee country through these actions. Missionaries who previously supported his work now accused him of hypocrisy and duplicity,⁷⁷ resented "that he was ever known here as a minister of the gospel, or even a professor of religion,"⁷⁸ and predicted that "he will effect nothing with the *nation*." Other white men declared that he "prostituted the dignity of his station" and charged him with "itinerating and wandering through the nation with a detachment of . . . troops."⁷⁹ And Indians loyal to Ross were so angered by Schermerhorn's behavior that they nicknamed him "Skaynooyaynah," which "signified the 'Devil's Horn.'"⁸⁰ Some Cherokees said, "We expected to find him a good man, but we find him a very bad one, even one guilty of profanity."⁸²

For whatever reason, Schermerhorn remained confident of victory and called for a new council to be held at Red Clay, Georgia, on October 24. The result at this council, however, was no different than before, and the people once again overwhelmingly disapproved the treaty's terms. In a separate vote at Red Clay, the people also gave Ross authority to "proceed to Washington with a Delegation . . . to conclude fully and finally a new treaty with the United States Government."⁸³

While Ross and his delegation prepared to depart for Washington, Schermerhorn announced a third council meeting, "to be held December 21, 1835, at the New Echota council grounds, for the purpose of negotiating and concluding a treaty with the United States."⁸⁴ In that same announcement Schermerhorn told the Indians that "those who do not attend the council, we shall conclude give their assent and sanction to whatever is done."⁸⁵

During the next two months, from October to December, Schermerhorn worked to secure a favorable vote at the council meeting. On December 19, he wrote Washington that his preparations were completed and that he expected a large gathering of Indians for the council. He reported general excitement throughout the Cherokee Nation to settle the treaty issue. Indians in North Carolina "are holding councils among themselves," he declared, and "the whole of them may attend here next week." In addition, Schermerhorn wrote that village Chiefs "who say they can no longer depend upon Ross" were sending runners to their people, "advising them all to attend the council." Expressing confidence that he would be successful at New Echota, he informed Washington that he would "return . . . as soon as the business of the council is settled."⁸⁶

The council at New Echota convened as scheduled on December 21, 1835. Approximately four hundred Indians assembled for this meeting, including women and children, a number far less than the commissioner anticipated.⁸⁷ Because John Ross and the delegation appointed at Red Clay chose to boycott this council and were then in Washington, Schermerhorn directed the people to elect a new committee to negotiate the terms of the treaty, which they did on December 23. Negotiations were held for the next several days and then finally, on December 29, 1835, the treaty was signed and the council adjourned.⁸⁸

Elated by all of this, Schermerhorn wrote Secretary Cass that "I have a treaty," adding that the council "was large and respectable" and the proceedings "were open and fair." "Ross," Schermerhorn declared,

after this treaty, is prostrate. The power of the nation is taken from him, as well as the money, and the treaty will give general satisfaction.⁸⁹

Predictably, Schermerhorn's settlement at New Echota evoked an uproar of outrage throughout the United States—from numerous members of Congress who said the treaty "brings...eternal disgrace upon the country,"⁹⁰ from large segments of the Christian community, including a few members of the Dutch Reformed Church,⁹¹ from average citizens who sent thousands of letters to Washington protesting the treaty,⁹² from the national press which vilified Schermerhorn and the proceedings at New Echota, and from the Cherokee Nation and especially John Ross, whose memorials of protest to Washington included more than fourteen thousand Indian signatures.⁹³

The protests, however, finally proved ineffectual. On March 5, 1836, President Jackson sent the treaty to the Senate "for its advice and consent."⁹⁴ After protracted debate, the Senate by one more than the necessary two-thirds majority, ratified the document.⁹⁵ On May 23, 1836, the President of the United States proclaimed the treaty as law.⁹⁶

Two years later, in 1838, The United States army began to forcibly remove the Cherokees from their lands to a new home west of the Mississippi River. The Rev. Daniel Buttrick, a Presbyterian missionary who served among the Cherokees and chose to remove with them, was an eyewitness sojourner on that westward march. He writes of American soldiers bayoneting pregnant women to death, pushing aged Indians into the river to drown, and abandoning small children at campsites, because these could not keep up. With justifiable indignation Buttrick gives his estimate of this tragic episode in United States-Indian relations:

Now, in view of the whole scene, how does the United States government appear? A great Nation, laying aside her dignity, and with thousands of soldiers, and all her great men, and all her mighty men, and all her powerful generals, with all her civil and military force, chasing a little trembling hare in the wilderness, merely to take its skin, and send it off to broil in the scorching deserts of the West. O how Noble! How magnanimous! How warlike the achievement! O what a conquest! What booty! How becoming the glory and grandeur of the United States! A little hare, a little trembling rabbit, indeed, is this poor, and afflicted nation, as to power, or a disposition to resist her murderers; though in reality a band of immortal beings, whose Redeemer is mighty, and has already taken hold on vengeance. . . .⁹⁷

Schermerhorn returned to Washington from New Echota in January, 1836, and shortly thereafter President Jackson appointed him "commissioner for holding a treaty with the New York Indians."⁹⁸ Like the Cherokees, New York's "Six Nation's of Indians" were reluctant to remove westward and represented the final major obstacle to the completion of Jackson's removal policy. For a number of reasons these negotiations were far more complicated, and Schermerhorn was less "successful" with these Indians. He did, however, manage to conclude treaties with three of the six tribes in the nation. His work apparently was not good enough, however, and on November 9, 1837, amidst continuing protest over his infamous treaty with the Cherokees, the new President, Martin Van Buren dismissed him as commissioner.⁹⁹

Broken by that unexpected turn of events, Schermerhorn spent the next year in Washington protesting the decision, but without success. Subsequently, in 1841, following a year long trip to the Netherlands, the Dutch Reformed Church appointed Schermerhorn a missionary to establish a new congregation in the Indiana territory. He died at his home in Lafayette, Indiana, on March 16, 1851, at the age of sixty-five.¹⁰⁰

Conclusion

Secretary of War Lewis Cass often referred to President Jackson's Indian removal policy as the "Great Experiment," equal in importance to any achievement in his administration.¹⁰¹ Whether or not that was the case, it is true that Jackson's policy of removal marked a watershed in United States-Indian relations; at the end of Jackson's two terms in office, nearly every tribe residing east of the Mississippi River either had removed to the West or was under treaty obligation to emigrate.

No appointed government official did more to implement Jackson's program of Indian removal in the field, during the 1830s, than the Dutch Reformed clergyman, the Rev. John Schermerhorn. In the five year period he served as commissioner he participated in treaty negotiations with twenty different tribes, including especially the difficult Cherokees. In addition, he made extensive explorations into the Western Territory in order to search out suitable land for the Indians, helped to formulate the government's new Indian Trade and Intercourse laws of 1834, and developed a plan of government for a future Indian State across the Mississippi River. In all of this, Schermerhorn believed he was working for the best interest of the Indians. "My goal as a commissioner," he wrote in 1839,

was always to preserve the Red man from further degradation and final extermination and ruin; to secure to them a permanent and peaceable home; to deliver them from state oppression and aggression; to protect them in the enjoyment of all their personal and political rights, which they had lost or could no longer enjoy... while they continued to reside within the jurisdiction of the States; and finally to civilize and Christianize them by every proper means and as soon as they were qualified for it to give them a name and rank in our federal Union.¹⁰²

Although Schermerhorn was a minister of the gospel, he did not hesitate to use questionable means to accomplish these goals. He was responsible for the uprooting of thousands of Indians from their native homes, many of whom died or were murdered as they were marched westward beyond the Mississippi River.

If Jackson's program of Indian removal was one of the most significant accomplishments of his administration, Schermerhorn was the person most called upon to carry out that program effectively in the field. Reflecting on his work some years before his death, Schermerhorn felt "bold to say because it cannot be denied, I have done more than any other person in the service of the government, for the time I have been engaged in this business of Indian removal."¹⁰³ His claim is undoubtedly deserving and accurate. That perhaps is judgment enough of his person, his career as a commissioner, and his goals for the Indians.

ENDNOTES

- ¹Davis to Cass, Mar. 5, 1836, Records of the United States Senate, Records Relating to the 19th Century Indian Treaties, in National Archives, Record Group 46.
- ²See, for example, Grant Foreman, *Indian Removal: The Emigration of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969, pp. 229-312; Thurman Wilkins, *Cherokee Tragedy: The Story of the Ridge Family and the decimation of a People* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1970); Grace Steele Woodward, *The Cherokees* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963).
- ³This paper is drawn from the author's "Salvation and Indian Removal," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., 1972.
- ⁴The New York census for 1790 lists the Schermerhorn family as follows: "Bernhardus F. Schermerhorn-Residence, Schenectady, south of the Mohawk; 1 male over 16 (father); 1 male under 16; 3 females (incl. mother); 1 slave." Richard Schermerhorn, *Schermerhorn Genealogy and Family Chronicles* (New York: Thomas A. Wright, 1914), p. 80.
- ⁵Leonard Woods, *History of Andover Theological Seminary* (Boston: James R. Osgood & Co., 1885), p. 27.
- ⁶Thomas C. Richards, *Samuel J. Mills, Missionary Pathfinder, Pioneer and Promoter* (Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1906), p. 52.
- ⁷"Constitution of the Society of Brethren," *Constitution and Records of the Society of Brethren* (Williams College: n.p. 1808). Mills used the Williams College Brethren Constitution in forming the same society at Andover Seminary.
- ⁸Schermerhorn to Catherine Yates, Feb. 18, 1810, Schermerhorn MSS Documents Western Historical Manuscripts Collection University of Missouri.
- ⁹*Ibid.*, July 22, 1811.
- ¹⁰*General Catalogue of the Theological Seminary, Andover, Massachusetts 1808-1908* (Boston: Thomas Todd, n.d.), p. 86.
- ¹¹John Freeman Schermerhorn and Samuel J. Mills, *A Correct View of that Part of the United States Which Lies West of the Allegheny Mountains, With Regard to Religion and Morals* (Hartford: Peter D. Gleason & Co. 1814) p. 1.
- ¹²*Ibid.*, p. 48.
- ¹³*Ibid.*, p. 49.
- ¹⁴*Ibid.*
- ¹⁵The *Correct View*... is divided into two sections. Section one covers forty-five printed pages and provides the analysis requested by the missionary societies. It was written by Schermerhorn. Section two is a brief, five page journal of the two missionaries' travels. It was written by Mills.
- ¹⁶*Minutes, General Synod, IIA* (Oct. and Nov., 1813), p. 37.
- ¹⁷The Montgomery Classis minutes for September 25, 1816, note that Schermerhorn passed the examination, "giving strong evidence of his knowledge, piety, and talents" See "Acts and Proceedings of the Classis of Montgomery, New York, Commencing with the First Wednesday in September A.D. 1800." MSS Collection in New Brunswick Theological Seminary Library, New Brunswick, New Jersey. See also Roydan Woodward Vosburgh, ed., *Records of the Reformed Dutch Church in the Town of Middleburgh Schoharie County, New York* (New York: n.p., 1918), p. 133.
- ¹⁸Roydan Woodward Vosburgh, *op. cit.*, p. 133.
- ¹⁹Frances B. Spencer, *History of the Reformed Church, Middleburgh New York* (Middleburgh: published by the consistory n.d.), p. 17 and *passim*.
- ²⁰Samuel Hopkins (1721-1803) was a New England theologian in the tradition of Jonathan Edwards, under whom Hopkins studied. Hopkins went farther than Edwards, however, in allowing greater freedom of the human will. The term "Hopkinsian" refers more to the spirit of theological liberalism, particularly as it relates to the question of freedom of the will, than to the actual theological position of Samuel Hopkins.
- ²¹Minutes of Montgomery Classis, *op. cit.*, May 26, 1819.
- ²²*Ibid.*, Oct. 28, 1819.
- ²³*Minutes, General Synod, IIA* (Oct., 1820), p. 22.
- ²⁴*Ibid.*, (June, 1820), p. 57.
- ²⁵*Ibid.*, (Oct., 1820), p. 31.
- ²⁶For information on "The True Reformed Dutch Church in the United States of America," see Herman Harmelink III *Ecumenism and the Reformed Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968), pp. 29-32.
- ²⁷*The Magazine of the Reformed Dutch Church*, III (Dec., 1828), p. 286. See also "Minutes of the Proceedings of the Board of Managers of the Missionary Society of the Reformed Dutch Church, Nov. 20, 1828." Unclassified MSS Documents in New Brunswick Theological Seminary Library, New Brunswick, New Jersey. (Hereinafter Minutes of Missionary Society.)
- ²⁸Minutes of Missionary Society, *op. cit.*, April 28, 1830, May 5, 1830 May 19, 1830.

- ²⁹"Circular: Office of the Board of Managers of the Missionary Society of the Reformed Dutch Church," *Christian Intelligencer*, II (Sept. 24, 1831), p. 31.
- ³⁰*Ibid.*, (Sept. 17, 1831), p. 25.
- ³¹*Ibid.*, (Sept. 3, 1831), p. 17.
- ³²"Minutes of the Particular Synod of Albany," May, 1830, p. 17.
- ³³*Christian Intelligencer*, II (Sept. 17, 1831), p. 25.
- ³⁴*Ibid.*, p. 27.
- ³⁵*Ibid.*
- ³⁶*Ibid.*, (Sept. 24, 1831), p. 31.
- ³⁷*Ibid.*, (Sept. 17, 1831), p. 26.
- ³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 27.
- ³⁹*Minutes, General Synod*, III (June, 1830, p. 297.
- ⁴⁰*Ibid.*, (Sept. 3, 1831), p. 18.
- ⁴¹*Minutes, General Synod*, III (June, 1831), p. 378.
- ⁴²*Ibid.*, III (Nov., 1831), p. 10.
- ⁴³*Ibid.*
- ⁴⁴*Ibid.*
- ⁴⁵*Ibid.*
- ⁴⁶*Ibid.*, III (June and Oct., 1832), p. 84.
- ⁴⁷*Ibid.*
- ⁴⁸*Ibid.*
- ⁴⁹*Ibid.*
- ⁵⁰*Documents and Proceedings Relative to the Formation and Progress of a Board in the City of New York, for the Emigration, Preservation, and Improvement, of the Aborigines of America, July 22, 1829* (New York: Vanderpool & Cole, 1829) pp. 20-23.
- ⁵¹*Ibid.*, p. 23.
- ⁵²Cass to Schermerhorn, Oct. 22, 1832, Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Letters Sent, 1830-1840, National Archives, Record Group 75. (Hereafter cited as IA, L.S.)
- ⁵³U.S. *Statutes at Large*, IV, pp. 595-596.
- ⁵⁴Cass to Schermerhorn, Oct. 22, 1832, IA, L.S.
- ⁵⁵Schermerhorn to Cass, Oct. 22, 1832, Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Letters Received, 1830-1840, National Archives, Record Group 75. (Hereafter cited as IA, L.R.)
- ⁵⁶Cass to Wm. Carroll, Montfort Stokes, and Robert Vaux, July 14, 1832, Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs Ratified Treaties, 1827-32, in National Archives, Record Group 74.
- ⁵⁷*House executive Document*, 22 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 2 (Serial 233), pp. 33-34.
- ⁵⁸*Ibid.*, p. 34.
- ⁵⁹*Ibid.*, p. 35.
- ⁶⁰Cass to Stambaugh, April 15, 1833, IA, L.S.
- ⁶¹Stambaugh to Arbuckle, May 3, 1834, IA, L.R.
- ⁶²*Ibid.*
- ⁶³*Ibid.* On February 2, 1833, Schermerhorn told the Cherokee and Creek Chiefs, "Tomorrow is the Lord's Day, when we cannot hold a council. There will be preaching here in this house at 11 o'clock in the morning, where any of [you] who wish to attend, can have an opportunity." "Journal of the proceedings of the U.S. Commissioners of Indian Affairs west at a General Council held with the Cherokees & Creek Indians at Fort Gibson, commencing January 29th, 1833," Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Ratified Treaties, 1801-1869, in National Archives, Record Group 75.
- ⁶⁴Cass to Schermerhorn, April 2, 1835, IA, L.S.
- ⁶⁵The Cherokee Constitution is printed in *House Documents* 23 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 91 (Serial 273), pp. 10-19.
- ⁶⁶William C. Dawson, Comp, *A Compilation of the Laws of the State of Georgia* (Milledgeville, 1831), pp. 198-199.
- ⁶⁷For a good study of the legal and ethical implications of the Supreme Court decision in "Georgia v. the Cherokee Nation, see Joseph C. Burke, "The Cherokee Cases: A Study in Law, Politics, and Morality," *The Stanford Law Review*, XXI, No. 3 (Feb., 1969), pp. 500-31).
- ⁶⁸See Wilson Lumpkin, *The Removal of the Cherokee Indians from Georgia, 1827-1841* (2 vols.; New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1907), for Georgia's position regarding Cherokee removal.

- ⁶⁹For an excellent study of the issues that led to the conflict among the Ridge and Ross factions in the Cherokee nation see Thurman Wilkins, *Cherokee Tragedy, The Story of the Ridge Family and the Decimation of a People*, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-329.
- ⁷⁰Cass to Schermerhorn, Feb. 11, 1835, IA, LS.
- ⁷¹*Senate Document*, 25 Congress, 2 Sess., No. 120 (Serial 315), p. 98.
- ⁷²Running Waters Council Report, *Ibid.*, p. 448.
- ⁷³John Howard Payne, "The Cherokee Nation to the People of the United States," in Clemens de Ballou, *John Howard Payne to His Countrymen* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1961), p. 53. Payne, the writer of "Home Sweet Home," had been a fellow student of Schermerhorn's at Union College Schenectady, New York. He arrived in the Indian country a few days before the start of the Red Clay Council (Oct. 12), and subsequently published a popular account of the proceedings which excited wide support for the Cherokees. Schermerhorn claimed that Ross assumed Payne's talented pen would assure the Chief's victory against the treaty. See Schermerhorn to Herring, Dec. 19, 1835, IA, LR.
- ⁷⁴Schermerhorn to Lumpkin, Sept. 18, 1835, "Cherokee Indians Letters, Talks, and Treaties, 1786-1838," MSS collection in Department of Archives and History, Atlanta, Ga.
- ⁷⁵Schermerhorn to Lumpkin, Nov. 23, 1835, *Ibid.*
- ⁷⁶Schermerhorn to John C. Ellsworth, Nov. 17, 1835, American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, MSS documents Houghton Library, Harvard University. (Hereafter cited as ABCFM.)
- ⁷⁷Daniel S. Buttrick MSS Journal, 1838, in ABCFM. Buttrick was a Presbyterian missionary serving in the Cherokee country. Only rarely did he give precise dates in his journal.
- ⁷⁸Ellsworth to Greene, Nov. 13, 1835, *Ibid.*
- ⁷⁹Ellsworth to Greene, Sept. 15, *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁰William M. Davis to Cass, March 5, 1836, Records of Indian Treaties, Record Group 46, National Archives.
- ⁸¹Elihur Butler to Greene, Jan. 15, 1836, ABCFM.
- ⁸²*Ibid.*
- ⁸³National Council of the Cherokee Nation, "Resolution by the Committee and National Council Oct. 23, 1835," in Record of Indian Treaties, *op. cit.*
- ⁸⁴Schermerhorn MS Document "Notice: To the Chiefs, Headmen People of the Cherokee Nation of Indians," in *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁵*Ibid.*
- ⁸⁶Schermerhorn to Herring, Dec. 19, 1835, IA, LR.
- ⁸⁷The estimate of those present at the council varies according to the loyalty of the reporter. Alexander McCoy, a friend of Ross, reported that there were seventy-nine eligible voters present (McCoy to Ross, Feb. 29, 1836, Records of Indian Treaties, *op. cit.*, and Major Wm. Davis estimated the number to be one-hundred, *Ibid.* Schermerhorn reported there were "at least four to five hundred" Cherokees at the council. (Schermerhorn to Cass, March 3, 1836, IA, LR.)
- ⁸⁸"New Echota Journal," IA, LR, Cherokee Agency, East. See also *Senate Documents op. cit.*, p. 517, and *U.S. Statutes at Large*, VII (1784-1842), "Treaty With the Cherokees," Dec. 29, 1835, art. 9, p. 482.
- ⁸⁹Schermerhorn to Cass, Dec. 30, 1835, IA, LR, Cherokee Agency East: *Seante Documents, op. cit.*, pp. 495-96.
- ⁹⁰Grace Steele Woodward, *op. cit.*, p. 193.
- ⁹¹Butler to Greene, Jan. 15, 1836, ABCFM.
- ⁹²"Memorials of Citizens of Andover, Mass.," May 7, 1838, Records of Indian Treaties, *op. cit.*
- ⁹³Ross to Cass, Feb. 29, 1836, *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁴MS Document in *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁵Charles Royce, "The Cherokee Nation of Indians: A Narrative of Their Official Relations With the Colonial and Federal Governments," *Fifth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology, 1883-1884* (Washington: Government Printing Office 1887), p. 283.
- ⁹⁶*U.S. Statutes at Large, op. cit.*, p. 478.
- ⁹⁷Daniel Buttrick Journal, ABCFM.
- ⁹⁸Cass to Schermerhorn, July 13, 1836, IA, LS.
- ⁹⁹Harris to Schermerhorn, Nov. 9, 1837 *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰⁰Charles E. Corwin, *A Manual of the Reformed Church in America* (New York: Board of Publication of the Reformed Church in America, 1922), p. 478.
- ¹⁰¹Cass to John Ross, Feb. 16, 1835, IA, LS.
- ¹⁰²Schermerhorn to Poinsett, Nov. 11, 1839, IA, LR.
- ¹⁰³Schermerhorn to Poinsett, June 20, 1838, IA, LR.