

THE PEN IS MIGHTIER THAN THE SWORD: ELIMINATING INDIANS IN THE
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

by

MELANIE N. GILPIN

(Under the Direction of Claudio Saunt)

ABSTRACT

This study examines how Europeans excluded Indians from travel accounts, effectively writing them out of Louisiana's history. Prior to European arrival, Indians flourished in the Lower Mississippi Valley, but by the end of Louisiana's colonial period, Indians were largely absent from travel accounts. Europeans used three main tactics to exclude Indians: leaving Indians out of accounts, changing the goals of colonization to dismiss Indians, and transforming Indians into resources. Accounts like those from Pere Jacques Marquette, Robert Cavalier De La Salle, brothers Pierre le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville and Jean Baptise le Moyne, Sieur de Bienville, Daniel Coxe, Le Page du Pratz, Jean-Jaques-Blaise d'Abbadie, Philip Pittman, Jean-Bernard Bossu, Francisco Bouligny and James Pitot cover the period from 1673 to 1803 and show that the Indians vanished from European travel accounts though they remained in the land.

INDEX WORDS: Mississippi, Louisiana, Travel Accounts, Indians

THE PEN IS MIGHTIER THAN THE SWORD: ELIMINATING INDIANS IN THE
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

by

MELANIE N. GILPIN

B.A., Oglethorpe University, 2000

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2004

© 2004

Melanie N. Gilpin

All Rights Reserved

THE PEN IS MIGHTIER THAN THE SWORD: ELIMINATING INDIANS IN THE
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

by

MELANIE N. GILPIN

Major Professor: Claudio Saunt

Committee: Reinaldo L. Román
Eve Troutt-Powell

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2004

Table Of Contents

	Page
CHAPTER	
1 Introduction.....	1
2 Early Explorations and Initial Claims.....	12
Indians Abound	13
The Goals of Early Colonization.....	24
Mapping the Land	28
3 The French Period in Louisiana.....	34
Writing the Indians Out.....	35
European Goals Change to Exclude Indians	50
Louisiana Indians as Resources.....	55
4 The Spanish and English in Louisiana.....	59
Europeans Abound	60
Goals of the Late Colonial Period	68
Fighting for the Enemy.....	73
5 Conclusion	76
Bibliography	80
Endnotes.....	83

Chapter 1

Introduction

The Louisiana territory encompassed most of the Mississippi River Valley during colonial times, and Indians populated the land long before European arrival. During the Mississippian Era, roughly A.D. 700 to 1550, native populations flourished throughout the river valley, creating some of the largest towns and most culturally advanced civilizations in North America.¹ These populations were always transforming, trading, adapting, waging war, separating and fusing with other tribes in the Mississippi Valley.² After Europeans and the accompanying diseases arrived, the Indian population declined, but it did not disappear.³ Indians again adapted and changed with their new neighbors, both European and African, just as they had done for centuries.⁴ By the time of French exploration in the late 1600s, scores of tribes still lived in the areas surrounding the Mississippi River and its tributaries, including large tribes such as the Choctaw, Chickasaw and Creek as well as smaller ones such as the Tunica, Natchez, Taensa, Bayogoula and Alabama.⁵

The French, English and Spanish all claimed land in the Mississippi Valley at one time during the eighteenth century, and accounts from each nation show a perceived decline in the Indian population. Without a doubt, there was a significant decline in the number of Indians in Louisiana. Daniel Usner writes that the Indian population in the Lower Mississippi Valley dropped from 67,000 in the early 1700s to 22,000 by mid-century.⁶ Scholars such as Alfred Crosby, Noble David Cook, Henry F. Dobyns, William H. McNeill and Russell Thornton have all documented the depopulation of North America, a decline largely caused by disease.⁷

Smallpox, measles, typhus, mumps, influenza and diphtheria all swept through America before 1600, and though the devastation was widespread and disastrous, the Indians did not completely vanish.⁸ They were present in the eighteenth century when France, Spain and England turned their eyes toward the conquest of the Lower Mississippi Valley. What is more, many tribes like the Alabama, Apalachee, Biloxi, Caddo, Chitimacha, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, Houma and Tunica still exist today.

If a strong Indian presence remained in Louisiana and European nations continued to interact with them on some basis, why do Indians seem to disappear from later travel accounts and in some correspondence with European governments? Small tribes living near the coast and European settlements sometimes assimilated into colonial society or moved upriver, away from Europeans. Further, disease struck most all of the tribes in the Mississippi Valley, killing thousands. The major reason for the disappearance though, lies with the Europeans themselves. Europeans increasingly excluded Indians from travel accounts, effectively writing them out of Louisiana's history.

After the discovery of the New World, Europeans constructed ideas of how they could take possession of new lands, and many of their rituals included some interaction with Indians. The English built homes, fences and fields on Indian land to signify possession while French explorers sought native consent and performed elaborate ceremonies including speeches, singing and parades.⁹ On the opposite end of the spectrum, the Spanish affirmed possession by reading the *Requerimiento*, a document specified by the crown that demanded natives submit to the Spanish monarchy and Catholicism.¹⁰ These rituals all technically required Indian consent, but if the explorers and settlers could show that Indians no longer inhabited the area, they no longer

needed Indian consent.¹¹ Colonists could then justify claiming the land for themselves and on behalf of their nation.

Having justification was of the utmost importance for European nations, especially after the publication of Bartolomé de Las Casas' *Short Account of the Destruction of the Indies* in 1542.¹² After all, Pope Alexander VI granted Spain a tremendous amount of land in 1493, shortly after Columbus' discovery of the New World, with the understanding that Spain would actively spread the gospel.¹³ The Pope cautioned Spain to "never inflict upon them [the Indians] hardships or dangers" in the process of enlarging Spanish territory and Christendom.¹⁴ Though Spain was not the only nation vying for a place in the New World, the comments from Pope Alexander VI are still instructive. Spain was a sort of test case for Europe since she was the first nation to claim land in the New World. Other nations followed the same general pattern when colonizing by sending missionaries and setting up churches. As you will see in many of the following documents, early explorers still adhered to the policy of Christianizing the Indians, and they were careful to leave the Indians unharmed, at least according to their reports. As the century progressed, however, validating land claims became unnecessary. Perhaps Europe no longer felt remorse for the deaths of thousands of Indians as it did in the sixteenth century, or, as I argue, perhaps Europeans no longer recognized that Indians lived in the land, at least according to the literature. If the Indians had vanished, there was no longer a need to Christianize them. Further, since Europeans did not kill the Indians, only ignored them, Europe would not find itself the subject of works like de Las Casas.

The conquest of the New World is not a new story. The Indians were here, died out and were replaced by Europeans. Though the story is not so uncomplicated, that is the abbreviated version that colonists and early historians like Frederick Jackson Turner and Charles Gayarré

proclaimed.¹⁵ A newer version of the story focuses on Indian societies that persevered through colonization.¹⁶ These works argue against Turner and the once-popular conception of the vanishing Indian. But why should historians have to argue against myths and lies? Historians still debate this issue because Indians are missing from some early documents and histories. This absence is especially glaring in the Lower Mississippi Valley because many of the Five Civilized Tribes originated there. Certainly, no one would argue that these tribes vanished.

In the past, historians and literary critics used sources such as travel accounts to show that colonized societies, not just American Indians, changed European ideas of the world and even made them redefine their idea of what was “European.” Anthony Pagden effectively chronicles European attitudes toward Native Americans in the sixteenth century, drawing on political and philosophical works to explain the prevailing attitudes, how these attitudes shifted and the resulting comparative ethnology that Europeans formed.¹⁷ Pagden shows that Europeans changed from seeing American Indians simply as barbarians to recognizing that different cultures existed, all influenced by societal factors. Mary Pratt extends her analysis to examine how the ‘other’ changed Europe.¹⁸ By looking at writing about Africa and Latin America, Pratt finds that not only did Europe define America, but America continually redefined Europe. Stephen Greenblatt on the other hand, looks at European writings about the New World for what they reveal about Europeans, claiming that the accounts cannot accurately portray native populations.¹⁹ Greenblatt says that Europeans were overwhelmed by the unfamiliar, and as a consequence created new strategies for understanding and dealing with the shock of the New World. These historians all look at how European’s views of Americans evolved and how the meaning of Europe itself changed in the process.

I situate my work somewhere in between ethnohistorians and those historians and literary critics looking back toward Europe for clarification of colonialism. Like Pagden, Pratt and Greenblatt, I see that Europeans studied and defined the Indians, but Europeans also extinguished the Indians with their writing. The statement, ‘the pen is mightier than the sword,’ comes to mind as I see European governors and settlers in eighteenth century Louisiana conveniently leaving Indians out of history, essentially writing the Indians off their own land. This is not to say that Indians are completely absent from colonial documents. In fact, officials regularly recorded Indian conferences, presents, trade and diplomatic relations, making the Indian’s absence in travel accounts all the more suspicious.

The purpose here is not to debate the unjust European actions or the innocence of Indians. I simply want to show that Europeans wrote the Indians out of the Lower Mississippi Valley in order to take ancestral lands. Writers in the Lower Mississippi employed many strategies for minimizing the native presence and native claims to land. Here, I would like to highlight some of those tactics, which fall under three main categories. Europeans neglected to include Indians in their works, changed the goals of colonization to omit Indians, and began to see Indians merely as resources or assets rather than human societies.

I have tried to gather as many accounts of Louisiana during its “colonial” period as possible, using at least one account from each writer. The accounts come from French, Spanish and English writers beginning in 1673 and ending with the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, the conventional end of colonial Louisiana. The writers include, Father Pere Jacques Marquette (1673-1674), Robert Cavalier De La Salle (1682-1687), brothers Pierre le Moyne, Sieur d’Iberville and Jean Baptiste le Moyne, Sieur de Bienville (1698-1702), Daniel Cöxe (1722), Le Page du Pratz (1718-1734), Jean-Jacques-Blaise d’Abbadie (1763-1764), Philip Pittman (1770),

Jean-Bernard Bossu (1770-1771), Francisco Bouligny (1776) and James Pitot (1796-1802).

Letters and reports from the French and Spanish governments also support my assertions. Since the English never officially owned Louisiana, colonial government documents do not exist. Papers from the Pensacola trading company, Panton and Leslie, however, serve in place of colonial government documents. Combined, the travel accounts and supporting documents reveal the increased absence of Indians and the strategies used to accomplish that end.

Three main categories divide the journalists: the exploration period, the French period and the Spanish and English period. During the exploration period, the voyages of Marquette and La Salle show that the Indians remained on the land and Europeans readily recognized their presence. This period is a sort of ‘before’ picture of Louisiana, prior to Europeans writing Indians out of the land. Nevertheless, early explorers began to exhibit some of the tactics for writing the Indians out. The second period, the French period, includes the works of Iberville, Bienville, Coxe, du Pratz and d’Abbadie, all of whom wrote Indians out of Louisiana. The French period showcases each of the tactics in action, and as the period progresses, Indians occur less frequently in journals. Finally, the Spanish and English period completes the transition from Indian land to European land. By the end of the period, the travel accounts reflect the perception that the Indians vanished from the land. Pittman, Bossu, Bouligny and Pitot mentioned Indians from time to time, but Indians had little bearing on the colonists’ actions or their observations of the colony.

Each of the chosen authors, whether reporting information to the crown or writing for public consumption, employed at least one method used to exclude the Indians from their homeland. In the early accounts, like those by Marquette, La Salle and his comrades, Iberville, Bienville and even Le Page du Pratz, exclusionary methods tended to be hidden, but the process

became increasingly obvious as the eighteenth century drew to a close. Whether covert, overt, intentional or unintentional, the results remained the same; the Indians, who once flourished in the Lower Mississippi Valley, were almost completely written out of the land. I am sure that settlers in the area recognized that tribes still existed; however, Europeans who never visited Louisiana and relied on published accounts for their information were led to believe that the Indians were gone, paving the way for a free title to a large and potentially valuable section of the New World. There are numerous ways that Europeans wrote Indians out. The first and most obvious way was for writers to leave Indians out of their monographs. Where early texts were filled with Indians and their villages, later texts are markedly silent in regards to Indians. For example, during Marquette's journey, he recorded Indians at every stop and chronicled numerous details concerning select tribes of the Upper Mississippi. La Salle, Iberville and Bienville followed suit, but by the time James Pitot wrote in 1796, he barely mentioned Indians, making it clear that he did not consider them a necessary or even ordinary part of daily life. What is more, rarely did any of the writers acknowledge the European role in the declining Indian population. Sentiments of native sympathizers like Bartolomé de Las Casas were completely absent, save a few allusions in the work of Bossu.

In addition to merely leaving Indians out of the narrative, Europeans claimed and renamed the land, beginning in earnest when La Salle reached the mouth of the Mississippi and claimed it for France in 1682. As the eighteenth century drew to a close, the Indians found themselves on European land rather than the other way around. Popular images of Indians, already prevalent in Europe, also facilitated the ability to claim land. Europeans regularly called Indians savage, barbaric and, at best, noted that their ways were primitive.²⁰ The journal accounts all show that both explorers and settlers held Indians in low esteem and considered

themselves far superior. In calling Indians primitive and savage, Europeans asserted that the Indians could not use the land to its full potential.

The second indicator that Europeans wrote Indians out of the Lower Mississippi Valley is the change in colonization goals. At first, Europeans actively sent missionaries and made them the primary carriers of colonization. Marquette was himself a missionary, and missionaries accompanied La Salle and Iberville on their voyages, but most other journalists focused on settlement and commerce rather than Christianity. The clergy continued to inhabit Louisiana, a Catholic colony, and went on to build the famous St. Louis Cathedral in 1727.²¹ The center of religion in the colony quickly became New Orleans, but priests increasingly began to focus their efforts on new settlers rather than the Indians. After all, how can you Christianize a population that is theoretically absent? What is more, the center for religion became the center for commerce. Instead of evangelism, we find building plans and commerce in both New Orleans and in travel accounts. As the French period in Louisiana progressed, Europeans rarely actively sought peaceful relations with the Indians and Indians became a last priority when mentioned at all. Indeed, colonial governments coveted peace, but they no longer diligently pursued it, especially with smaller tribes. For example, Iberville and Bienville repeatedly traveled to Indian villages, seeking permission to stay and bartering for goods. Later governors, however, asked Indians to come to New Orleans and other major European population centers when the need arose. The governor in charge of the transition from French to Spanish rule, Jean-Jaques-Blaise d'Abbadie, never once traveled to an Indian village and rarely sent emissaries to remaining tribes. Rather, he requested that tribes come to New Orleans.²²

The final indicator that Europeans wrote Indians out of Louisiana was the new position they were assigned. In the eighteenth century, accounts increasingly portrayed Indians as

resources or assets to the colony rather than human beings. Officials seemed to view Indians in the same way they viewed cattle, timber or even cannons. Indians performed work, were good for trade and useful in war. Europeans accomplished this task in a number of ways. First, Europeans continued to undermine Indian dignity and humanity by calling them savages and barbarians. The second method Europeans used to make the transition from Indians as humans to Indians as assets was to move tribes by mapping out “free” areas and claiming that land was “abandoned.” European governors, in the late eighteenth century, felt they had the right to move tribes to new locations. For instance, in 1763, Governor d’Abbadie reported that he made a decision to settle the Tunica and Pacana Indians among the Copalissa.²³ During this time of mapping land and moving tribes, the travel accounts and documents, sometimes inadvertently, showed that Indians still inhabited the area, but now they usually arose only in the event of a crisis. For instance, Europeans cited Indians when they caused trouble or were expected to participate as warriors in battles against neighboring countries. Finally, when European officials referred to Indians in the late eighteenth century, they frequently employed the terms “ours” and “theirs” to refer to specific tribes. Not only did Europeans claim the Indians’ land, they also claimed the Indians themselves.

Indians traditionally understood the land in different ways and did not always recognize European traditions of possession. For the southeastern Indians, as well as Indians throughout the Americas, kinship, belief systems and their identity were often tied to the land. Kinship helped define ways Indians thought about “relationships between discrete kinship groups, between different towns, and even between wholly different societies,” thus defining the geography of the land.²⁴ Similarly, their beliefs explained the formation of land as well as governed their interactions with the land and animals.²⁵ In much the same way, belief systems

tied into Indian identities, seen through origin myths. The Chickasaw origin myth, for instance, tells of a sacred pole that directed them eastward until finally reaching the Tombigbee highlands in Mississippi. There, the pole righted itself and the Chickasaw began settling and planting, claiming their new tribal home.²⁶ Similarly, the Choctaw origin myth places them in their tribal land. The Choctaw reportedly either sprung from a hole in the ground, Nanih Waiya, or traveled along with the Chickasaw and Chakchimu.²⁷ Indian relationships to the land were intricate and not easily severed. As an extension of their relationship with the land, tribes usually thought of land as communal property.²⁸ Indian and European ideas of land and property and its exchange were certainly different. This is not to say that Indian ideas of property did not change after European arrival. On the contrary, Indian ideas of property and law did change, sometimes drastically, when Europeans settled in the Lower Mississippi Valley. As one example, during the colonial period Indians adapted to a new economy, termed the frontier exchange economy by Daniel Usner, as well as shaped the world of European colonists.²⁹

Still, many Indians did not fully understand or agree with the European intruders. Indians who disagreed with their new European landlords after the Seven Years' War showed their displeasure, but their attacks were not enough to change European plans. When the English tried to ascend the Mississippi to take possession of the Illinois, for example, Indians like the Tunica frequently ambushed ships, demonstrating that they did not accept the English. Europeans simply recorded the Indians' mischief, encouraged them to remain at peace and warned them of possible repercussions.³⁰ Rarely, if ever, did the Louisiana officials allow Indian dissent to hinder their project of colonization and domination.

This story, then, is about the Europeans. It is not about European actions and swords but rather their words and pens. Documented European actions included trading, giving presents,

forming alliances and even sometimes warring against the Indians in the Mississippi Valley. The travel accounts and journals from those in the area, however, do not include details of all the many interactions that took place. Since many of the published travel accounts were potentially Europe's only source of knowledge of Louisiana, the absence of Indian interactions created a false picture of the Mississippi Valley in some European's minds. These accounts, then, combined with colonial documents, prove that Europeans, through their writings, dispossessed Indians from the land from the beginnings of colonization in the late seventeenth century to the end of the eighteenth century.

Chapter 2

Early Explorations and Initial Claims

The first mention of the Mississippi River, the heart of the coveted Louisiana territory, is on a surprisingly accurate map from 1513.³¹ Five years later, in 1518, Francisco de Garay investigated the river, later named Rio del Espiritu Santo.³² A host of other explorers followed with various degrees of failure in their dreams of finding the Mississippi's mouth and colonizing the area. Pánfilo de Narváez ventured toward the Gulf in 1527 but perished along with the majority of his crew during the tiresome journey.³³ Cabeza de Vaca, along with three other survivors, wandered throughout the southwest and even lived with Texas Indian groups for survival. They finally reached Mexico and some of their fellow countrymen in 1536.³⁴ It was not until Hernando de Soto's 1539 expedition that Europeans again encountered the Mississippi River. De Soto, a Peruvian conqueror, heard de Vaca's stories of vast riches and explored great portions of southeastern North America. He failed to find gold and riches, but he did manage to find the famed Rio Del Espiritu Santo sometime between May 9 and May 21, 1541. Accounts from Rodrigo Rangel, Luís Hernández de Biedma and the anonymous gentleman from Elvas, confirmed the discovery of the Mississippi and proclaimed the Mississippi to be the main artery of North America.³⁵

All of these early explorations, though successful in finding territory and paving the way for future explorers, failed to establish settlements of substance or firmly claim land for their homelands. By the late seventeenth century, however, the Gulf was one of the most contested regions of the New World. Three large Indian tribes, numerous small tribes, at least three

European nations and the expanding Americans all vied for control of the Mississippi. During this exploration period, the Indians remained in the accounts, but a close examination of the texts reveals that, even during the exploration period, travelers were overlooking Indians. Only a few of the strategies for writing the Indians out appeared here. The primary tactics were literally leaving Indians out of accounts, claiming the land as “European” and using stereotypes of Indians to justify taking land. Christianizing Indians and maintaining peaceful relations were priorities in the early period. During the French and Spanish period, however, evangelism and diplomatic relations bear little or no consequence for the journalists. Explorers and writers also began the process of transforming the Indians from humans to resources, a process that reached full fruition by the Louisiana Purchase in 1803.

Indians Abound

Early European chroniclers of the upper Mississippi were acutely aware of the Indian population. They filled their accounts with remarks on the large number of inhabitants, the customs and ways of the Indians and detailed accounts of interactions with the Indians. Sieur Jean Nicolet was a traveling Jesuit missionary in Canada who had become “almost” an Indian, according to historian John G. Shea, and scholars credit him with first discovering the Mississippi by way of Lake Green Bay in 1639.³⁶ Nicolet often visited the Huron, Ojibwe (Winnebagoes) and a host of Algonquin Indians. He filled his letters with encounters that included details of the tribes he visited.³⁷

Father Pere Jacques Marquette, another Jesuit Missionary, followed Nicolet’s path to the Mississippi from Green Bay, but Marquette traveled on to the Arkansas River.³⁸ Louis Jolliet accompanied Marquette. Jolliet was a Canadian commissioned to find the great river that Indians spoke of so frequently. The two men, along with five others, reached the upper

Mississippi in June 1673 and began their descent.³⁹ Like Nicolet, Marquette found Indians everywhere.⁴⁰ Marquette always noted Indians in his journal when they were around, assuming that Indians inhabited the land and were flourishing. In fact, before reaching the Illinois, Marquette noted his surprise at not finding any inhabitants. He said, “we advanced constantly, ...having already made more than a hundred leagues without having discovered anything but beasts and birds, we kept well on our guard.”⁴¹ Marquette knew the Indians existed, and he even mentioned them when they were not physically present. By the middle of the colonial period, if any European had traveled over 100 leagues without seeing anyone, he would have deemed the land abandoned by the Indians and settled the area. Even more surprising is the fact that Marquette was not satisfied, at times, with the amount of information he gathered about the Indians. After leaving the Illinois, Marquette recorded that, “the shortness of [his] stay among them did not allow [him] to secure all the information that [he] would have desired.”⁴² Again, later explorers desired as little information as possible and usually only stayed in villages long enough to secure peace.

Still, even with all of Marquette’s abundant observations, we see the very beginnings of a change in European attitudes. While traveling on the upper Mississippi, Marquette included elaborate comments about the Wild Oats, Mascouten and Illinois Indians in his journal, but then he traveled over 200 miles without mentioning Indians.⁴³ Finally, he arrived at the Chickasaw nation and resumed his comments. Marquette saw them on the riverbank with guns in hand. He called to them in Huron while trying to present his feathered calumet. The Indians provided food and somehow signaled to Marquette that the sea was only ten days journey.⁴⁴ Europeans, probably the Spanish, had previously visited the Chickasaw, and Marquette noted that they had rosaries and pictures but none in the tribe who “seemed to have received any instruction in the

faith.”⁴⁵ Besides describing the Indians’ method of keeping mosquitoes away and the comments mentioned above, Marquette was silent in regards to the Chickasaw. The omission is surprising since the Jesuits were the most careful explorers and Marquette had previously expressed remorse at not staying with the Illinois longer to find information. Of course, Marquette did not have the leisure to know the tribe fully, but he neglected even a description of their homes and town. Did Marquette simply find nothing to write about or was he writing out the Indians?

Perhaps if Marquette only regarded one tribe with diminished interest we could dismiss his role in writing the Indians out. Whether consciously or unconsciously though, Marquette repeatedly declined to acknowledge or comment on tribes the further he traveled down the river. For instance, where the river turned from “prairies to forests,” Father Marquette met the Mitchihamea Indians and later the Arkansas, but as in the Chickasaw case, he neglected a detailed description of their lifestyle and surroundings, unlike his early comments. His remarks usually only included a brief encounter and the reception he received. The Arkansas Indians did show some interest in “the faith” and consequently in keeping Marquette in their village to instruct them. Perhaps though, the presents Marquette gave only moments earlier helped to persuade them.⁴⁶ Marquette, after feasting, turned back at the Arkansas camp, afraid of the reportedly perilous journey ahead, and he returned to New France. The Indians then, remained in the land, and Marquette readily recognized them despite the fact that the length of his observations declined.

Robert Cavalier De La Salle and the members of his exploring party were the next group to explore the Mississippi. King Louis XIV appointed La Salle to journey down the Mississippi and claim it for France in 1678.⁴⁷ La Salle met Prince de Conti, the Chevalier Henri de Tonty, before leaving Paris on his mission, and he asked de Tonty to join him. The two arrived in

Quebec in September 1678, where Recollect Gabriel Louis Hennepin and Zenobe Membré joined them.⁴⁸ The famed La Salle expedition soon began and accomplished its mission of finding the Mississippi's mouth in 1682. La Salle followed Louis' wishes and claimed the area for France, paving the way for the penetration of Mexico.⁴⁹ Of the group, de Tonty, Hennepin and notary, Jacques de la Metairie most clearly showed that Indians abounded in the country, but Europeans had already begun the process of writing Indians off the landscape.

Notary Jacques de la Metairie recorded the official account of the voyage. His entire account of the Mississippi below the Illinois country was filled with Indian encounters. The meetings were numerous, but the details were sparse. On March 12, the Kapaha village of Arkansas, on the fifteenth, "another of their villages," and later the largest Arkansas village, the Imaha, were all recorded with few other details save that "peace was confirmed."⁵⁰ The La Salle expedition also noted the presence of tribes such as the Talusas, Tourika, Jason, Kouera, Taensa and Maheouala. Again, little or no description was included when de la Metairie mentioned tribes. In just over 10 years then, from Marquette to La Salle, interest in Indians faded slightly when measured by the quantity of detail for each tribe.

Others on La Salle's first journey also recorded Indians in rather large numbers. Henri de Tonty reported seeing Indian villages everywhere and even acknowledged Indians when they were not physically present.⁵¹ Wintry weather prevailed for a significant part of La Salle's voyage, leaving many Indian villages abandoned for winter quarters. De Tonty still recorded these villages with the implication that the Indians still had rights to the land. Most of his comments were relatively short and general. For instance, during the harsh winter, de Tonty resided with the Poutouatamis, but all he said is that "two Ottawas savages came up, who led us to where the Poutouatamnis were. ...I spent the winter with them... [and] I left this place in the

spring.”⁵² Similarly, de Tonty remarked that the Chickasaw have 2000 warriors, a great number, but he felt the need to record only the number of warriors and that the Chickasaw desired flat heads since they often tried to flatten the heads of newborns in the tribe.⁵³ His comments about the Arkansas are representative and instructive. He said that the Arkansas

Are situated on the great river (Mississippi). ...they have cabins made with the bark of cedar; they have no other worship than the adoration of all sorts of animals. Their country is very beautiful, having abundance of peach, plum, and apple trees, and vines flourish there; buffaloes, deer, stags, bears, turkeys, are very numerous. They have domestic fowls. They have very little snow during the winter, and ice is not thicker than a dollar. They gave us guides to conduct us to their allies....⁵⁴

Still, even with the somewhat vague and general comments, de Tonty, more than any other person on the La Salle voyage, seemed to be truly interested in the Indians and their lifestyle. De Tonty went into great detail at some villages, reporting the state of diplomatic relations between the Illinois and Iroquois in detail and also elaborating on the European’s reception at the Teansa village.⁵⁵ De Tonty stands out from others on the voyage. In fact, his interest in the Indians is so great that it led him to serve as an emissary between the French and Indians during construction of the first settlements. De Tonty followed the general pattern of the early exploration period. He found Indians throughout the Lower Mississippi Valley and recorded them all, but many times his observations were brief and relatively uninformative, showing the very beginning of writing the Indians out.

Father Louis Hennepin, a missionary on La Salle’s journey, confirmed that a number of Indian tribes resided along the Mississippi in 1682.⁵⁶ Though he rarely dwelt on Indians, there were a few instances in his journal that focused on a specific tribe. In the Illinois country, for instance, Hennepin recorded the tribe’s position on the river and its style of housing. The Illinois were in their winter camps when the party arrived so Hennepin limited his observations at the initial camp. Five days later, however, the expedition found the Illinois once again. This time,

Hennepin saw eighty wigwams “full of Indians.”⁵⁷ Notice that Hennepin, like de Tonty, found an abandoned summer camp but still recorded Indians. During the exploration period, abandoned Indian land was still Indian land. Later, chronicles suggest that abandoned land was European.

On La Salle’s first trip, then, changes in the practice of recording Indians were slight. Indians remained on the landscape en masse, but their customs and tribal landscape seemed somewhat diminished in importance. There was no pattern that Europeans used to exclude Indians at this point. Perhaps writers unconsciously left out Indians because they seemed ordinary after a few years of contact. La Salle’s first voyage also served to antagonize the Spanish Crown further. Louis XIV could not have been happier with the situation and readily approved another voyage to the Gulf. The marine and colonial minister, Marquis de Seignelay, had long hoped to establish a colony on the mouth of the Mississippi, and La Salle’s proposition for a second trip coincided with his goals.⁵⁸ After a few setbacks, La Salle set sail on August 1, 1864. Two weeks later on August 15, the Truce of Ratisbon secured peace between France and Spain for a period of twenty years, but La Salle left believing that France and Spain were still at war.⁵⁹ The ill-fated voyage ultimately failed in its goal to reach the Mississippi by way of the Gulf of Mexico and establish a colony, but it did succeed in unsettling the Spanish when La Salle landed in Texas, even closer to Spanish silver mines.⁶⁰

Though the mission failed, the French continued the pattern of writing Indians out of the Lower Mississippi Valley. La Salle’s memoir proposing a second voyage down the Mississippi first highlighted his struggles and considerable efforts already dedicated to the King.⁶¹ He also mentioned the European rivalry that helped shape the area and its colonization. Then, as expected, all energies turned toward convincing de Seignelay and Louis XIV to support another

voyage. La Salle spent the rest of his memoir explaining the advantages of the land and giving a brief description of all the land that comprised the new territory. With the exception of a few sentences, La Salle de-emphasized the Indians. He usually only mentioned natives when he believed that they helped his case for further explorations, aided in the protection of Louisiana from other European nations or would continue to trade. For instance, while bolstering his image, La Salle reported that he “traversed more than 6000 leagues of unknown country, among many barbarous and cannibal nations, against whom he was obliged to fight almost daily....”⁶² Here, La Salle was trying to show his dedication to the King. However, his statement tells us that Indians indeed inhabited the Lower Mississippi, so much that La Salle encountered them almost daily, or so he said. He did not, however, mention tribal names or give details.

During the initial exploration period, Indians remained on the land and in European narratives. The picture the travel narratives painted was a land filled with Indians, some peaceful and others hostile. Though there were some instances where the Indian presence seemed unjustly diminished, Europeans had only begun writing the Indians out. The process became much more apparent in later periods. Similarly, the second indicator that Indians were written out remained somewhat undeveloped in this early period. The second strategy included claiming the land as “European” rather than “Indian.” What is more, Europeans no longer consulted with Indians when exchanging land as time progressed. Marquette continued to label land as “Indian” land, but La Salle and his companions began the process of claiming the land.

Marquette did not make any claims of possession to the new area that he and Louis Jolliet explored. Marquette only applied French ownership to New France, the area above the Mississippi. When he did speak to Indians on the Mississippi about the French, like the Illinois, Marquette did not assume that the French owned the land further down the Mississippi. Granted,

Marquette did reinforce the French image and assured the Indians of the Frenchmen's peaceful intentions, paving the way for future inroads to possession. Overall though, Marquette's only claim was that the land belonged to God, the sovereign of the French and the Indians. Formal possession of the land did not occur on Marquette's first voyage.⁶³ Here again, Marquette's journal revealed a 'before' picture of European perceptions of the land.

By the time Robert Cavalier de La Salle formally took possession of the Mississippi and the surrounding land, however, an obvious change began. La Salle clearly saw the land as European after performing the possession ceremony. After traveling from Canada to the Mississippi's mouth at the Gulf of Mexico, La Salle took "possession" "of the country of Louisiana, near the three mouths of the River Colbert, in the Gulf of Mexico, on the 9th of April, 1682," according to Jacques De La Metairie, the notary for the voyage.⁶⁴ La Metairie recorded the full possession ritual that La Salle used. "The whole party," he says,

under arms, chanted the *Te Deum*, the *Exaudiat*, the *Domine slavum fac Regem*; and then after a salute of firearms and cries of *Vive le Roi*, the column was erected by M. de la Salle, who, standing near it, said, with a loud voice, in French: - 'In the name of the most high, might, invincible, and victorious Prince, Louis the Great, by the Grace of God King of France and [Havana]'⁶⁵

La Metairie went on to describe the area that the King now possessed and asserted that the "Chaouanons, [Chickasaws], and other people dwelling therein" gave their consent for French ownership.⁶⁶ The transformation from Indian land to European land began but remained incomplete until later in the French period. Frenchmen continued to consult Indians and include them in their assertions of ownership, despite how insincere Europeans were in their tales of Indian consent. Certainly, Europeans could not and did not consult with each Indian tribe, affirm that the tribe understood European ownership and then gain the Indian's consent. Many explorers frequently made those types of assertions, however.

La Metairie was one of those Frenchmen who claimed land while including Indians. Whether or not the Chickasaw actually gave their consent or fully understood the French ceremony is highly questionable. From other sources we find that Indians were not always eager to help the French. Francis Parkman, an early historian of French America, while reporting an episode at Michillimackinac, said that, "Here, as usual, all was hostile; and [La Salle] had great difficulty in inducing the Indians, ...to sell provisions."⁶⁷ Another episode of hostility occurred after a possession ceremony at Saut St. Marie, in the upper region of the Mississippi. La Salle and missionaries planted a cross which the Crees, Monsonis, Amikoués, and Nipissings stripped soon after the French departure.⁶⁸ Parkman speculates that the Indians took down the royal arms because they "feared it as a charm."⁶⁹ Whether the Chickasaw understood and consented to possession does not change the fact that the French claimed the land. This change is markedly different from Marquette's journal where Europeans did not claim specific parcels of land while exploring. Another glaring detail suggesting that France no longer perceived the land as Indian is the fact that La Metairie only mentioned the Chickasaw. The "other people dwelling therein" are presumably Indians, but avoiding naming specific tribes diminishes their claims of ownership.

During the exploration period, Europeans also began the process of completely removing Indians from land transactions, though this goal was much harder to accomplish, and Europeans did not completely remove Indians from land transactions until the Spanish and English periods. Coming back to La Salle's memoir to Monsieigneur de Seignelay, the first few statements support the fact that Indians inhabited the Mississippi River Valley in large numbers. The statements also revealed that La Salle, in addition to claiming the land in general for France, reorganized and claimed land from specific tribes. In his memoir, La Salle reported establishing

a fort and placing “several” settlers at the Illinois post in addition to “[bringing] together many savage nations, amounting to more than 18,000 in number.”⁷⁰ These two statements show that Indian tribes were sometimes completely reorganized and moved. If tribes did manage to escape the harshest aspects of European colonization, their alliances were certainly tampered with. La Salle’s next observation is more damning. La Salle said that the settlers and Indians together “commence[d] a powerful colony.”⁷¹ No longer did the Indians possess the land themselves; they now shared it with the French. Thus, La Salle began the process of taking away Indian claims to land in the Illinois country, and later throughout the Mississippi Valley. Again, however, the process had only begun. The French continued to share the land with Indians while later Spaniards, Englishmen and Americans claimed complete ownership.

Yet another indicator that the Indians were written out of Louisiana history was the stereotypes that filled travel accounts. Using stereotypes was not as blatant as leaving Indians out and taking their land, but the consequences were the same. When Europeans stereotyped Indians, they affirmed their own superiority. Perhaps some of the writers used stereotypes of Indians without fully realizing the consequences. Whatever their motives, however, the result remained the same. For Marquette and La Salle, the attitude of European superiority was glaring, but since Indians remained on the land in large numbers, the effects of using stereotypes was not as harmful to the Indians’ claims. What is more, Marquette and La Salle only peppered their accounts with words like ‘savage’ and ‘barbarian’ while later journalists, like James Pitot in 1796, refused to even conceive of the Indians as humans.

Marquette most frequently employed the word ‘savage’ to describe Indians, but he seemed to use the word almost interchangeably with ‘Indians’ and ‘people.’ Before his journey began, Marquette said that he “obtained all the information that [he] could from the savages who

had frequented” the region he hoped to explore.⁷² In the very next sentence, however, Marquette calls the Indians ‘peoples.’ Similarly, at the Folle Avoine, or village of the Wild Oats, he said that he would “go and visit these peoples.”⁷³ It seems that Marquette and others, during this early period, thought of the Indians in derogatory terms, but they also recognized some sliver of humanity. At the very least, Europeans realized that they were outnumbered. When speaking of the Illinois, Marquette reported, “When one speaks the word ‘Illinois,’ it is as if one said in their language, ‘the men,’ – As if the other Savages were looked upon by them merely as animals. It must also be admitted that they have an air of humanity....”⁷⁴ Attitudes toward Indians appeared to fluctuate frequently for Marquette, showing that stereotypes of the Louisiana Indians continued to evolve.

On La Salle’s first voyage, stereotypes of Indians as savages, barbarians, cannibals, tricksters and simpletons emerged. De Tonty, like Marquette, peppered his work with the word ‘savage,’ and used it almost interchangeably with the words, ‘Indian,’ ‘nation’ and even ‘men.’⁷⁵ Father Louis Hennepin went further and made numerous assertions about Indians in a section of his work called, “Customs of the Indians.” Hennepin implied that the Indians were incredibly rude and uncivilized. He said, “the men and women conceal only their private parts. Indians break wind before everyone regardless. They treat their old men so rudely that they even do this in their faces....Indians snuff and puff like animals when eating....They belch continually....To sum up, they show no reticence whatsoever in their actions; they follow primitive animal instincts.”⁷⁶ Hennepin did concede that Indians practiced “some occasional acts of politeness and consideration,” but in one case, he claimed that the Indians’ consideration was trickery.⁷⁷

Similarly, in La Salle’s memoir to de Seignelay, imagery of cannibalism, barbarism and savagery prevailed. He said that during his first time exploring in North America, he “traversed

more than 6000 leagues of unknown country, among many *barbarous* and *cannibal* nations, against whom he was obliged to fight almost daily...”(emphasis mine).⁷⁸ Remember that La Salle also reported placing “several” settlers at Illinois in addition to “[bringing] together many *savage* nations” (emphasis mine).⁷⁹ If La Salle and other travelers could convince Europeans at home that the Indians were something less than human, justifying stealing their land would not be an issue. How could something that was inhuman own land?

The Goals of Early Colonization

In addition to leaving the Indians out of Louisiana’s history, the goals of explorers and colonists helped to write Indians out of their land. During the exploration period, evangelism and exploration were top priorities, but as time passed, settlement and expansion overshadowed missionary work. A majority of the time, settlement plans neglected to include Indians and their issues, and Europeans generally placed Indians last in the list of priorities as time progressed. The final indicator that Europeans changed their goals, effectively writing Indians out of Louisiana, was the fact that Europeans rarely actively sought peaceful relations with Indians during later periods. In the exploration period, however, Indians remained central in many journals because the visible goals of colonization included exploration, evangelism and, in the end, possession.

Father Marquette’s journey is an obvious place to examine European intentions of evangelism. Marquette, a Jesuit missionary, began the journey and his narrative with a deep and seemingly sincere interest in the souls of Indians. “I was ...enraptured,” he said, at the “necessity of exposing my life for the salvation of all these nations.”⁸⁰ His interest and deep religiosity continued throughout his voyage. For instance, after being in the Maskouten village, he said, “Before embarking, we all began together a new devotion to the Blessed Virgin

Immaculate, which we practiced every day....”⁸¹ The all in this case was the Father, Jolliet, other Frenchmen who accompanied them and the two new Maskouten guides. Finally, after the explorers turned back up the Mississippi, Marquette remarked, “had all this voyage caused the salvation of a single soul, I should deem all my fatigue well repaid.”⁸² Marquette, however, became adamant about salvation and began truly evangelizing at the Illinois’ village . There, Marquette assured the Illinois of his peaceful intentions and “declared to them that God their Creator had pity on them, since, after having been so long ignorant of him, he wished to become known to all nations.”⁸³ Marquette also promised to return the next year and stay with the Illinois to instruct them in the ways of God. He seemed quite sincere and showcased the European initiative to Christianize the Indians in the journal of his first voyage.

Father Louis Hennepin accompanied La Salle, serving as a missionary for the trip and keeping the European campaign of evangelism alive. Hennepin, like Marquette, had a great interest in the Illinois and their faith, but it seemed that Hennepin shifted his habits to coincide with the larger European goals of peace and exploration. Hennepin’s journal entries, while in the Illinois country, first recorded the Indians’ position on the river and their housing customs, including winter and summer camps. At the winter camp, Hennepin saw eighty wigwams “full of Indians,” and though apprehensive, La Salle’s party cried out “according to the custom of th[o]se tribes.”⁸⁴ The Illinois realized that the French came in peace and immediately offered the calumet. Hennepin and the other priests began to council the Illinois in the Gospel as La Salle bartered with them for provisions. Hennepin also recorded a reassuring comment. The Illinois promised La Salle that the Colbert River (Mississippi) was navigable to the sea and that no Europeans were presently there.⁸⁵

Like Marquette, it seems that Hennepin devoted himself to Christianizing the Indians. Hennepin though appears more closely aligned with secular exploration than Marquette. Generally, Hennepin did not include references to the Lord and salvation throughout his work, as Marquette did. Many of Hennepin's writings concern the landscape and Indian customs. Specifically, notice in the Illinois entry that Hennepin described the landscape, the Illinois' position on the river, their customs and winter camps. Finally, Hennepin made room for conversion, but Christianity no longer seemed like a top priority but rather among the top priorities. Hennepin included more worldly observations in his journal, but his final comments showed that although he felt his work was in vain, he hoped others could continue his work. "Only the grace of God working in a miraculous way can Christianize the Indians before they are civilized," he said.⁸⁶ Here, in his final comments, Hennepin did not completely disregard evangelism, but he did give future Europeans an excuse when their efforts failed.

The Indian must be civilized before he can be Christianized. Until Christians are the absolute masters of the Indians, missionaries will have scant success without a very special grace of God, a miracle which He does not perform for every people. These are my convictions from my experience with our Recollect Order in America, and this artless statement is made not with the intent of shocking anyone but because I must write the truth.⁸⁷

Finally, La Salle himself even contended that Christianity was still a goal of colonization. In his memoir to Seignelay, notice the order La Salle used when listing the benefits of colonization. He claimed that he had the experience to carry on the journey he proposed, and then he immediately said that the Indians needed to be exposed to the Gospel. Finally, La Salle asserted that the King would have the glory of conquest on land and sea, including the rich silver mines that "adjoin the River Colbert," or Mississippi.⁸⁸ Priorities began to shift during the

exploration period, but Christianity was still one of the main pretenses for colonization. At least feigning interest in evangelism remained firmly rooted.

The second indicator that goals changed over the exploration and early colonial period is the fact that Europeans less frequently sought peaceful relations with Indians. During this initial phase, Europeans readily displayed the peace calumet and avoided most confrontations with Indians. In later periods, peace became secondary to settlement concerns. The proclivity for peace began with Marquette. He did not always record lengthy observations about each tribe that he encountered, but Marquette was always careful to note the peacefulness of tribes. For example, at the Maskouten villages, he recorded that the Indians “civilly consented” to giving Marquette guides. Further, the Indians gave Marquette a present in the form of a bed mat. He then traveled onward to the villages of the Illinois where the Indians received him in a hospitable manner.⁸⁹ At the Arkansas village, one of his last encounters before heading home, Marquette recorded that the Indians brought out the calumet, sang with the European party and then fed them sagamité.⁹⁰ Europeans, including Marquette, coveted peaceful relations with the Indians during the exploration period for two reasons. First, Indians were instrumental in trade. Second, peaceful relations were pivotal when Europeans traveled down the river. Hostile tribes could make passage particularly treacherous and deadly for explorers.

La Salle and the members of his expedition continued to place peace as a top priority in their interactions with Indians. Hennepin recorded the receptions the Indians gave such as “the Ottawa chiefs did us honor in their fashion,” or “the Hurons, who all have firearms, saluted us with a volley repeated three times to do honor to our ship and the French.”⁹¹ Similarly, de Tonty remarked that just below the Natchez area, at the village of the Quinipissas, some arrows were aimed at them, but “as M. de la Salle would not fight against any nation, he made us embark.”⁹²

De Tonty's remarks are significant because they show that La Salle coveted peace and allowed Indians to prevail in some instances to preserve peace. Granted, the fact that La Salle was outnumbered probably greatly influenced his actions, but whatever the motivation, his attitude was a far cry from the attitude of later Frenchmen who often knowingly acted in a manner sure to provoke the Indians.

Hennepin echoed La Salle and de Tonty's concerns about peace. Before reaching the Mississippi, Hennepin recorded that the explorers found the Potawatomi and Fox, noting that each tribe sought peace immediately with the French. The Indians always sang the calumet and provided supplies according to Hennepin. When some mishap did occur, such as when the Fox stole from La Salle, Hennepin said that the Indians initially mistook them for the Iroquois who, had numerous enemies.⁹³ Whether the Fox really thought the Europeans were Iroquois is highly debatable, but Hennepin's excuse showed that Europeans tried to keep a façade of peace. In the early period then, Europeans wanted to spread Christianity and form peaceful relationships with the Indians, and they often wrote with these goals in mind.

Mapping the Land

The final indicator that the Indians were written out of Louisiana's history is their evolving position in European eyes. Indians went from humans in the early period, albeit savage humans, to resources in later periods. Like other indicators, the exploration period only gives glimpses of the future. During the exploration period, the Indians remained on the land and were not considered under European authority. However, these early explorers laid groundwork that conveniently allowed future colonists to overlook Indians. Mapping the land, moving tribes, overlooking tribes in times of tranquility, expecting services in times of distress and claiming tribes as their own were all ways Europeans made the transition from Indians as humans to

Indians as resources. Here, during the exploration period, travel accounts recognized Indians as humans, but they began including a number of these tactics.

The first sign that Indians were no longer human, or at the very least, less human than Europeans, was the habit of mapping and moving tribes. The general pattern for Europeans in Louisiana was mapping land in order to facilitate future settlement. Then Europeans began pointing out abandoned Indian land, clearing the way for European claims on the land. Finally, European nations claimed the land, leaving the Indians completely out. Another popular tactic was moving tribes to outlying areas, many times by requesting they move, but forcibly moving them if necessary. Physically moving tribes became much clearer during the French and Spanish settlement periods. During the early exploration period, many of these tactics were absent. Europeans tended to merely map the land.

Marquette's narrative exhibited a great interest in the land itself, the river, flora and fauna. Marquette crudely tried to map out the land as he traveled, noting the length of bays and other land or water markers. In a river just past the Wild Oats tribe, Marquette commented that the river he entered was "very beautiful at its mouth, and flow[ed] gently; it [was] full of bustards, duck, teal, and other birds, attracted by the wild oats of which they [we]re very fond."⁹⁴ Similarly, after leaving the Maskoutens, he recorded, in the same manner, the river they left from and the distance traveled. He said that the river

Is very wide; it has a sandy bottom, which forms various shoals that render its navigation very difficult. It is full of Islands Covered with Vines. On the banks one sees fertile land, diversified with woods, prairies, and Hills. There are oak, Walnut, and basswood trees; and another kind, whose branches are armed with long thorns. We saw there neither feathered game nor fish, but many deer, and a large number of cattle. Our route lay to the southwest, and, after navigating about 30 leagues, we saw a spot presenting all the appearances of an iron mine...⁹⁵

His comments may not seem significant, but they potentially provided future travelers with a crude map and description of the land, future travelers who would take exploration and settlement to the next step.

Hennepin, while journeying with La Salle, continued the descriptive mapping pattern. Hennepin did not have as great of an opportunity as others on the journey since La Salle ordered him back to explore the Mississippi's uppermost regions. Issati (Souix) Indians took Hennepin captive shortly after he departed from La Salle's group. One comment Hennepin made, however, showed that he too was interested in descriptively mapping the landscape. On the Seignelay River, Hennepin recorded that the river was "broad" and "deep," that "as far as the eye can see, there was only swamp land covered with rushes and alders."⁹⁶ La Salle made up for Hennepin's inadequate mapping in his memoir requesting a second voyage. He descriptively traced a rugged map of the region and pointed out all the resources available for exploitation. La Salle proclaimed that not only was the Mississippi navigable for more than 100 leagues for large vessels, but smaller ships could sail more than 500 leagues without trouble. La Salle claimed that the favorable soil, wood and mild climate all held the potential for prosperous crops and livestock in Louisiana. In addition, La Salle assured King Louis XIV that France would save money on travel to and from the upper regions of its holdings.⁹⁷

Mapping during the early period usually promoted land for future settlement, but as the eighteenth century advanced, Europeans began to claim specific parcels of land for their own. Already during the exploration period, La Salle felt secure enough to claim general ownership of the Mississippi, its tributaries and the surrounding land upon reaching the Gulf. In fact, throughout his journey, La Salle made loose claims to specific parcels of Indian land. On March 12, at the village of the Kapaha (Arkansas), de la Metairie recorded, "Having established peace

there, and taken possession, we passed....”⁹⁸ Later, de la Metairie noted that at another Arkansas village, “peace was confirmed, and ...the chief acknowledged that the village belonged to his Majesty.”⁹⁹ Having only days to consult with Indians in a best case scenario, La Salle assumed possession. It is unlikely that these two Arkansas tribes truly understood what La Salle’s intentions were. Nevertheless, La Salle, through de la Metairie, mapped and claimed Arkansas land on his way to the Gulf.

After mapping out the land they wanted, the next step in turning their Indian neighbors into resources was for Europeans to make both the Indians and the land useful and profitable. At the beginning of exploration, Frenchmen asked Indians to travel with them as guides and serve as porters. This relationship, however, was not established, and Europeans had to continually request aid, never assured of what the answer would be. Early accounts showed that the European travelers continually requested food and guides. Marquette for instance, asked for guides from the Mascouten tribe, and the Indians obliged him with two Miami Indians who served as guides and porters.¹⁰⁰ As time passed, the French became increasingly assured of Indian aid, especially with tribes who previously interacted peacefully with Europeans. Henri de Tonty, while searching for food and scouting on his own happened upon an Illinois village. He reported “arriv[ing] at a village of the savages. They were absent hunting and as we had no provisions we opened some caches of Indian corn.”¹⁰¹ The Frenchmen later found the Indians, joined with them in the calumet and paid them in goods for the corn. Notice though, that the French took what they needed first, before consulting with the Indians, assuming that they were in some way entitled to the goods or that the Indians would not care. Europeans stole from Indian supplies long before La Salle and de Tonty. Nevertheless, the relationship patterns the

French participated in lead Europeans to eventually see the Indians as resources and sometimes slaves, not humans.

Towards the close of his journal, de Tonty almost transformed the Indians into resources. Many Europeans speculated how the Indians and land could turn a profit, and de Tonty was no different. He remarked that the “savages” in the area were “stationary and ha[d] some habits of subordination, [and] they might be obliged to make silk in order to procure necessities for themselves; bringing to them from France the eggs of silkworms, for the forests are full of mulberry trees. This would be a valuable trade.”¹⁰² De Tonty did two things in his statement. First, he said that the Indians “ha[d] some habits of subordination” which is part of the stereotypes previously mentioned. Here, de Tonty began distancing himself and other Europeans from the Indians. Then, he showed how the Indians could be useful to Europeans, turning them into resources. In the early period, the process of making the Indians resources and assets hardly began, but by the Spanish and English periods, Europeans frequently employed this tactic.

The Indians, by the end of the exploration period, had become almost vassals in European eyes. Europeans still recognized and recorded the Indians in large numbers, but Europeans now claimed the land. What is more, Europeans began many of the tactics they used to remove the Indians from the literature. The Indians probably did not recognize French and other European claims; nevertheless, the stage was set for a vanishing Indian, at least in the literature. After La Salle’s somewhat unsuccessful second journey and his death, neither France, Spain nor England sent large expeditions to the Mississippi. The only Europeans venturing down the Mississippi were those few traders and missionaries, like Father Montigny and Father Davion from Canada working with the Taensa and Tonica, who traded and lived with the Indians. The area was not forgotten, however, and in the late 1690s, France again looked toward Louisiana as the English

in Carolina and Spanish in Pensacola threatened Louisiana. The Indians were forced to continue maintaining their claims to Louisiana. In fact, the assault on Indian tribes in the Lower Mississippi Valley had only begun.

Chapter 3

The French Period in Louisiana

From La Salle's death until the late 1690s, France did not attempt to settle Louisiana, but she did not forget about her Mississippi possession, knowing that the Spanish were stationed at Pensacola and that the English were settled in Carolina. King Louis XIV, Chancellor Louis Pheypeaux de Ponchartrain and the Minister of Marine, Jerome Pheypeaux de Maurepas, still hoped to establish a colony. Meanwhile, hostilities between France, England and Spain continued with the War of the League of Ausburg and the looming War of Spanish Succession. Louis XIV wanted to protect his claim to Louisiana from rival nations and hoped that a port on the Gulf, besides bringing more money into the economy, would help protect his valuable Caribbean sugar colonies. Louis chose Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville to settle Louisiana, due in part to his loyalty and military expertise. Settlement soon began, and the process of writing the Indians out of their land continued with increasing fervor.

Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville's forts finally secured French possession of the Mississippi, completing the mission La Salle began. Fort Maurepas near modern Biloxi, Mississippi, Fort de la Boulaye, Fort Saint Louis de la Mobile above the Mobile River and a fort in the modern city of Mobile all secured France's claim. The colony did not remain on sure footing for long but fell on tough times in the early eighteenth century. First, continual wars drained the French treasury. Second, France failed to convince many families to move to Louisiana, and the settlers that did inhabit Louisiana were mostly former soldiers with little desire to farm. Then, leadership problems developed. During the roughly 70 years of French colonization, 14 different governors

held office. The constant change of power was not detrimental to the colony by itself. The turmoil was almost overwhelming, however, when compounded by the turnover of countless lesser officials, frequent changes in trading policies and constant bickering.¹⁰³

All of the accounts of Louisiana from the early to mid eighteenth century commented on the colony's increasing disorder while promoting trade and Louisiana's potential prosperity, but the writers neglected to represent Louisiana Indians accurately, both in numbers and importance. During the exploration period, Indians filled the land and accounts, but during the French period, their numbers dramatically decreased, especially in the literature. All of the outlined tactics for excluding Indians appeared during the French period, and by the end of the period, Louisiana looked like a different land than it did in the journals of people such as Marquette, Hennepin, de Tonty and La Salle. Beginning with Pierre le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville and his brother, Jean Baptiste le Moyne, Sieur de Bienville, Indians slowly began to disappear from journals. Daniel Coxe, an Englishman writing to promote his claims to Louisiana, followed suit, focusing on a description of the land itself rather than those who inhabited that land. Le Page du Pratz, a Frenchman who lived in the colony for sixteen years, did include sections about the Indians in his work but the overall effect of the journal was not positive for Indian history in Louisiana. Finally, Jean Jacques-Blaise D'Abbadie, the governor sent to transition from French to Spanish and English rule, almost completely ignored Indians. French officials and settlers handed over Louisiana to new Spanish and English owners along with a prejudice against the Indians and a history of ignoring them.

Writing the Indians Out

Europeans, mainly Frenchmen during this period, accomplished writing the Indians out the texts and their land by neglecting to include the Indian population in their accounts, claiming

that all land was European and perpetuating stereotypes of an Indian population in decline. Where explorers in the early period found Indians everywhere, settlers in the French period found them sporadically, if at all. Though La Salle claimed Louisiana, there were still a few concessions for Indian ownership. As the French period continued, however, Frenchmen settled and claimed more of Louisiana, no longer allowing for Indian claims to the land. Finally, stereotypes of Indians continued to pepper accounts. A drunken, warring Indian was the picture painted in the majority of journals from the French period. People that did not subscribe to the savage Indian myth, like Jean Bossu, were little better. They painted Louisiana Indians as simpletons. By the end of the French period in Louisiana, Indians were well on their way to literary extinction.

Pierre le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville's first voyage, beginning on October 24, 1698, marked the change from possession to colonization.¹⁰⁴ Iberville arrived at Pensacola in January 1699, where he encountered a strong Spanish presence. Moving westward towards the mouth of the Mississippi, the French explorers found land unsettled by Europeans. Iberville set up Fort Maurepas on Ship Island, just outside Biloxi, and from his base, he began truly exploring the Mississippi for further settlement. Iberville and his brother Bienville both included a number of references to Indians in accounts of their voyages, from 1698 to 1702.

The brother's first trip to Louisiana, in 1698, was a scouting period with minimal settlement. On this journey, Iberville recognized numerous tribes and elaborated on some of the tribes he spent time with. For instance, after spending a few days with the Bayougoula, Iberville described their temple, commented on their dress and critiqued their seeming lack of industry.¹⁰⁵ Though he did not always describe tribes in detail, Iberville mentioned quite a few, if only to use them as a point of reference for measuring the land.¹⁰⁶ Most encounters seemed to consist of a

meeting and some kind of peace ceremony that many times included trade.¹⁰⁷ For instance, after arriving at the Ouma village, Iberville displayed the calumet and sang with the Indians.¹⁰⁸ After seeing the chief, Iberville “gave them a small present in advance of what [he] intended to give them at [his] longboats.”¹⁰⁹ Iberville then described the reception and village in some detail. During the initial voyage Indians remained in the land and Europeans like Iberville readily acknowledged them, in much the same way as early explorers did.

On his second voyage, from December 1699, to May 1700, Iberville began slighting Indians more frequently as plans for settlement commenced. For the most part, Bienville explored while Iberville involved himself with settlement plans that usually excluded Indians. For instance, during a week in January 1700, Bienville traveled to the Bayougoula village “to see what [was] going on among them” while Iberville “had a little land cleared and some sugar cane planted.”¹¹⁰ Here Iberville continued to recognize the Indians’ importance because he sent Bienville to visit tribes, but his personal focus shifted. Despite his new settlement interests, Iberville recognized a number of Indians during the second voyage, but they were usually mentioned in passing or in a long list. During his travels, Iberville said he thought it best to “go to the Taensas and from there by land to the [Natchitoches] and the [Caddo].”¹¹¹ By listing Indian tribes rather than singling them out, Iberville minimized the Indians’ presence. Still, there were a few occasions during the second voyage where Iberville extended his commentary to include diplomatic relations. In March 1700, Iberville sent presents to the Tonica and Chickasaw. “I instructed M. de Tonty to tell them that we have settled on the Mississippi – [we are] friends of all nations nearby, with whom we are doing business in everything; [and] that is rested entirely with them to do as much and become friend of ours by ceasing to make war on the [Natchez] and the [Colapissa] and the [Choctaw].”¹¹² Clearly, the Indians remained a concern

since Iberville continued to send emissaries to tribes and frequently noted tribe's whereabouts. Nevertheless, Indians in Louisiana lost some ground.

Bienville, during the second voyage, was not as indifferent about the Indians and, beginning on the first journey, he proved himself to be a skillful diplomat. On March 15, 1699, Iberville said that while in the Bayogoula nation, "I understood many of their words, which I had taken down in writing the first time I saw them; at least my brother did: He was making himself understood fairly well, having applied himself to the task with the guide I had got on the river...."¹¹³ Bienville was obviously the one who took time to learn Indian languages and customs. He fared so well that Iberville sent him out alone on numerous occasions. On one such occasion, Bienville traveled from the Taensa to the Yatachés from March 22 to May 18, 1700, and recorded his findings.¹¹⁴ Bienville, unlike his brother, frequently commented on the Indians and their villages as he traveled up the river, but his notations were rarely very informative, a symptom of excluding Indians. For instance, "there are no more than five huts and about seventy men," he wrote after arriving at the Ouachita village.¹¹⁵ Bienville and Iberville recognized that Indians inhabited Louisiana, and in the first two voyages Indian encounters frequently occurred. But in spite of everything, the brother's relative awareness of Indians paled in comparison with the early explorers who sometimes spent days with tribes and recorded lengthy explanations about them.

By the third trip to Louisiana, in 1701, new settlements occupied almost all of Iberville's time, and his letters reflected the shift in interest, from Indians to settlement. It seemed that Bienville continued taking short scouting trips while Iberville increasingly disregarded the Indians. On March 4, 1702, for instance, Iberville sent Bienville "to examine several abandoned Indian settlements on the islands in the vicinity."¹¹⁶ In the meantime, Iberville cut a

“mainmast... for the *Palmier* and ha[d] men working to finish it before it [was] sent.”¹¹⁷ Notice how Iberville wrote the Indians out of his account. First, Iberville noted that the land was abandoned but failed to acknowledge which tribe had abandoned the land. Later, when Bienville returned, Iberville only briefly recorded Bienville’s findings while seeming more interested in the images of Indian gods that his brother took. In addition to his own limited encounters and his brother’s travels, Iberville mentioned tribal names and dispositions when de Tonty or Bienville discussed diplomatic relations and trade issues with Louisiana tribes. Indians were present in the journal, but both tribes and details about them were quickly disappearing.

One striking thing to note in the opening years of the French period was the continued shortness of Iberville’s narratives. His first journal, covering approximately four months, was 79 pages of typed material, and his second voyage, lasting five months, was only 40 pages, a significant drop. By the time of the third journal, covering four and a half months, Iberville recorded only 22 pages of typed material. All of his trips were four to five months long, yet his record dropped by half each time he traveled. Perhaps Iberville found nothing interesting to write about, but with the ever changing conditions of the Mississippi River and the number of Indian nations who, like European nations, were rarely diplomatically stable, a lack of material was improbable. More likely, Iberville became familiar with the area and more certain of France’s claim to the Mississippi River. The decrease in Iberville’s journals is symbolic of the Indian’s fate during the French period.

As Louisiana slowly grew under the direction of Iberville, the Spaniards continued claiming a monopoly in the Lower Mississippi Valley, insisting that the French were trespassing. The English also continued plotting against the budding colony.¹¹⁸ In fact, Englishman Daniel Coxe claimed that he owned Louisiana through a grant from Charles II, given sometime between

1692 and 1698.¹¹⁹ Coxe claimed that Carolana, his name for Louisiana, included land on the east and west of the Mississippi. The boundaries, though slightly unclear, seemed to include all land from New Mexico to the borders of the seventeenth-century English colonies. From north to south, the claim was reportedly from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, excluding Spanish St. Augustine.¹²⁰ Coxe tried to affirm his claim in 1699, but the ship met Bienville on the way up the Mississippi. The discovery of French settlements and the War of Spanish succession, beginning in 1702, halted Dr. Coxe's explorations. His son, also Daniel Coxe, took over promoting the English colony and wrote *A Description of the English Province of Carolana* in 1722, both describing his holdings and asserting that though the French won the race for settlement, the English already possessed the land.¹²¹ The account, like Iberville's journals continued to minimize the Indians' presence.

Because of the journal's brevity, being less than one hundred pages, and the large mass of his purported holdings, Coxe rarely expounded on his brief comments concerning Indians of the Mississippi River Valley. He mentioned a number of tribes by name: the Houmas, Natchez, Yazoo, Tunica, Koroa, Tihou, Samboukia, Natchitoches, Naguateers, Natsohocks, Arkansas, Osage, Tonginga, Cappa, Chickasaw, Cherokee, and Epitoupa. Any other tribes though, were included in the statement, "by this river you may have communication with above 40 nations...."¹²² Coxe's brief statements, when present, rarely did more than describe where a tribe resided and the disposition of the tribe if known. For example, of the Taensa, Coxe said that they "abound[ed] in pearls, and enjoy[ed] an excellent country; [and were] very hospitable to strangers...."¹²³ Of the Choctaw, Coxe said only that they consisted "of near 3000 fighting men, live[d] chiefly about the middle of the river, and [were] not far from the [Chickasaws]."¹²⁴ The Choctaw and Chickasaw were the largest tribes in the Lower Mississippi Valley, holding

sway with both Indians and colonists alike. From Coxe's account, however, the Choctaw appeared somewhat comparable to much smaller tribes who faced extinction during the French period. Coxe's short descriptions of the Indians, besides being an undesirable effect of covering such ground in a short space, continued the pattern of excluding Indians in writings concerning Louisiana, in effect, writing them out of their land.

Not only did Coxe conveniently exclude tribe names and details, but in his assertions of English possession, he neglected even to acknowledge that the Indians, who inhabited the land long before the advent of Europeans, had any claim to the land. Coxe wrote, "this colony does most certainly of right belong to the Crown of Great-Britain, if the first discovery, grant, possession, and other most material circumstances, may be allow'd to carry any weight with [the French]." ¹²⁵ The Indian population first 'discovered' the land and various tribes claimed possession of the Lower Mississippi Valley long before the French or English claimed the area. Therefore, if Coxe or the Frenchmen allowed these "circumstances" to "carry any weight," the Indians actually owned the land. Europeans, however, were so certain of their claims that, in many cases, Indians did not even merit discussion when possession was at stake. Certainly, Coxe contributed to writing the Indians out of Louisiana.

Perhaps the one exception to the colonial writers who increasingly excluded Indians from their narratives is Le Page du Pratz. Du Pratz lived in Louisiana for sixteen years, from 1718 to 1734, and witnessed much of the colony's turmoil, European conflicts and Indian interactions. ¹²⁶ The majority of du Pratz' journal consisted of reports from the various excursions he took while in Louisiana, including brief histories, current descriptions and speculations about the future. Interestingly enough, the account of "French Settlements or Posts" neglected to mention a single Indian. From Mobile to New Orleans and Baton Rouge to the Red River, du Pratz focused on

how much more Louisiana could prosper if the area was improved.¹²⁷ Only at Natchitoches did he mention that the name originated “from a nation of that name, settled in the neighborhood.”¹²⁸ The omission was surprising because a 1720 map prominently names villages of the Tohomes, Pascagoula and Colapissas.¹²⁹ Besides map notations, colonial documents frequently mentioned Indians, especially in the first quarter of the century. For instance, the Tohomes, one of the tribes du Pratz excluded, lived only twenty-two miles from Mobile, and the second lieutenant at Mobile, Régis du Roulet, recorded traveling to the Tohomes village on his way to the Choctaw village in 1729.¹³⁰ In addition, other reports to Minister of the Marine, Maurepas, recorded that tribes such as the Tombecbé and Alabamas continued to inhabit the area around Mobile and relied on them for presents.¹³¹ Similarly, the Chitimachas inhabited the area between Point Coupeé and New Orleans in a large enough number for settlers to mention them on trips to the capital in 1738.¹³² The fact that Indians continued to fill government correspondence made their absence from travel accounts even more conspicuous.

Little slips in writing elsewhere in du Pratz’ journal, however, such as in the case of his account of the Pascagoula River, prove that Indians still inhabited the land despite French possession and assertions that the Indians had almost disappeared. He says, “we coasted along the continent, and came to lie in the mouth of the river [Pascagoula]... and to the east of a bay of the same name, dwells a nation, called [Pascagoula].”¹³³ Notice that du Pratz wrote about Indians in the present tense. Du Pratz also included several chapters on the Indians, including “An Account of Several Nations of Indians in Louisiana,” but his information was rarely enlightening. “My design,” he said, “is only to sh[o]w in general, from the character of those people, what course we ought to observe, in order to draw advantage from our intercourse with them.”¹³⁴ Du Pratz bought land from the Natchez Indians and lived alongside them for over

eight years, during which time he became an intimate friend with the sovereign chief and keepers of the temple.¹³⁵ His firsthand knowledge allowed him to expound on the Natchez culture, one of the only Indian groups du Pratz truly explored and acknowledged. Du Pratz learned the Natchez language and recorded some of the more common expressions like “are you there,” “sit you down”, and “Great Spirit.”¹³⁶ His special affection for the Natchez even lead du Pratz to side with them during the French war against that nation in 1729, unlike the vast majority of colonists. Still, du Pratz excluded scores of other tribes in the Lower Mississippi Valley, many of which lived alongside Europeans, making his work part of the European movement to write Indians off the land.

Almost thirty years separated du Pratz’ departure from Louisiana and the end of the French period. The prejudice toward the Indians remained, and Europeans writing about Louisiana increasingly left out their indigenous neighbors. Director-General Jean-Jacques-Blaise D’Abbadie, the colony’s civil and military director after the Seven Years’ War, clearly showed that Indians were no longer a matter of great importance to the colony in his journal.¹³⁷ His job was to prepare the colony for takeover by the Spanish and English. France lost the Seven Years’ War and consequently, her holdings in North America. The Peace of Paris granted all of Canada to England and split Spanish Florida into two colonies to be controlled by England. The Peace of Paris also gave Louisiana a new border at the Iberville River between Baton Rouge and New Orleans. After the secret Treaty of Fontainebleau in November 1762, Spain owned Louisiana.¹³⁸ In preparation for the new owners, King Louis XV ordered d’Abbadie to remove French troops, relocate settlers who wished to move, maintain good relations with the Indians, settle all royal accounts and give an account of all royal property to the new Spanish and English rulers.¹³⁹

D'Abbadie jumped right into colonial business, issuing ordinances looking into the colonies past financial practices, evacuating royal troops and approving the dissolution of the Jesuits among others.¹⁴⁰ D'Abbadie seemed eager to complete all of his charges from France, but one of the stated goals was to maintain good relations with the Indians. He did not prioritize the Indians, and the French Governor assumed relations were in good standing. All d'Abbadie said of the Indians in his first full month in Louisiana was,

During the course of this month, I saw the chiefs of various Indian tribes: The Biloxi, the Chitimacha, the Houma, the Choctaw, the Arkansas, and the Natchez. All of the tribes which are friendly and devoted to the French came to New Orleans to sound out rumors circulating among them concerning the cession of fragments of Louisiana to England and...to Spain.¹⁴¹

It was not until September 1763, that D'Abbadie mentioned Indians again. He was “informed” from a report from Pointe Coupée that a minor Arkansas chief was killed by the Choctaws. D'Abbadie said only, “It was an affair pitting redmen against redmen; nevertheless, we have lost in this chieftain a friend of the French who was esteemed in his village.”¹⁴² Notice that even when d'Abbadie mentioned the Indians, he dismissed them and their concerns. In the first case, the governor did not deem the Indians important enough to send word that the Spanish and English would takeover the colony. In the second case, d'Abbadie was unconcerned with the outcome of the Indian affair. Again, this attitude of indifference towards the Indians greatly differed from the inquisitiveness of early explorers. D'Abbadie did comment on the Indians in a few other instances, usually when the Indians caused problems for the English or disagreed with the land exchange.¹⁴³ D'Abbadie, however, rarely did more than acknowledge the Indians' position before turning to other colonial business.¹⁴⁴

In addition to ignoring or trivializing Indian issues when he did mention them, d'Abbadie's journal also reflected the Indians' diminished importance when he was not even

addressing Indians. Upon arrival in Louisiana, d'Abbadie carefully noted all of the ceremonies he held or attended. On June 21, 1763, d'Abbadie arrived at Balise at the mouth of the Mississippi, and the soldiers and officers welcomed him with a fifteen-gun salute.¹⁴⁵ Again, a few days later, upon arriving in New Orleans, soldiers gave the governor another salute. D'Abbadie recorded "receiv[ing] felicitations...from the entire officer corps as well as [from] different professionals in the colony."¹⁴⁶ D'Abbadie carefully recorded each ceremony, parade and celebration with soldiers, government officials and clergy. It seemed that he addressed everyone but the Indian population. No Indians came to welcome or confirm D'Abbadie's position, and the new governor did not extend any welcome towards them. The omission revealed the Indian's position in the governor's eyes.

During the French period, Europeans clearly excluded Indians in the Lower Mississippi Valley from their accounts and letters, paving the way for stronger European claims. In fact, by 1763, the close of the French period in Louisiana, European land claims were secure, and the French no longer sought Indian consent for land exchange. La Salle officially took possession of the Mississippi and its surrounding area in 1682, but he did not erect any settlements or lines of defense or establish major Indian alliances. Any nation could easily challenge France's claim until the French established a permanent presence. Iberville's 1698 voyage reinforced France's claim and continued to minimize any Indian claims.

Upon arrival, Iberville quickly began constructing a settlement, but more importantly, he promoted the French claim to Louisiana by showing that he had dominion over the Indians and the land. For instance, on March 26, 1699, Iberville had no guide but said, "I prefer to follow this stream [to] show the Indians that, without a guide, I go wherever I want to go."¹⁴⁷ In his statement, Iberville showed that he believed the French had ownership of Louisiana, and he tried

to convince the Indians of that fact. Another telling incident occurred at the Bayougoula village. Iberville said that he performed the calumet ceremony in the Bayougoula's manner. Then, he gave the Indians axes, knives, blankets, shirts and beads. Iberville said that he made the Indians understand that the gifts and calumet "unit[ed] them to the French and that [the Indians and French] were from now on one."¹⁴⁸ Iberville, at the very least, emphasized that the French and Indians both had claims to the land. The Bayougoula and other Indian tribes undoubtedly disagreed with Iberville's account of their interactions, but the account remained as a reflection of European perceptions.

By his second voyage in December 1699, Iberville began clearing, planting and building in earnest, affirming France's claims to Louisiana through settlements. Further, as in the latter part of his first journal, he tried to show the Indians that the French dominated the land. "I have thought it important at the beginning of a settlement, not to permit the Indians to kill any Frenchmen without making a show of preparation to avenge his death in order to avoid making ourselves contemptible to every nation in the area," he says.¹⁴⁹ Iberville successfully demanded satisfaction from the Natchez in February of 1700, boosting French confidence, and by the end of the month, Iberville meddled in intertribal relationships, all displaying Iberville's perceived position over the Indians.¹⁵⁰ Even with La Salle's claim and Iberville's affirmations though, the French continued to covet Indian support. Iberville continued sending Bienville to explore and "to see what is going on among [the Indians]," showing that the French still recognized Indians and needed their support."¹⁵¹

Iberville's third and final journey followed the pattern of asserting French claims through meddling in Indian relations and settlement issues, focusing primarily on everyday life at Fort Mobile and general upkeep in the colony. Iberville spoke of cutting masts, "laying out the

alignment of the streets,” and “assigning lots.”¹⁵² The explorer turned settler highlighted abandoned Indian land “where one ha[d] only to settle farmers, who [would] have no more to do than cut canes or reeds or bramble away before they sow[ed].”¹⁵³ There was little room for Indians in the new settlement plans, but even more telling were Iberville’s interactions with three Chickasaw chiefs de Tonty brought to New Orleans. Iberville heard reports that English from Carolina tried to incite the Louisiana Indians against the French. He gave the following speech to try to affirm the Chickasaw/French alliance:

[You] foolishly followed the advice of the English, who have no other objective than to work their destruction by inciting the [Chickasaw] and the [Choctaw] to make wars on each other so that the English can get slaves whom they send away to other countries to be sold. ...And the ultimate plan of the Englishmen, after weakening you by means of wars, is to come and seize you in your villages and then send you to be sold somewhere else, in faraway countries from which you can never return, as the English have treated others, as you know. To prevent all these calamities, you must no longer listen to the Englishmen... [you] cannot be friends with the French if you do not drive them from your village.¹⁵⁴

Iberville obviously felt that he was in a position to threaten loss of French friendship should the Chickasaw not comply with his wishes, and he even charged the Chickasaw with the task of expelling the English. These bold assertions proved that Iberville perceived that he presided over Louisiana, both the land and all of its inhabitants.

Other Europeans reiterated Iberville’s growing claims on the Indians’ land. Daniel Coxe, though he never visited Louisiana and rarely addressed Indians, pushed European claims, albeit English claims, even further. Repeatedly, Coxe skirted the issue of Indian land ownership by saying that Indians inhabit the land, much like settlers inhabited areas on the Mississippi. Statement such as, “the River of the Houmas so nam[ed] from a considerable Nation, who inhabit ... it,” “the south branch is inhabited by the Corroas, the North by the [Natchez],” “the nation of the [Osage]; their great body inhabiting a large river which bears their name,” peppered

his account.¹⁵⁵ Writing in 1722, Coxe only acknowledged that Indians inhabited the area, and he never found that the Indians owned the land.

Other accounts, like that of Le Page du Pratz, confused the issue of European land claims. Overall, however, du Pratz' account maintained that the Indians were in decline and the French now owned the land. The first place du Pratz decided to set up his plantation was on St. John's Creek, "preferable to any others, with a view to dispose more easily of [his] goods and provisions."¹⁵⁶ After selecting the site, du Pratz assumed that the land was France's and he made his request of M. Paillou, the commandant at St. John's Creek. "I told M. Paillou of my choice, who came and put it me in possession, in the name of the West-India Company," reported du Pratz.¹⁵⁷ A few years later when du Pratz moved to Natchez, near Fort Rosalie, he purchased the land from the Indians. Notice that the land here belonged to the Indians rather than the French. Perhaps his purchase was preferable since the French were not as well established further upriver. The implication remained that France did not own the land near the Natchez, meaning that, at least for du Pratz, European land claims were not as clear as others supposed.

Jean-Jacques-Blaise D'Abbadie did not share du Pratz' sentiments of accommodation concerning Indian land ownership. Remember that d'Abbadie failed to consult the Indians upon his arrival, and he did not send emissaries to consult with them. D'Abbadie simply assumed that the Indians would transfer land rights, if he recognized that Indians had any rights at all. The Indians did not welcome the new English administration, and officials in New Orleans, including d'Abbadie were well aware of the fact. More the twelve thousand men, including the Choctaw, Cherokee and Alabama, "say openly that they are not yet all dead; that the French have no right to give them away, and finally that they know what they have to do when the time comes," implying they would fight the English.¹⁵⁸ D'Abbadie and former Governor Kerlérec tried to

encourage the Indians to remain at peace, but they only coveted peace to the extent that it did not impinge on European ambitions. D'Abbadie clearly did not let the phrase, "the French have no right to give [us] away," bother him. D'Abbadie told the Arkansas, Choctaw and Tunica that the English were French friends and peace should reign, and he proclaimed that the English would "take possession of the lands which the great emperor had given them."¹⁵⁹ Without a doubt, the French perceived that they possessed Louisiana. The French king gave the land to another, and the Indians were no longer a party in the exchange. They were merely asked to be domicile as lands they once ruled are taken from them in just over half a century.

The final way that Europeans wrote Indians out of Louisiana was by using stereotypes. Though the French claimed that the Indian population was declining, there were still many interactions with Indians, and Europeans used stereotypes as a way of discrediting any remaining Indians. On his first voyage, Iberville called one Bayougoula clan "beggarly," saying that they "hav[e] no conveniences in their huts and engag[e] in no work."¹⁶⁰ By calling the Indians "beggarly" and painting them in a distasteful light, Iberville minimized their importance, lessening their claims to the land. To the same end on his third voyage, Iberville perpetuated the vanishing Indian myth by highlighting abandoned Indian land. The Biloxi village "is deserted," he said, "this nation having been destroyed two years ago by diseases."¹⁶¹ There were numerous instances where Iberville delighted in abandoned villages and deserted fields, both of which gave France a clear title to the land.

Le Page du Pratz and colonial officials during the 1730s continued stressing the vanishing Indian myth. Remember that du Pratz neglected to comment on any Indians in his survey of Louisiana, but rather relegated Indians to a separate section called "An Account of Several Nations of Indians in Louisiana." He said his findings support the fact that "this quarter

of the world, before it was discovered by Christopher Columbus, was very populous, not only on the continent but also in the islands.”¹⁶² Notice though, that du Pratz said before Columbus, already setting the precedent of the vanishing Indian. Further, du Pratz placed blame for Indian deaths on the Indians themselves. He said that the Spanish were responsible for numerous deaths in South America, and two or three warlike nations in North America produced the same effect.¹⁶³ Similarly, Governor Périer, in a letter to the Minister of Marine, Périer continued the vanishing Indian myth when he said, “I expect that in less than a year we shall no longer have any Indian nations on the river from the lower part of the river to the Natchez except the Tunica.... If they were not following this course we should be obliged to destroy them....”¹⁶⁴ If the Indians were in decline, according to these vanishing Indian myths, then Europeans, the French in this case, had every reason to believe the Indians would continue to decline and eventually vanish. Undoubtedly, Indian nations suffered from disease and other tragedies, but it seems that Europeans like Iberville and du Pratz particularly delighted in and perhaps overemphasized these occurrences.

European Goals Change to Exclude Indians

Besides excluding Indians from texts, Europeans changed their goals in order to write Indians out of Louisiana. The first change included removing evangelism from colonization. Remember that the first explorers were Jesuits and actively sought to Christianize the Indians. In the early French period, the pattern continued. On Iberville’s voyages, priests played a small role. We know a recollect father traveled with Iberville on his first voyage because he caused trouble between the French and Bayougoula over some food.¹⁶⁵ Later during the second voyage, Iberville said that a “Jesuit father is leaving a servant to build a church.”¹⁶⁶ More substantial though, Iberville recorded on March 21, 1700 that Father M. de Montigny planned to move to

the Natchez “without deserting the Taensas, among whom he is going to locate a missionary he has been expecting from Canada.”¹⁶⁷ Clearly, evangelization was still a factor in colonization since missionaries accompanied the explorers, made plans to build churches and took on new Indian towns. Notice though, that the missionary’s importance was diminished since references to them were tucked away in the journal, amongst the numerous settlement plans.

Just 20 years later, Daniel Coxe, the Englishman trying to reclaim land in Louisiana, did not even acknowledge the church or evangelization. He concerned himself only with declaring his claim over Louisiana and encouraging Englishmen to settle there. Le Page du Pratz failed to address religion in his narrative as well. Even when he had the opportunity to address converting the Indians, he neglected to make the connection. Remember that du Pratz held a special affection for the Natchez tribe. From the sovereign chief and keepers of the temple he learned to speak Natchez and constantly requested information about their culture and spiritual beliefs.¹⁶⁸ Du Pratz respected the Indian’s religion and never tried to take idols or parts of the temple for souvenirs. Being so close to the chief and temple guards, however, he would, in all probability, have at least mentioned Christianity if evangelization was still a goal of colonization. By the end of the French period, when Jean-Jacques-Blaise D’Abbadie took over the colony, his orders from the King did not even include religious matters. He was only to remove French troops, relocate settlers who wished to move, maintain good relations with the Indians, settle all royal accounts and give an account to the new Spanish and English rulers of all royal property in the colony.¹⁶⁹ When d’Abbadie did mention the Jesuits, he removed them from Louisiana, burying the order for their dissolution in other colonial business.¹⁷⁰

Taking evangelism out of colonization removed some possible Indian interactions. For instance, missionaries decreased their trips to Indian villages, thereby decreasing colonial

interaction. Instead of evangelism, Europeans focused on settlement and building plans, a focus that also downplayed the Indian's presence. Initially, Iberville and Bienville explored Louisiana, made peace with Indians and noted Indians frequently in their journals. As time progressed, however, their focus increasingly shifted to settlement issues. During his first voyages, Iberville mainly concerned himself with exploring the area and setting up his base at Fort Maurepas and later on Massacre Island (modern Dauphin Island). On the second voyage, however, Iberville's attention turned almost solely to settlement, and he immediately began planting, clearing and building. The Frenchmen still felt the need to explore and talk with Indians on the second voyage, and Iberville did make a few trips to Indian villages, like his trips to the Ouma and Bayougoula. By the third voyage, the majority of what Iberville recorded dealt with the everyday life of Fort Mobile and the general upkeep of the colony. Iberville spoke of distributing provisions, communication between posts and the population at various garrisons.¹⁷¹ Iberville's main focus on settlement excluded the Indians, in essence, writing them off of the land.

Jean-Jacques-Blaise D'Abbadie, writing at the end of the French period, undeniably turned his attention toward the colony's issues at the Indians' expense. Remember that d'Abbadie's goals centered on preparing the colony for new owners, and he eagerly completed his orders. He ordered the evacuation of outposts on August 8, 1763, kept up with the transfer of goods in the colony, established a post office, moved settlers and recorded the prices of goods in the colony.¹⁷² Of course d'Abbadie feigned interest in the English and their problems. He said, "I did not want to seem uncooperative..." but by in large his only concerns remained with the French, all at the expense of the Indians.¹⁷³ The scattered notations of Indians primarily occurred when Indians traveled to New Orleans, and in those cases, d'Abbadie usually only mentioned that Indians came before moving on to other business. This attitude of slight indifference to

Indian relations differed greatly from La Salle's inquisitiveness and even Iberville's early travels where he made it a point to keep abreast of all changes in the Indian villages.

In conjunction with putting settlement issues first, Europeans actively placed Indian issues last in the French Period. During Iberville's third trip to Louisiana, his interaction with the Chickasaw chiefs de Tonty brought to New Orleans showed that, though Indians were still an important consideration, their status clearly dropped. The first thing to notice about this interaction was that Iberville has the Chickasaw come to him. Trips to Indian villages from the first journal had almost disappeared. Second, when the Indians arrived, Iberville "gave them the best welcome [he] could but postponed conversation with them till tomorrow."¹⁷⁴ Iberville failed to mention what the "best welcome" included or why he decided to postpone talks. His actions, however, signaled to the Chickasaw representatives that they were not immediately worth Iberville's time. If the Indians remained a top priority, Iberville would have seen them immediately, if not traveled to their village.

At the end of the French period, Indians remained in last place. D'Abbadie and other colonial officials, as previously seen, focused on all colonial matters except Indian issues. Few colonial officials visited Indians tribes, but rather they requested that tribes come to colonial centers.¹⁷⁵ When tribes did come, Indian issues were overlooked and the Indians were asked to remain peaceful and allow Europeans to rule as they pleased. For instance, the Apalaches, having stirred their enemies, begged the French to allow them to relocate in 1763. D'Abbadie and former governor Kerlérec believed the Indians could be useful in aiding vessels going to Natchitoches, so they, among others, were allowed to relocate.¹⁷⁶ A few other tribes that came to d'Abbadie to express reservations were simply asked to live in peace with the English. D'Abbadie did not relocate them since he found no immediate use for the Indians.¹⁷⁷ Similarly,

when the Arkansas, Choctaw and Tunica came to New Orleans to express concerns over their new English rulers, d'Abbadie told them that the English were French friends and peace should reign.¹⁷⁸ Indian concerns dropped to last place, and d'Abbadie even placed the English before them. It is surprising that the governor placed the Indians behind the English who were a recent French enemy and who d'Abbadie made derogatory remarks about. "What a commission to have to deal with people intoxicated with their success who regard themselves masters of the world!" said d'Abbadie, speaking of the English.¹⁷⁹ Yet, the Indians were prioritized behind these "masters of the world."

Another indication that the Indians dropped to last priority is the fact that Indians were no longer sought out for peaceful relations. In fact, many Europeans, beginning with Iberville, deliberately antagonized the Indians. On his first voyage to Louisiana, Iberville frequently pursued Indians, provoking tribes who showed no sign of the calumet. Not long after arriving in Louisiana, on March 12, Iberville spotted a column of smoke about five and a half leagues away. The next day he crossed to the place with only fourteen men. After finding two fresh trails, Iberville pursued the Indians with only one man. A day later, Iberville said that "I got into my canoe and pursued the [Indian's] canoes and overtook them as they were landing on the shore."¹⁸⁰ This encounter fortunately turned out for the best, with the Indians performing the calumet ceremony, but at the time of the incident, Iberville could not have been assured of peace. Later on the third voyage, Iberville had Indians gods removed and sent to Europe.¹⁸¹ Surely Iberville knew that such a bold act could stir resentment from the Indians. Fortunately, no skirmish occurred, according to Iberville, and all the neighboring tribes were "amazed at the [French] boldness."¹⁸²

As the French period progressed, colonial officials increasingly threw off their peaceful intentions towards the Indians. Governor Périer, writing to the Minister of Marine in 1730 said, “The Choctaws have persuaded the small nations to retire toward them. If they were not following this course we should be obliged to destroy them....”¹⁸³ Destroy is a strong word with no hint of peaceful cohabitation. For the Indians that remained in Louisiana, Louis Billouart de Kerlérec, Governor in 1758, admitted that “the true means...to preserve this colony...is to have warehouses always abundantly supplied with trade goods, in order to attach the Indian nations to us by the care that they see is being taken to provide the things they need.”¹⁸⁴ Kerlérec cultivated peace through goods. Again, the French coveted peace, but they hoped to appease the Indians with as few goods or as little effort as possible. Government officials continually sought ways to decrease the cost and frequency of presents to the Indians. Not only did the presents cost money, but the act of giving presents still emphasized the control Louisiana Indians had. Périer even proposed that the French “would ...be in a position to diminish the number of these presents in proportion as the number of troops increased.”¹⁸⁵ Again, he showed that the French coveted peace, but that peace rarely included the best interest of the Louisiana Indians.

Louisiana Indians as Resources

The final way Europeans wrote Indians out of their land was by transforming the Indians into something less than human. Already, we saw some of the stereotypes Europeans used to lessen the Indians’ claims to their land, but Europeans went one step further than simply using stereotypes to justify taking land. Europeans turned Indians into resources. In other words, in order to dispossess the Indians of their land completely, the French had to possess the Indians themselves. Not only did this last tactic take away the Indians rights to land, but it also helped Europeans to cope in their new environment where they were frequently outnumbered.

After proclaiming that the Indians were savage, the next step in changing them into resources was moving tribes, just as one might move assets. In order to move tribes, Europeans had to map out the land, point out abandoned Indian land and control that land. Early explorers and settlers completed most of these steps in the early period of colonization. Marquette, La Salle and even Iberville mapped out the land. La Salle took care of claiming the land for France, and Louis XIV began the process of ruling the land when he named Iberville as Louisiana's first governor. Still, vestiges of mapping and claiming remained as the French began to reorganize and move tribes.

Iberville methodically recorded details such as dates, latitude, longitude, leagues traveled, flora and fauna in his journal. His description when entering the Mississippi was characteristic of many entries. Iberville said that he ascended the river exactly "1½ leagues and there made camp among the reeds, the river being 350 fathoms wide, the current strong enough to take one 1⅓ leagues per hour, the water quite muddy and white."¹⁸⁶ Iberville frequently made charts to guide himself and future Europeans. Charts such as this one,

From the Acansa to Coroa	73 ½ Leagues
From the Coroa to the Taensa	21
From the Taensa to the Naché	17 ½
From the Naché or Théloël to	53 ½
The Ouma	
	<hr/> 164 ½ leagues ¹⁸⁷

showing the distance between Indian villages was also a common occurrence in the journal.

Mapping an area not only allowed France a more secure claim, but it also facilitated future settlement. Similarly, during the second voyage, Bienville continued exploring and mapping.

Immediately after leaving the Taensa village, Bienville said, "I came to the bank of a small river 70 yards wide and very deep, 4 ½ leagues west of the Taensas."¹⁸⁸

After the French firmly claimed and mapped the land, they moved the Indians around as they saw fit. Physically moving the Indians reduced them to resources or assets, and during the transition from French to Spanish and English rule, Europeans began the process in earnest. Jean-Jacques-Blaise D'Abbadie spoke at length about the relocation of the Apalaches in his 1763 account. Having stirred their enemies, the Apalaches begged the French to allow them to relocate. Governors D'Abbadie and Kerlérec believed the Indians could be useful in aiding vessels going to Natchitoches, so they, among others, were allowed to relocate.¹⁸⁹ A few other tribes came to d'Abbadie expressing reservations, but the governor simply asked them to live in peace with the English. They were not relocated since the French found no use for them.¹⁹⁰ Ironically, Indians like the Tunica and Pacana who asked to relocate came to come to New Orleans and begged for land that was once their own. At the end of the period, the picture of d'Abbadie was that of a king who had ultimate possession and domination over the Indians and the land. He said, "I have not yet decided where I will establish [the Tunica and Pacana]. In the meantime, I shall settle them among the Colapissa..."¹⁹¹

The next leap the French took, completing the process of writing the Indians out of Louisiana, was using the Indians. Sometimes European requests only included provisions, but the demands continually increased until, by the end of the French period, Europeans went as far as claiming the Indians themselves. Recall Iberville's speech to the Chickasaw where he commanded them to "no longer listen to the Englishmen..." and "drive them from your village."¹⁹² Iberville put the responsibility of removing the English from Louisiana on the Chickasaw. The English traders were a French problem and Iberville set a precedent of using the Indians as a war-time resource.

After the Chickasaw left, Iberville felt assured that the chiefs would carry out his wishes. Judging from later documents, perhaps the perceived French dominion was not so secure. In 1709, Bienville reported that “the English of Carolina” were still inciting “*their*” Indians to destroy French allies.¹⁹³ Further, Bienville said that he had reports from both Indians and an Irishman that the English were preparing “to come this autumn to the number of forty and with twenty-five hundred Indians to attack this colony.”¹⁹⁴ A few days later on August 20, Bienville reported that the English have sent “*their*” Indians to destroy the Mobile and Tohomés. In retaliation, he said, “I had them pursued by *our* Indians (emphasis mine).”¹⁹⁵ In just a few years, the French felt that they not only owned the land, but the Indians as well.¹⁹⁶

After just over a half century of French rule, the Indians were almost gone from Louisiana, according to travel accounts. Europeans mentioned them infrequently and changed the goals of colonization to exclude the Indians. What is more, when the Indians did appear in texts, they were pictured as savages with no rights. Colonists and officials in the colony cared very little for the welfare or status of the Indians as long as a peace remained. Finally, the French began the terrible process of turning the Indians into assets, a type of voluntary servitude that lead the Indians into the Spanish and English periods with little hope of regaining title to their land or a prominent place in the history of Louisiana.

Chapter 4

The Spanish and English in Louisiana

The Spanish acquired Louisiana in 1762 but did not attempt to take possession until 1765. The King appointed Don Antonio de Ulloa as the first governor in May 1765, and he gave Ulloa orders to keep the current French system of government in place.¹⁹⁷ Ulloa arrived in the colony in March 1766 and quickly found problems. Not only did the colony need several repairs, but French soldiers and residents protested the Spanish takeover, causing trouble for Ulloa.¹⁹⁸ Merchants in the colony were especially distressed by the new commercial regulations of 1768. The new regulations allowed Louisiana to trade only with Spain and merchants could only use Spanish vessels, among other stipulations.¹⁹⁹ A general revolt occurred and governor Ulloa withdrew to Havana in December 1768. The King sent military commander Alejandro O'Reilly in July 1769, and he suppressed the rebellion, granting clemency to scores, sentencing five men to death and imprisoning others for life.²⁰⁰ The English in Florida also experienced hardship while taking possession of their new holdings, seen through the abandonment of a number of posts near Spanish Louisiana in 1768.²⁰¹ The English problems, however, were not nearly as severe as the money shortage in Louisiana. Despite adversity, the new Spanish and English rulers had both secured their claims by 1769.

During the last quarter of the eighteenth century, Indians continued to inhabit the Spanish and English sectors of Louisiana and Florida according to colonial letters and the papers of the Pantón, Leslie and Co. trading house. Nevertheless, the Indians remained absent in travel accounts. After the Peace of Paris, new people flocked to Louisiana while others evacuated.

Among those who came were soldiers such as Philip Pittman and Francisco Bouligny, merchants like James Pitot and travelers like Jean-Bernard Bossu. Accounts from these men continued the process of writing the Indians out and showed the result of Europeans overlooking the Indian population for over a century. By the end of the Spanish and English periods, journalists James Pitot claimed that the Indians either no longer existed or were no longer important, painting a sort of 'after' picture for audiences of Louisiana travel accounts.

Europeans Abound

For travelers in the Lower Mississippi Valley after the Peace of Paris, excluding the Indians was not a hard task. Frenchmen and early visitors to the colony set a precedent for ignoring Louisiana Indians. Most journalists after 1763 simply perpetuated the myth of the vanishing Indian, leaving the Indians out of narratives, allowing only for European land claims and showing a definite attitude of superiority. Philip Pittman, Francisco Bouligny and James Pitot all followed the pattern of perpetuating the vanishing Indian. Only one traveler, Jean-Bernard Bossu, sympathized with the Indians, traveling specifically to visit Indian nations. He found that his favorite tribes, the Arkansas and Alabama, still existed and perhaps had some loose claims to their land. Bossu, however, did not question any European actions and showed the Indians in a definite inferior position. Despite his concessions, Bossu's account still exhibited many of the tactics for writing Indians out of their land. Together, these four journals completed the task of writing the Indians out of Louisiana, both the land and its history.

Philip Pittman's work, *The Present State of the European Settlements on the Mississippi*, is that of a surveyor, and the account was very professionally written.²⁰² Pittman, writing in 1770, concerned himself with giving a correct account of all the settlements along the Mississippi, from the Gulf to the English holdings in Illinois.²⁰³ From the outset, it was clear that

the settlements he intended to record were European settlements, not Indian settlements, due to the oversight of large tribes like the Choctaw and Chickasaw. Pittman started in Illinois and proceeded down the Mississippi to New Orleans, mentioning every European settlement and even some that no longer existed. He generally named the settlement and then calculated the number of leagues to the nearest river or next closest settlement. Then, Pittman recorded the approximate size of the population, any of its major buildings and the products the settlement contributed to the economy. He was always careful to mention any churches in the area and which missionaries ministered to the population. Indians usually only appeared in Pittman's survey when their name corresponded to the town he discussed. Pittman said that Yazoo was formerly a French post and name of the Indians who resided in the country, though both were now extinct.²⁰⁴ Some of the posts Pittman mentioned were named for somewhat prominent Indian tribes but he failed to mention these. "The inhabitants and traders who reside at Point Coupee, at Natchitoches, Atakapa, Arkansas, [and] the Illinois... would rather trade at the [Iberville river] than at New Orleans," said Pittman.²⁰⁵ Though all of these towns, save Point Coupee, were named for Indian tribes, Pittman failed to make the connection. When Indian tribes did exist, Pittman usually minimized them. Ten leagues from the German settlement lay the villages of the Houma and Alabama, said Pittman. Though they were once very "considerable," the Houma now have only about 40 warriors and the Alabama only 20 families.²⁰⁶ The Tunica were also a formerly large group, but Pittman carefully noted that "their constant intercourse with the French, and immoderate use of spirituous liquors, has reduced them to about thirty warriors."²⁰⁷ Pittman showed no remorse that the Yazoo were gone or that other tribes were quickly following.

Downplaying the Indians he found near settlements was by no means Pittman's most egregious error. The Yazoo, Chickasaw, Houma, Alabama, Chitimacha, Tunica, Natchez, Arkansas, Caddo and Illinois were the only tribes Pittman mentioned throughout his account. Obviously, he failed to mention numerous nations, and for the nations he mentioned, the references did not begin to describe the magnitude of their presence. For example, all Pittman said of the Chickasaw was, "The [Chickasaws] formerly were very troublesome to [the English]." ²⁰⁸ Pittman's omission was even more surprising after consulting Frederick Haldimand's papers. Haldimand commanded the Southern District of North America, meaning West Florida, for the English Government, and he frequently called Pittman to complete surveys and serve as the engineer on expeditions. ²⁰⁹ Sometime between 1763 and 1765, Haldimand recorded a survey of the number of "men able to bear arms in the different Indian nations," and many tribes Pittman failed to mention appear on the list. In the Lower Mississippi Valley and West Florida, there were 2500 Cherokee, 3500 Creek, 2800 Choctaw, 150 Natchez and a host of other (sometimes illegibly recorded) tribes according to the list. ²¹⁰ Pittman's record certainly did not do justice to Louisiana Indians, even in comparison with European government documents.

The Arkansas and Illinois Indians were the two exceptions to Pittman's pattern of recording tribes in decline. Of the Arkansas, Pittman said, "they amount in all to about six hundred warriors; they are recorded amongst the bravest of the southern Indians; they hunt little more than for their common subsistence, and are generally at war with the natives to the westward of them." ²¹¹ Likewise, his account of the Illinois Indians was similar though his esteem for them was low. Pittman said, "Except in the hunting seasons, they reside near the English settlement in the country, where they have built their huts. They are poor, debauched and dastardly people. They count about three hundred and fifty warriors." ²¹² It is interesting to

note that Pittman did not find the Arkansas Indians as “poor, debauched and dastardly” as the Illinois. Perhaps Pittman found the Arkansas Indians more tolerable than the Illinois because they resided nearer to the Spanish. Whatever his reasons, neglecting to mention numerous tribes and deemphasizing others made his account part of the European tradition of writing the Indians out of the Lower Mississippi Valley.

If diminishing the Indian presence was not enough, Pittman portrayed the land as completely under European control. He did not allow for any Indian claims to the land. While protesting against Spanish incursions against the English, Pittman even declared that the Spanish provoked Indians “settled on *our* territor[y]” (emphasis mine).²¹³ Pittman considered the land to be solely European, making the declining Indian population guests, if not intruders, on English and Spanish land. Likewise, notice that when speaking of the Illinois Pittman said that the Indians “built their huts” “near the English settlement,” not that the English built their fort near or on the Indians’ land. There is no question that the Illinois Indians inhabited the land near that post long before European arrival. While our first explorer, Marquette, found the Illinois inhabiting a country bearing their name, Pittman denied that the Illinois or any other tribes had claims to the land.²¹⁴

Jean-Bernard Bossu, a former French soldier turned traveler, was perhaps the only journalist who allowed for an Indian population in Louisiana. Bossu frequently wrote to his friend, M. Douin Chevalier, while traveling to the Arkansas and Alabama villages from 1770 to 1771.²¹⁵ He filled his account with Indian interactions, and on almost every page, he discussed the traditions and current issues within tribes. While not in Indian villages, Bossu looked forward to seeing his Indian friends or lamented leaving them. Despite his affection for the

Arkansas and Alabama, however, Bossu almost completely overlooked other tribes, participating in writing out the Louisiana Indians.

First, notice how Bossu spoke of the Arkansas and Alabama. He frequently called them his children and said that he “valued the blood of red men...especially that of [his] friends, the [Arkansas].”²¹⁶ Even here, with his beloved ‘children,’ Bossu found that their numbers were declining. In speaking of how the Arkansas society functioned, Bossu said, “their villages [are] few in number.”²¹⁷ What is more, Bossu only mentioned five tribes throughout the letters: the Arkansas, Alabama, Chickasaw Natchez and Tunica. In regards to the Chickasaw and Natchez, Bossu said only that the Arkansas helped fight against those two nations during the Natchez war in 1729.²¹⁸ Of the Tunica, Bossu only recorded his interactions with two Indians who accompanied him on his way to the Arkansas River. The Indians proved very useful to Bossu, hunting for meat, killing a large rattlesnake and spotting a trap the Chickasaw laid.²¹⁹ That is all Bossu recorded in regards to these three tribes. After the Chickasaw threat was gone and the Tunica no longer provided a service to Bossu, they were not mentioned again. Obviously, more than four tribes inhabited Louisiana, but Bossu neglected to acknowledge them.

In conjunction with overlooking many Indian tribes, Bossu, like Pittman, left little room for Indian claims to the land. Bossu sided with the French rebels against the Spanish saying that the Spanish delay and disregard for the information given to them on cession of the colony were the sole cause of the rebellion. Had the Spanish “followed the treaty agreement to the letter,” “there is no doubt that ...the French would have been as faithfully attached to the King of Spain as they heretofore had been to their first and legitimate sovereign.”²²⁰ Notice that Bossu called the French King the legitimate sovereign. Bossu took European claims to the land for granted,

even claims to the land of his Arkansas and Alabama Indians. In his defense, Bossu said that the Arkansas wee,

appalled by this cession. Having no acquaintance with the political system of European courts, [the Indians] repeated to me what they had said on my first trip: that the first white men they saw were the French whom they welcomed to the exclusion of all other people, but now they were astonished to see that we had deserted them without even giving any reason for it.²²¹

Bossu stated that the Indians questioned the new Spanish rulers but “welcomed” the French.

Bossu never mentioned the fact that the Indians probably did not understand French intentions for their land.

As the Spanish and English period progressed, Europeans increasingly left the Indians out of their journals and failed to acknowledge any Indian claims to the land. Francisco Boulogny, an officer in Louisiana, arrived with O'Reilly and lived in Louisiana until his death in 1800.²²² Boulogny's work, entitled *Notice of the Actual State of Commerce and Population of New Orleans and Spanish Louisiana*, began, like others before him, with a brief description of the land. He commented on the many advantages of the Lower Mississippi Valley, like the prospect of mills on both banks and the easy irrigation of fields.²²³ He then encouraged possible colonists claiming that the land was plentiful and available. Already Boulogny neglected to remember that Indian tribes inhabited the land surrounding the somewhat scattered European settlements. Boulogny only recalled that the land was sparsely settled by Europeans. After covering all the other important aspects of colonial administration, Boulogny finally turned to the Indians.

Though he placed the Indians toward the end of his relation, Boulogny claimed that Indian relations “[were] one of the principle [topics]” for the preservation of Louisiana.²²⁴ The Indians in Louisiana were “innumerable” according to Boulogny, contrary to his previous

assertion that Louisiana was sparsely settled.²²⁵ Bouligny's account of the Louisiana natives is also unique in the fact that he only mentioned the Choctaw and Illinois by name, and then only to say that they were numerous. Like Bossu, Bouligny deemphasized the Indian presence by completely ignoring many tribes. Rather than giving details and listing each tribe, he said only that the Indians had so far been of little concern because the colony had been at peace, but he warned that they could become trouble in the event of war since the English had secured their loyalty. In saying that the Indians have been of "little concern" was an understatement.

In 1776, the war for American Independence erupted. All Spanish officials carefully noted the buildup of English forces as the war drew near, and Louisiana officials were no exception.²²⁶ Louisiana gave some supplies to the Americans but tried to steer clear of the conflict. Soon though, Spain began to look toward Florida, its former colony. With England's attention on the rebelling colonies, Americans like Patrick Henry gently urged Spain to consider retaking Florida, which she did, beginning with the East Bank of the Mississippi in Natchez.²²⁷ The Spanish continued taking land, forging all the way to Pensacola. The second Peace of Paris, in 1783, ended the Revolutionary War and restored both East and West Florida to Spain, although boundaries between Spain and America were left unclear. Finally, in 1795, the Treaty of San Lorenzo, or Pinckney's Treaty, settled the dispute at the thirty-first parallel, giving Americans full navigation rights on the Mississippi River.

Spain continued to rule Louisiana and Florida, carefully traversing through Indian relations, especially with the Creek, and trying to keep American settlers at bay. France, ever sensitive to its lost Louisiana colony finally, in 1800, was in a position to retake control of the colony, and Spain ceded control, though secretly, back to France in the Treaty of Ildefonso. Napoleon Bonaparte kept the Spanish government in place until such time as he could assemble

a force to keep both the Americans and British from challenging his Mississippi possessions. The Americans though, coveted the port city of New Orleans, and Thomas Jefferson sent ambassadors to France, requesting to purchase the city. In a surprising twist, Bonaparte offered to sell the Americans Louisiana in 1803.

During the final days of the accepted colonial period, merchant James Pitot wrote *Observations on the colony of Louisiana*, in order to increase his business opportunities.²²⁸ Because Pitot's main interests in the colony were commercial, it was not surprising that his comments toward both Europeans and Indians centered on, much like Bouligny, Louisiana's prosperity. He even said that he would not speak about the past. Pitot believed that only events which "thr[e]w some light on the present condition" were worthy of his time.²²⁹ Nevertheless, Pitot's focus on trade should have led him to at least mention the Indians, but he only devoted seven of the 180 pages to Indian trade. In most cases Pitot only faulted Spain for isolating the Indian trade in the "hands of foreigners" by restricting trade to a few trading companies, especially, Pantón, Leslie, and Co. from Pensacola.²³⁰ His short comments included, "trade with the Indians...established several businessmen and made their fortune," "peltry... is the only trade that combines the needs of the Indian and the habits of the old colonists..." and "[Spain] did not concern herself with the progress of the Indian trade."²³¹ One of the few comments Pitot made that directly concerned the Indians did nothing to rectify their absence in the rest of his account. "Trade [has] diminished because of the distance to the locality where the Indians have withdrawn," he said. According to Pitot then, not only were the Indians irrelevant, but they no longer existed in close proximity to the colonists. On the rare occasion that Pitot mentioned a tribe by name, he was careful to note their sparseness and civility. Of the Atakapa and Opelousa, Pitot said "one still sees some survivors who, peaceful and somewhat civilized, keep themselves

busy either by farming or navigation of waterways.”²³² Indians that remained in the area, then, were civilized and working toward the larger goals of the Louisiana colonists according to the journal. Pittman said nothing of the turmoil with the Creek and Osage nation, among others, that occupied much of the government’s time.²³³

After a century of writing the Indians out, only a few scattered notations existed in the travel accounts, and the Europeans completely dismissed Indians with the continued use of stereotypes when they did merit acknowledgement. James Pitot began his work by saying that he would

not further distract the reader’s attention by long recitations, or new stories, about the Indians who still occupy a part of these lands. In general ignorant and barbaric throughout America, they nearly all resemble one another in their morals and habits; and to arouse curiosity regarding them it would be necessary, like so many others have done at the expense of truth, to embellish some events about which even tradition gives no indication. A little more rational and more provident than the animals of the forests, less modest, and generally filthier than they are, they had, and often still have, all of their ferocity. If among the viciousness of their customs, some fine examples of sensibility and courage are often observed, it is nevertheless, true that someone like myself, who has visited several Indian tribes, or who has been able to talk with reliable travelers about those things of which he has no knowledge, finds everywhere the repulsive ridiculousness of their morals, the horror or futility of their religious ceremonies, the barbarism of their politics, and finally that veneer of bestiality which often makes an Indian seem hardly better than part civilized and part tiger.²³⁴

In this paragraph, Pitot summarized the feelings of many journalists. He called the Indians ignorant and barbaric and asserted that there was no knowledge of “fine examples of sensibility and courage,” reinforcing that the Indians were unimportant and had no claims to the land. After all, how could a few Indians who were little better than “part tiger” have claims to Louisiana?

Goals of the Late Colonial Period

By 1763, Indians had all but vanished in the travel accounts, and the goals of many people in Louisiana placed Indians outside the realm of importance as well. Most soldiers and businessmen seemed to desire only profit and higher offices. The idea of colonization as a

Christianizing force had disappeared, but of course settlers could not Christianize Indians whom they had already written out of the land. Philip Pittman was the only journalist in the late eighteenth century who mentioned churches. Remember that his survey of Louisiana included any church buildings that existed near settlements. Never did Pittman specify if the missionaries were for Indians or settlers. In all probability, however, Pittman meant that European settlers had erected a church since he usually neglected to mention Indian nations. Bossu, Bouligny and Pitot all failed to mention Christianization, and again, even if they had focused on religion, their exclusion of Indians would probably place their focus on Christian settlers.

By 1763, most of the journalists had goals of commerce and higher offices, neither of which included Indians. Francisco Bouligny, writing in 1776, wanted higher military offices and even coveted the governor's office before his death. He wrote to suggest ways that Louisiana could prosper, hoping that his suggestions would also lead him to prosperity in the colony. Bouligny commented on the plentiful land, and in order to encourage colonists, Bouligny listed the many products of the country like wood, indigo, cotton, rice, sugar, skins and mines, among others.²³⁵ Exaggerating profusely, he said, "wealth is certain and the mines of gold, silver, lead, salt and nitrate abound in every part of the country." Bouligny even asserted that more mines were in Louisiana than in Mexico.²³⁶ In his comments on the population, Bouligny continued to paint the colony as flatteringly as possible. He praised the people of Louisiana by claiming that no one was lazy and everyone worked hard with the exception of some day laborers. The industrious slaves, according to Bouligny, were so well fed and dressed that people frequently mistook them for freedmen.²³⁷ Notice that though Bouligny proclaimed to praise the "people" of Louisiana, he only mentioned the settlers and slaves. Bouligny did not mention the Indians in his survey of the people of Louisiana.

Bouligny's other major concerns were the English and the future of commerce in the colony. The threat of war seemed to loom around every corner in the eighteenth century, and Spain almost always opposed England. Everyone in Louisiana knew that the English in Florida were better supplied and garrisoned. They could easily overtake Louisiana should an opportunity arise.²³⁸ Further, by 1776, the English had an established, albeit illegal, trade with many Spanish citizens. Bouligny correctly believed that English commerce harmed Louisianans and deserved attention. The English threat seemed even more detrimental when Bouligny looked at the Indians' allegiance. Many of the larger tribes like the Chickasaw and even the Choctaw that had long been French allies were turning toward the English for trade goods and alliances. Bouligny outlined the current English practices including employing two superintendents and holding Indian congresses.²³⁹ He realized that Spanish neglect had encouraged these tribes who had once been hostile towards the English to embrace them due to their steady supply of presents. Had England and Spain been long-time allies, Bouligny would probably not have concerned himself with Indian matters, but the current tedious relations made Indian alliances important. Even here, Bouligny did not mention specific tribes, nor did he make any notation that Indian presents would still be important if the English were not a current threat. "Until now," says Bouligny, the Indians "have not worried us because of peace but, in the event of war, New Orleans is not safe if we do not take the most prudent measures to win over these nations."²⁴⁰

Documents from the Spanish colonial government and the papers from the Panton and Leslie trading company betrayed assertions that the Indians no longer mattered to the colony or to traders. The Indians, like the Osage, continued to plague Louisiana and its settlers by skirmishing throughout the land. Louisiana governors even supplied other tribes to fight the

Osage.²⁴¹ The Spanish government also frequently supplied the Creeks with goods and ammunition to use against the Americans who were a common enemy.²⁴² Both of these situations required traders and mattered to officials in Louisiana, especially in the case of the Creek Indians and encroaching Americans, defying Pitot and Bouligny's assertion that the Indians no longer mattered

Jean-Bernard Bossu was the only journalist in the late eighteenth century whose goals included defending the Indians. His stated goal was to "imbibe from Nature knowledge that can contribute to the preservation of his fellow men."²⁴³ However noble his goals were, remember that Bossu continued the pattern of writing Indians out of Louisiana by recording interactions with only two primary tribes. Bossu only saw the Arkansas and Alabama Indians as his fellow men. A few examples from his time in the Arkansas village prove that Bossu was not the humanitarian he claimed to be. Rather, Bossu seemed to enjoy the simple qualities of the Indians and their way of life, both traits that left him in an elevated position in the tribe. The following examples illustrate Bossu's pride and arrogance.

Upon reaching the Arkansas, Bossu recorded a king's welcome as the Indians rejoiced that their "father" had returned.²⁴⁴ He relished his title and continually worked to make the Indians feel that he was powerful and above them. When an Indian arrived in the Arkansas village to inoculate the Indians against smallpox, one Arkansas died and another lost an eye. The Arkansas Indians proceeded to have the Indian doctor put to death until Bossu stepped in. He told the Arkansas that he knew the doctor's medicine was good, and that "they should imitate white men who were more learned than the red who do not have the speaking bark [books] to instruct them in the art of medicine."²⁴⁵ Bossu might have proclaimed to hope for the

preservation of his fellow man, but his fellowman was a simpleton in need of European guidance according to this interaction.

At other times, Bossu practiced his own brand of medicine to keep the Indians believing that he had great power. When an Arkansas became so drunk that he slipped into unconsciousness, Bossu recorded that the Indians came weeping to him. After examining the body, Bossu realized that the Indian was not dead and “felt assured” that he could revive him. Bossu told his friend, “I confess...that I was pleased with this occurrence, the outcome of which was going to give me additional prestige among these Americans.”²⁴⁶ Bossu made preparations to “practice medicine in grand style,” and “adorn[ed]” himself with “all the glorious distinctions of the Doctorate,” including a long robe, tall hat, beard, glasses and books. His cure included running like a madman, calling down spirits, convulsing, flying through the pages of his book and tossing water on the Indian.²⁴⁷ He was happy to report that his cure aroused the Indian and his position over the tribe was raised as a result of his trickery.

These two incidents, along with others interspersed throughout the complements Bossu showered on the Arkansas and Alabama Indians, showed that he felt that the Indians were below him and other Europeans. For most tribes then, Bossu completely ignored their existence and for his favorite tribes, he noted that “these people must be kept thinking that white men know everything that happens in the two worlds and that they can hardly be fooled. It is ...this wrong opinion which makes the Americans respect Europeans scattered in such small numbers throughout this vast country.”²⁴⁸ The small number of Indians that Bossu recognized are seen as beneath him, and they had to remain in this state for the continued success of Europeans.

Fighting for the Enemy

During the early exploration period, explorers and travelers mapped the area which future colonists and officials used to usurp Indian land. As the French period arrived, Indians were frequently employed as guides and Frenchmen started the process of claiming tribes as their own. By 1763, the transition of Indians from humans to resources was complete. Hardly any of the journalists would argue against the position that the Indians' primary purpose for existence was to assist the colonists, usually by fighting battles for them. Bossu was perhaps the only person who would disagree with this position, but even he would most likely only protect his beloved Arkansas or Alabama Indians.

Philip Pittman rarely spoke about the Indians in any large contexts, but one of the times he did, it seems that he only lavished praises on the Natchez for their usefulness. Pittman obviously read Le Page du Pratz' account of the Natchez War from his high opinion of the Natchez tribe. Remember that du Pratz sided with the Natchez. The Natchez, Pittman said, were the "most civilized Indians on the continent of America."²⁴⁹ "They lived some years in great friendship with the French whom they permitted to settle on their lands, and to whom they rendered every service in their power. Their hospitality was repaid with ingratitude...."²⁵⁰ In a way, it seemed that one of the only reasons Pittman praised the Natchez was because they were hospitable and "rendered every service" possible to Europeans. Pittman only esteemed Indians who aided Europeans in their desire to settle Indian land.

Jean-Bernard Bossu, though he sometimes seemed to be the humanitarian of all the journalists, exhibited signs of using the Indians as resources as well. Recall that Bossu only mentioned the Tunica Indians when they were useful to him. He said that he was "obliged to hire two savages of the [Tunica] nation to hunt during the course of our trip" to the Arkansas

River.²⁵¹ Similarly, the Alabama, who “esteem only nobility of soul,” were close to Bossu’s heart because of their great loyalty to the French.²⁵² After the cession to England, the French moved from Fort Toulouse, and Tamathlemingo and his subjects tore the fort so that the English might not benefit from it and moved to Mobile.²⁵³ Finally, Bossu even displayed the usefulness of the Arkansas Indians. Bossu carefully recorded a speech the Arkansas chief made to him. “Our warriors will go to fight the common enemy in order to take prisoners to be your slaves,” the chief proclaimed in order to endear Bossu to him.²⁵⁴

Francisco Bouligny and other government officials took the Indians up on their offer to help fight the European battles. The English threat of war concerned Bouligny, and he devoted a number of pages to discussing a solution to the English threat.²⁵⁵ Bouligny wanted Louisiana to entice the Indians to fight the English and English Indian allies. “If we were able to unite these nations and manipulate them as the English manipulate *theirs*, we would not need another barrier to resist all the forces of the English,” says Bouligny (emphasis mine).²⁵⁶ Not only did Bouligny want the Indians to fight in the European conflict, but he also reverted to claiming tribes, a practice begun in the French period. The practice of seeing the Indians as resources was fully in place and not even questioned at the close of the eighteenth century.

The Spanish administration in Louisiana echoed the sentiments of the journalists, repeatedly using the Indians to fight their battles. In the mid 1780s, the Great Osage Indians continued to cause trouble for the colony, attacking their neighboring tribes in Illinois and Natchitoches. Governor Miro encouraged the Osage’s enemies to go against them and even supplied the Indians with powder.²⁵⁷ As previously noted, the Creeks were the other major warring tribe in Louisiana during the Spanish period. They, however, fought against the encroaching American frontiersmen, a goal which the Spanish government eagerly supported

due to border disputes.²⁵⁸ In order to save their land from encroaching Americans and Frenchmen, Baron de Carondelet urged the Spanish to “provide [the Creeks] with provisions, and allow them to make incursions against Pensacola and the rest of the settlements” so that the Creeks would stop allowing “enemies to pass through their lands.”²⁵⁹ All parties eventually settled the dispute, but the fact that Spain used the Indians to fight her battles is instructive. Indians, after the early periods in Louisiana, seemed almost to disappear in times of peace, only popping up occasionally in travel accounts and in some documents. When trouble arose though, Spain quickly assembled any tribes it could to fight. Spain supported the Choctaw/Chickasaw conflict to keep both tribes from turning against Louisiana, supplied the Creeks in their border wars with Americans and even contemplated using smaller tribes like the Tallapoosa against other Europeans.²⁶⁰ Indian tribes still existed in Louisiana in 1803, but officials and colonists only recognized them in situations where the Indians were useful to the colonist’s goals, turning the Indians into mere resources.

On the eve of the Louisiana Purchase, Indians in the Lower Mississippi Valley held a much lower position than the Indians in the 1600s, prior to European arrival. By the Spanish and English periods in Louisiana, Europeans had almost completely written Indians off of the land and pushed them aside by changing their colonization goals to only include settlement and prosperity. Where allowances for Indians were made in the journals, the Indians were quickly dismissed as savages or either put to use, usually fighting European wars. On Marquette’s voyage down the Mississippi in 1673, Indians abounded, but by 1803, Europeans had usurped the land. At least that is the picture travel accounts from Louisiana left.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

A significant number of Indian tribes still remain in what was once the Louisiana territory today, despite both European and American attempts to remove the Indians. In the modern states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Illinois, Louisiana and Mississippi, some of the main states that the previous travel accounts addressed, over thirty- six tribal groups exist, eight federally recognized.²⁶¹ Among the tribes still represented are, Cherokee, Creek, Ouachita, Miccosukee, Yamasee, Apalachee, Biloxi, Chitimacha, Caddo, Choctaw, Coushatta, Tunica and Houma. The list, though not as long as the number of tribes before 1699, does show that Indians in the Southeast and throughout the Americas are still thriving, continuing to adapt in much the same ways they did before the arrival of Europeans.

Unfortunately, because early Europeans wrote the Indians out of possession of their land, and because the expanding United States implemented its policies of removal, the Indians in the Southeast have had a long struggle to be federally recognized and to claim the ancestral land that is rightly theirs. Not until 1920 did the United States government begin to recognize tribes that could prove they had existed for an extended period of time, and finally in 1946, Congress created the Indian Claims Commission that gave tribes hope of compensation for lost land.²⁶² The commission actively tried to terminate Indian claims, and many tribes remained without satisfaction since they were required to prove that they indeed inhabited the land they claimed or that the land was not fairly appraised at the time of cession. The reason many of these tribes had so much trouble in their endeavor is because of European and American actions, like the ones

described above. Europeans and later Americans would find it relatively easy to write the Indians out of their land; however, writing the Indians back into their land proved and still proves to be a much harder task.

I believe that writing the American indigenous population back into the American cannon is one of the most pressing issues for scholars today. Modern textbooks from many academic disciplines dedicate only a chapter, if that much, to Indians while spending scores of pages on the minuscule five hundred years of European history in America. What is more, Indian art and language, because it does not conform to accepted notions of art and writing, have been almost completely excluded from academia. Ancient rock art, sand art and oral history are just now becoming accepted into academia as legitimate sources of information. Because academics have excluded these native traditions for centuries, modern scholars find it difficult to reinsert them into accepted notions of art and writing. Indian tribes themselves sometimes struggle to hold onto their traditional art forms and language due to the policies of acculturation.

My interest in the neglected Indian history is personal. It began when I was a young child. When the cotton and corn fields near my home in southeastern Georgia, located in the Savannah River Valley, were plowed every year or when a strong rainstorm filled the local creeks to overflowing, arrowheads, pottery shards and old metal bullet remains lay on the ground. These items were treasured. Friends and family members would explain that the arrowheads and pottery shards were from Indians who lived in the area long, long ago. The bullet shards, however, were explained in detail. Most were found near the Buckhead Creek area where a horrible Civil War battle took place. The Union soldiers used the pews from the local Baptist church as a bridge across the creek, and you can still see the hoof imprints from Sherman's horses in those pews today, or so I have been told. Most of the people you speak with

can recall every ancestor who fought in the Civil War and will speculate that the very bullet you hold might have been the one those “Yankees” used to kill him with. Their knowledge of history does not end with the Civil War. They can also recall where in Europe their ancestors came from, what colonies their ancestors settled, where old county and state lines were drawn and a plethora of other facts. Why did these people, my family and neighbors, who seem to know so much about the history of the land explain my childhood treasures with the dismissive attitude that, “those arrowheads are leftover from the Indians who lived here long ago?”

Their response has been engrained from the time Europeans began colonizing America. Remember that Le Page du Pratz reported that there were many Indians before Columbus. There, already, he began the trend of explaining Indian history with the phrase, “long, long ago.” There is no denying that Indians were written off of their land, out of the American cannon and sometimes they were even written out of their own identity. We must start to put them back. Before this process can begin though, scholars must discover at what points the indigenous population of America begin to vanish. Only then can they be given their rightful place.

Since the advent of the Indian Claims Commission, Ethnohistory has grown and developed into a subdivision of history. These scholars look primarily to the Indians for their story. I applaud their efforts, but I caution that we should re-examine the European story, as I have tried to do, to see where and how the Indians were excluded. That knowledge will lead to a better understanding of how to reinsert them into the American cannon. This is precisely why I chose to follow Stephen Greenblatt’s example, since many of the sources we use to write Indian history are from Europeans themselves.

I cannot stress enough the importance of correcting the mistakes of the past. In every sense of the word, America is still a colonized nation. The colonizers still remain and the

colonized are still repressed, a fact that many tribes have not forgotten. Craig S. Womack, a Creek Indian, begs for the recognition of native authors in literature, and Abenaki poet, Cheryl Savageau, claims that history needs to be reevaluated.²⁶³ “Some versions of history are not just a point of view,” Savageau claims, “but actual distortions and lies.”²⁶⁴ These distortions and lies are what I have tried to expose through my study of travel accounts from Louisiana.

Bibliography

- Allain, Mathé. *Not Worth A Straw: French Colonial Policy and the Early Years of Louisiana*. Lafayette, 1988.
- Axtell, James. "Imagining the Other: First Encounters in North America." In *Beyond 1492: Encounters in Colonial North America*, James Axtell. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Axtell, James. "The Ethnohistory of Early America: A Review Essay." In *William and Mary Quarterly* 35 (1978): 110-144.
- Bouligny, Francisco. *Louisiana in 1776: A Memoria of Francisco Bouligny*, trans. Gilbert C. Din. New Orleans: Louisiana Collection Series, 1977.
- Bossu, Jean-Bernard. *New Travels in North America, 1770-1771*, trans. and ed., Samuel Dorris Dickinson. Natchitoches, Louisiana: Northwestern State University Press, 1982.
- Brasseaux, Carl A. *A Comparative View of Louisiana: The Journals of Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville and Jean-Jacques Blaise d'Abbadie, 1699 and 1762*. Lafayette: USL History Series, 1979.
- Brasseaux, Carl A. *A Dictionary of Louisiana Biography*, 2 vol. New Orleans: Louisiana Historical Association, 1988.
- Brown, Ian W. "The Calumet Ceremony in the Southeast and Its Archaeological Manifestations." In *American Antiquity* 54 (1989): 311-331.
- Cook, Noble David. *Born To Die: Disease and New World Conquest, 1492-1650*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1998.
- Coxe, Daniel. *A Description of the English Province of Carolana, but by the Spaniards call'd Florida and by the French La Louisiana*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1976.
- Din, Gilbert C. *Francisco Bouligny: A Bourbon Soldiers in Spanish Louisiana*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993.
- Du Pratz, Le Page. *The History of Louisiana, or of the West Parts of Virginia and ...Carolina, Containing a Description of the countries that Lie on both Sides of the Mississippi*. New Orleans: Pelican Press, 1941.
- Falconer, Thomas. *Discovery of the Mississippi and on the South-Western, Oregon, and North-Western Boundary of the United States*. Texas: Shoal Creek Publishers, 1975.
- Joutel, Henri. *The La Salle Expedition to Texas: The Journal of Henri Joutel, 1684-1687*. Austin, Texas State Historical Society, 1998.
- Galloway, Patricia. *Choctaw Genesis: 1500-1700*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995.
- Giardino, Marco J. "Documentary Evidence for the Location of Historic Indian Villages in the Mississippi Delta." In *Perspectives on Gulf Coast Prehistory*, ed. Dave D. Davis, 232-257. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1984.
- Gibson, Arrell M. "Chickasaw Ethnography: An Ethnohistorical Reconstruction." In *Ethnohistory* 18 (1971): 99-118.

- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Hennepin, Louis. *Father Louis Hennepin's Description of Louisiana: Newly Discovered to the Southwest of New France by Order of the King*. Trans. Marion E. Cross. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1938.
- Hudson, Charles. *The Southeastern Indians*. USA: University of Tennessee Press, 1976.
- Iberville, Pierre le Moyne, Sieur de. *Iberville's Gulf Journals*, trans. and ed. Richebourg Gaillard McWilliams. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1981.
- Kinnaird, Lawrence, ed. *Spain in the Mississippi Valley, 1765-1794, I-III*. Washington: United States Printing Office, 1949.
- Marquette, Jacques. *Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France*. Fairfield, Washington: Ye Galleon Press, 2001.
- Merrell, James. *The Indian's New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbors From European Contact Through the Era of Removal*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1989.
- Norman, Charles. *Discoverers of America*. New York: Charles Norman, 1968.
- Pagden, Anthony. *The Fall of Natural Man: The American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Papers of Panton, Leslie, and Co. Special Collections, John C. Pace Library. University of West Florida, Pensacola, Florida.
- Parkman, Francis. *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1869.
- Pitot, Jacques-Francois. *Observations on the Colony of Louisiana from 1796-1802*, trans. and ed., Henry C. Pitot. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1979.
- Pittman, Philip. *The Present State of the European Settlement on the Mississippi: With Geographical Description of that River Illustrated by Plans and Draughts*. London: J. Norse, 1770.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Reeves, Miriam G. *The Governors of Louisiana*. Gretna: Pelican Publishing Company, 1980.
- Rowland, Dunbar and Albert Godfrey Sanders. *Mississippi Provincial Archives; French Dominion, I-III*. Jackson, Mississippi: Mississippi Department of Archives and History, 1929-1932.
- Rowland, Dunbar and Albert Godfrey Sanders, rev. and ed., Patricia Galloway. *Mississippi Provincial Archives: French Dominion, IV-V*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1984.
- Seed, Patricia. *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Shea, John Gilmary. *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley: With the Original Narrative of Marquette, Alouez, Membré, Hennepin, and Anastase Douay*. New York: Redfield, 1852.
- Smith, F. Todd. *The Caddo Indians: Tribes at the Convergence of Empires, 1542-1854*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1995.
- Smith, Marvin. *Archaeology of Aboriginal Culture Change in the Interior Southeast: Depopulation During the Early Historic Period*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1987.

- Swanton, John R. *Source Material for the Social and Cultural Life of the Choctaw Indians*. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1931.
- Usner, Daniel. *American Indians in the Lower Mississippi Valley: Social and Economic Histories*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Usner, Daniel. *Indians, Settler, and Slaves in a Frontier Exchange Economy*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- Waldman, Carl, ed. *Atlas of the North American Indian*, revised edition. New York: Checkmark Books, 2000.
- Wall, Bennett H., Light Townsend Cummins, Judith Kelleher Schafer, Edward F. Hass and Michael L. Kurtz, eds. *Louisiana: A History*, 4th ed. Wheeling, Illinois: Harlan Davidson, 2002.
- Weddle, Robert S., ed. *La Salle, the Mississippi, and the Gulf*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1987.
- Womack, Craig S. *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Endnotes

¹ Charles Hudson, *The Southeastern Indians* (USA: University of Tennessee, 1976), 77-97; Carl Waldman, *Atlas of The North American Indian*, rev. ed. (New York: Checkmark Books, 2000), 244.

² See Hudson and Patricia Galloway, *Choctaw Genesis: 1500-1700* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995).

³ Early Spanish explorers to the southeast brought new diseases with them, and other tribes stricken by European germs undoubtedly transferred diseases along with trade items. See Marvin T Smith, *Archaeology of Aboriginal Culture Change in the Interior Southeast: Depopulation during the Early Historic Period* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1987) and Noble David Cook, *Born To Die: Disease and New World Conquest, 1492-1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 154-165.

⁴ See F. Todd Smith, *The Caddo Indians: Tribes at the Convergence of Empires, 1542-1854* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1995) and James H. Merrell, *The Indian's New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbors From European Contact Through The Era of Removal* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1989).

⁵ Marco J. Giardino, "Documentary Evidence for the Location of Historic Indian Villages in the Mississippi Delta," in *Perspectives on Gulf Coast Prehistory*, Dave D. Davis, ed. (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1984), 232-257; Waldman, *Atlas of the North American Indian*; Daniel Usner, *Indians, Settlers, and Slaves in a Frontier Exchange Economy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992).

⁶ Daniel Usner, *American Indians in the Lower Mississippi Valley: Social and Economic Histories* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 54-55.

⁷ For more information see Cook, *Born to Die*; Alfred Crosby, *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion, 900-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Henry F. Dobyns, *Their Number Become Thinned: Native American Depopulation Dynamics in Eastern North America* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983); William H. McNeill, *Plagues and Peoples* (Garden City: Anchor Doubleday, 1976); and Russell Thornton, *American Indians Holocaust and Survival: A population History Since 1492* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992).

⁸ Cook, *Born to Die*, 132.

⁹ Patricia Seed, *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 16-68.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 69-99.

¹¹ For more information, see Charles Norman, *Discoverers of America* (New York: Charles Norman, 1968); James Axtell, "Imagining the Other: First Encounters in North America," in *Beyond 1492: Encounters in Colonial North America*, James Axtell (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Seed, *Ceremonies of Possession*.

¹² Las Casas, Bartolomé de, *A short Account of the Destruction of the Indies*, ed. and trans. Nigel Griffin, intro. Anthony Pagden (New York: Penguin, 1992).

¹³ *Ibid.*, xvi-xvii.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, xvii.

¹⁵ For a expansive list of Louisiana scholarship, see Glen R. Conrad and Carl A. Brasseaux, *A Selected Bibliography of Scholarly Literature on Colonial Louisiana and New France* (Lafayette, LA, 1982) and Light Townsend Cummins and Glen Jeansonne, eds., *A Guide to the History of Louisiana* (Westport, Conn., 1982). Not only have scholars like Frederick Jackson Turner, *History, Frontier, and Section: Three Essays* (Albuquerque, University of New Mexico, 1993), overlooked the Indians as a whole, but when borderlands history began to surface, scholars like Charles Gayarré, *History of Louisiana* (New York: Redfield, 1854), continued to overlook the vast native population when writing the history of the region. Instead, later writers tended to focus on the European population and the military, political or religious history of the area.

¹⁶ For some recent works by ethnohistorians of the Lower Mississippi Valley, please see Usner, *Indians, Settlers, and Slaves*, Merrell, *The Indian's New World*, Michael D. Green, *The Politics of Indians Removal: Creek Government and Society in Crisis* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982), James Axtell, *The Indian's New South: Cultural Change in the Colonial Southeast* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1997), Timothy Perttula, *The Caddo Nation: Archaeological and Ethnohistoric Perspectives* (Austin: University of Texas Press,

1992), Smith, *The Caddo Indians* and Greg O'Brien, *Choctaws in a Revolutionary Age, 1750-1830* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 2002); Claudio Saunt, *A New Order of Things: Property, Power, and the Transformation of the Creek Indians, 1733-1816* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

¹⁷ Pagden, Anthony, *The Fall of Natural Man: The American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

¹⁸ Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York: Routledge, 1992).

¹⁹ Stephen Greenblatt, *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

²⁰ Pagden, *The Fall of Natural Man* and Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492-1797* (New York: Methuen, 1986).

²¹ Leonard V. Huber and Samuel Wilson, Jr., *The Basilica on Jackson Square: The History of The St. Louis Cathedral and its Predecessors, 1727-1998* (Laborde Printing: New Orleans, 1999).

²² D'Abbadie was sent by France to get Louisiana's affairs in order so that the transition to Spanish rule in 1763 would be as smooth as possible. D'Abbadie's policies and actions regarding Indians will be discussed in later chapters.

²³ Carl A. Brasseaux, trans. and ed., *A Comparative View of French Louisiana: The Journals of Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville and Jean-Jacques Blaise d'Abbadie, 1699 and 1762* (Lafayette: USL History Series, 1979), 114.

²⁴ Hudson, *The Southeastern Indians*, 184-186.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 120-172.

²⁶ Arrell M. Gibson, "Chickasaw Ethnography: An Ethnohistorical Reconstruction," *Ethnohistory* 18, no. 2 (1971): 103.

²⁷ John R. Swanton, *Source Material for the Social and Ceremonial Life of the Choctaw Indians* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1931), 49, 103.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 103.

²⁹ Usner, *Indians, Settlers and Slaves*.

³⁰ D'Abbadie, "The d'Abbadie Journal," in *A Comparative View*, Brasseaux, 123.

³¹ John Gilmary Shea, *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley: With the Original Narratives of Marquette, Allouez, Membré, Hennepin, and Anastase Douay* (New York: Redfield, 1852), vii.

³² *Ibid.*, viii.

³³ *Ibid.*, ix-x.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, x. For more information on Narváez or de Vaca, see, Álgar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, *The Narrative of Cabeza de Vaca* ed., trans., and with an intro. by Rolena Adorno and Patrick Charles Pautz (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 2003).

³⁵ For a general overview of the accounts concerning De Soto, see Charles Hudson, *Knights of Spain, Warriors of the Sun: Hernando de Soto and the South's Ancient Chiefdoms* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1997), 441-481.

³⁶ Shea, xx.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, xx-xxi.

³⁸ Marquette was born on June 1, 1637, into a family with a long tradition in the French military. He joined the Jesuit order in 1654 but after teaching for some years decided that overseas missionary work was his passion. He arrived in Quebec on September 20, 1666, and began language training almost immediately. His first mission was with the Ottawa Indians at St. Ignace where he met Louis Jolliet, a former Jesuit turned trader. Jolliet was hoping to find the great river mentioned by Illinois Indians, and Marquette partnered with Jolliet for the voyage. After a winter of preparation, learning from Indians which rivers to take and what nations he would pass through along his route, Marquette set out with Jolliet to explore the Mississippi further than previous explorers. The journey began on May 17, 1673, from Michilimackinac where Marquette was stationed and the explorers reached the Mississippi on June 17, 1673. For more information, see Shea, *Discovery and Exploration*, intro. and Jacques Marquette, *Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France* (Fairfield, Washington: Ye Galleon Press, 2001), Introduction.

³⁹ Marquette, 91.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 91, 93-97, 101-105, 113-137, 145-149, 151-159.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 125.

⁴³ *A New Map of Louisiana and the River Mississippi* (London, 1720).

⁴⁴ Marquette, 44.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 44.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 47.

⁴⁷ Robert Cavalier De La Salle was born into an obscure family at Rouen and educated at a Jesuit seminary. La Salle moved to Canada and began to gain fame as an explorer. Consequently, on a trip back to France, in May 1678, Louis XIV appointed him to journey down the Mississippi and claim the land for France. For more information, see Shea, *Discovery and Exploration*; Donald S. Johnson, *La Salle: A Perilous Odyssey from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico* (New York: Copper Square Press, 2002); and Patricia K. Galloway, ed., *La Salle and His Legacy: Frenchmen and Indians in the Lower Mississippi Valley* (Jackson: University of Mississippi, 1982).

⁴⁸ Hennepin only accompanied La Salle on his journey a little further than the Illinois. The rest of his narrative is highly debated and most likely fabricated.

⁴⁹ Letters Patent Granted by the King of France, to the Sieur De La Salle, 12 May 1678, in *Discovery of the Mississippi and on the South-Western, Oregon, and North-Western Boundary of The United States*, ed. Thomas Falconer (Texas: Shoal Creek Publishers, 1975), 18.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 38.

⁵¹ Henri de Tonty, "Memoir Sent in 1693, on the Discovery of the Mississippi and the Neighboring Nations by M. De La Salle, From the year 1678 to the time of his death, and by the Sieur de Tonty to the Year 1691," in Falconer, 54-59, 60, 63, 54-96. Henri de Tonty met La Salle in France just as La Salle was petitioning to take a trip to the Gulf of Mexico. De Tonty agreed to accompany La Salle on his journey down the Mississippi, having numerous years of military service. De Tonty served as an emissary between the Indians and the French, often making the initial offers of peace and securing supplies. It was on these expeditions that de Tonty learned the languages and skills he needed to help later explorers establish permanent settlements in the early 1700s. Upon returning to France after La Salle's second and final voyage to the Gulf, de Tonty set down a memoir in 1693.

⁵² De Tonty, 61.

⁵³ Ibid., 63.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 63-64.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 54-60, 65-66.

⁵⁶ Father Louis Hennepin was born April 7, 1640, in Belgium and entered the Franciscan order at Béthune, France around the year 1660. His term in New France began in 1675 where he served as a missionary for three years before accompanying La Salle for one year on his journey. After straying from La Salle, he was captured by the Sioux and kept captive for a few months before being rescued and returning to France. Upon his return, Hennepin published *Description de la Louisiana* in 1683. Since the Jesuit reports were suppressed in 1673, Hennepin's 1683 report was both popular and probably partly padded for entertainment. For more information, see Louis Hennepin, *Father Louis Hennepin's Description of Louisiana: Newly Discovered ...to the Southwest of New France by Order of the King*, Trans. Marion E. Cross and Intro. by Grace Lee Nute, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1938) and Carl A Brasseaux, ed., *A Dictionary of Louisiana Biography* (New Orleans: Louisiana Historical Association, 1988), 1:397.

⁵⁶ Brasseaux, *A Dictionary of Louisiana*, 1:398.

⁵⁶ Nute, x.

⁵⁷ Hennepin, 67.

⁵⁸ William C. Foster, introduction to *The La Salle Expedition to Texas: The Journal of Henri Joutel, 1684-1687* by Henri Joutel (Austin: Texas State Historical Society, 1998), 22.

⁵⁹ Robert S. Weddle, ed., *La Salle, the Mississippi, and the Gulf* (College Station: Texas A & M, 1987), 4.

⁶⁰ La Salle missed the Gulf entrance to the Mississippi and ended up of the coast of Texas. One of his four ships was captured by Spanish privateers in route while another, the *L'Aimable*, ran aground in Matagorda Bay. Ready to end their adventure, a number of settlers and some of La Salle's crew turned back for France on a third ship. The remaining crew and settlers took their now inadequate supplies and began to establish a settlement while La Salle searched for the Mississippi. After the final ship, *La Belle*, was also lost in a storm though, La Salle decided to take the survivors and head to the Illinois country. He was killed by one of his own men during the trip. Only six people out of almost three hundred made it back to France.⁶⁰ Of those who were left at the crude fort, only a few children living with the Indians were found in 1689 when Captain Alonso de León arrived from Spanish Mexico to destroy the French settlement. Foster, introduction to *The La Salle Expedition to Texas*, 4.

⁶⁰ Bennett H. Wall, Light Townsend Cummins, Judith Kelleher Schafer, Edward F. Haas, and Michael L. Kurtz, eds., *Louisiana: A History* 4th ed. (Wheeling, Illinois: Harlan Davidson, 2002), 22-23.

⁶¹ Falconer 21-34.

-
- ⁶² Sieur de La Salle, "Memoir of the Sieur de La Salle Reporting To Monsiegnier De Seignelay the Discoveries Made By Him Under the Order of His Majesty," in Falconer, 22.
- ⁶³ Marquette, 105
- ⁶⁴ "Of the Taking Possession of Louisiana, At the Mouth of the Mississippi, By the Sieur de La Salle, on the 9th of April 1682," in Falconer, 35.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid., 41.
- ⁶⁶ Ibid., 42.
- ⁶⁷ Francis Parkman, *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West* (Cambridge: University Press, 1869; reprint, Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1894), 189.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid., 43-46.
- ⁶⁹ Ibid., 46.
- ⁷⁰ Sieur de La Salle, "Memoir of the Sieur de La Salle Reporting To Monsiegnier De Seignelay the Discoveries Made By Him Under the Order of His Majesty," in Falconer, 22.
- ⁷¹ Ibid., 22.
- ⁷² Marquette, 91.
- ⁷³ Ibid., 93.
- ⁷⁴ Ibid., 125.
- ⁷⁵ De Tonty, 52, 54, 56, 61, 62, 63, 64, 67, 70, 73.
- ⁷⁶ Hennepin, 158-160
- ⁷⁷ Ibid., 160.
- ⁷⁸ Sieur de La Salle, "Memoir of the Sieur de La Salle," in Falconer, 22.
- ⁷⁹ Ibid., 22.
- ⁸⁰ Marquette, 6.
- ⁸¹ Ibid., 15.
- ⁸² Ibid., 51.
- ⁸³ Ibid., 23.
- ⁸⁴ Hennepin, 67.
- ⁸⁵ Ibid., 70.
- ⁸⁶ Ibid., 179.
- ⁸⁷ Ibid., 180.
- ⁸⁸ La Salle, in Falconer, 25.
- ⁸⁹ Marquette, 115-121.
- ⁹⁰ Ibid., 153.
- ⁹¹ Hennepin, 36.
- ⁹² De Tonty in Falconer, 69.
- ⁹³ Hennepin, 47.
- ⁹⁴ Marquette, 12.
- ⁹⁵ Ibid., 107.
- ⁹⁶ Hennepin, 58.
- ⁹⁷ La Salle in Falconer, 26.
- ⁹⁸ "Of the Taking Possession of Louisiana, At the Mouth of the Mississippi, By the Sieur de La Salle, on the 9th of April 1682," in Falconer, 38.
- ⁹⁹ Ibid 38-39.
- ¹⁰⁰ Marquette, 106.
- ¹⁰¹ De Tonty in Falconer, 52.
- ¹⁰² Ibid., 71.

¹⁰³ France finally realized that the colony was a drain on the purse and even considered abandoning the operation altogether. The strategic importance outweighed the losses though and France kept the colony but granted ownership to Antoine Crozat, the Marquis de Chatel in 1712. After losses of well over one million livres, Crozat begged to be out from under the colony in 1717. The crown, not being able to find another proprietor, awarded the colony to the joint-stock company, the Company of the West, in late 1717. The colony again changed leadership in 1718 when John Law and the Company of the Indies took control. Though Louisiana began to prosper under the company, a crash in the Royal Bank and Company of the Indies caused the burden of Louisiana to fall again on the French crown. The crown allowed the colony to remain under the Company of the Indies as a public-stock venture. The company requested release from its obligations and the colony once again became a royal colony in 1731, staying that way until 1763 when it was ceded to Spain at the settlement of the Seven Years War. For an overview of Louisiana's history see, Bennett H. Wall, Light Townsend Cummins, Judith Kelleher Schafer, Edward F. Hass and Michael L. Kurtz, eds. *Louisiana: A History*, 4th ed. (Wheeling, Illinois: Harlan Davidson, 2002).

¹⁰⁴ Iberville, born July 20, 1661, in the Montreal wilderness, received only a basic education but a strong love of the home country, leading him to join the military where his career flourished. During the War of the League of Ausburg against England, Iberville fought from 1686 to 1697 in the Hudson Bay area and became a French hero, among his many other accomplishments. His brother, Jean Baptiste le Moyne, Sieur de Bienville, only 21 at the time, eagerly accompanied Iberville on the journey. Bienville and Iberville both served as Governors of Louisiana. Iberville was the first governor in the sense that he directed all operations. Bienville, on the other hand, held the position on three separate occasions. Bienville led the colony, continued exploring and secured peaceful Indian relations in Iberville's absence between voyages. After his brother's death, Bienville went on to found the city of New Orleans and successfully defended himself against charges of misconduct brought by enemies. Together, the two brothers made the perfect team; the military genius of Iberville, the pioneer spirit of both and the diplomatic genius of Bienville finally put the colony on stable footing. See Brasseaux, 1:422.

¹⁰⁵ Pierre le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville, *Iberville's Gulf Journals*, trans. and ed. by Richebourg Gaillard McWilliams (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1981), 63.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 74-75.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 45-47.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 66.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 68.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 110-112.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 123.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 133.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 59.

¹¹⁴ Jean Baptiste le Moyne, Sieur de Bienville, "Copy of the Journal of M. de Bienville's Overland Journey from the Taensa to the Village of the Yatachés," in Iberville, 146-155.

¹¹⁵ Bienville in Iberville 148.

¹¹⁶ Iberville, 168.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 168.

¹¹⁸ Mathé Allain, *Not Worth A Straw: French Colonial Policy and the Early Years of Louisiana* (Lafayette, 1988), 52.

¹¹⁹ Daniel Coxe, *A Description of the English province of Carolana, but by the Spaniards call'd Florida and by the French La Louisiana*, intro. by William S. Coker (London, 1722) (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1976), xx.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, xx.

¹²¹ Coxe's narrative is taken from numerous second-hand sources. He used his father's writings and those of other travelers, never really journeying out of England and New Jersey. Most of the younger Coxe's days were spent in New Jersey as Commander of Military Forces and serving as a member of the Council of Proprietors of West Jersey, where he reportedly had a "stormy career," battling with both the Queen and Governors of New Jersey. The privileged youth lacked a trade and retained his family's wealth mostly through land speculation.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 8-20.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 9-10.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 25.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, preface.

- ¹²⁶ Le Page du Pratz, a professional architect, came to Louisiana in 1718 under the Company of the Indies, living on Bayou St. John, near the Natchez and even in New Orleans. When the Company of the Indies folded in 1734, du Pratz lost his job and returned to France. Upon returning, he set to writing an account of Louisiana to try to dispel the misconception that everything in Louisiana would fail. His work was published in article form until 1758 when an edition of *The History of Louisiana* appeared in Paris. See Le Page Du Pratz, *The History of Louisiana, or of the West Parts of Virginia and Carolina, Containing a Description of the countries that Lie on both Sides of the Mississippi* (New Orleans: Pelican Press, 1941).
- ¹²⁷ Ibid., 45-55.
- ¹²⁸ Ibid., 54.
- ¹²⁹ *A New Map of Louisiana and the River Mississippi* (London, 1720).
- ¹³⁰ Regis du Roulet to Maurepas, "Journal of the Journey That I Made in the Choctaw Nation in the Year 1729. In Dunbar Dunbar Rowland and A.G. Sanders, *Mississippi Provincial Archives: French Dominion*, vol. 1:21.
- ¹³¹ Beauchamp, Mobile to Maurepas, 25 April 1734. In Dunbar and Sanders, 4: 181.
- ¹³² Louboey to Maurepas, 28 November 1738. In Dunbar and Sanders, 4:157; Usner, 85; Michel, New Orleans, to Rouillé 22 January 1750. In Dunbar Rowland and A.G. Sanders, *Mississippi Provincial Archives: French Dominion*, vol. 5, 1749-1763, ed. by Patricia Galloway (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1984), 40.
- ¹³³ Du Pratz, 15.
- ¹³⁴ Ibid., 306.
- ¹³⁵ Ibid., 306.
- ¹³⁶ Ibid., 311-312.
- ¹³⁷ D'Abbadie, born and raised in France, entered the bureau of the Marine after completing his degree where he served as a scribe and later chief clerk of the artillery department, eventually being transferred to the colonial department. Finally, on January 18, 1762, prior to the peace, d'Abbadie received word to go to Louisiana. The hostile British in the Bay of Biscay intercepted his first ship, and d'Abbadie was detained in Barbados for three months. During the course of his detainment, however, d'Abbadie was promoted to Director-General in light of the Peace of Paris, Treaty of Fontainebleau and recall of Louisiana's Governor, Louis Billouart de Kerlérec. The Seven Years' War, beginning in 1754, pitted England against France and Spain and redrew boundaries for the Lower Mississippi Valley. Finally on June 21, 1763, D'Abbadie reached Louisiana to complete his duties as the transitioning official. His journal records his actions from June 1763 to his death in 1764.
- ¹³⁸ Act of Acceptance of Louisiana by Charles III of Spain, 13 November 1762. Dunbar and Sanders, 5:281-283.
- ¹³⁹ Brasseaux, *A Comparative View*, 87.
- ¹⁴⁰ Carl A. Brasseaux, *A Comparative View of Louisiana: The Journals of Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville and Jean-Jacques Blaise d'Abbadie, 1699 and 1762*, (Lafayette: USL History Series, 1979), 94.
- ¹⁴¹ Ibid., 96.
- ¹⁴² Ibid., 100.
- ¹⁴³ Kerlérec, New Orleans, to Choiseul, France, 2 May 1763. In Dunbar and Sanders, 5:284.
- ¹⁴⁴ Kerlérec, New Orleans, to Choiseul, France, 2 May 1763. In Dunbar and Sanders, 5:284. ¹⁴⁴ D'Abbadie, "The d'Abbadie Journal," in *A Comparative View*, Brasseaux, 123.
- ¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 89.
- ¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 89-92.
- ¹⁴⁷ Iberville, 81, 89.
- ¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 46.
- ¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 114.
- ¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 114.
- ¹⁵¹ Ibid., 110-112.
- ¹⁵² Ibid., 168-170.
- ¹⁵³ Ibid., 168-170.
- ¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 171-172.
- ¹⁵⁵ Coxé, 8-11.
- ¹⁵⁶ Du Pratz, 18.
- ¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 18.
- ¹⁵⁸ Kerlérec, New Orleans, to Choiseul, France, 2 May 1763. In Dunbar and Sanders, 5:284.
- ¹⁵⁹ D'Abbadie, "The d'Abbadie Journal," in *A Comparative View*, Brasseaux, 123.
- ¹⁶⁰ Iberville, 63.
- ¹⁶¹ Ibid., 139.

-
- ¹⁶² Du Pratz, 290.
- ¹⁶³ Ibid., 291.
- ¹⁶⁴ Périer, Louisiana, to Maurepas, France, 1 April 1730. In Dunbar and Sanders, 4: 33.
- ¹⁶⁵ Iberville, 86.
- ¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 132.
- ¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 131.
- ¹⁶⁸ Du Pratz, 311-312.
- ¹⁶⁹ D'Abbadie, "The d'Abbadie Journal," in *A Comparative View*, Brasseaux, 87.
- ¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 94.
- ¹⁷¹ Iberville, 159, 178.
- ¹⁷² D'Abbadie, "The d'Abbadie Journal," in *A Comparative View*, Brasseaux, 94, 97.
- ¹⁷³ Ibid., 105.
- ¹⁷⁴ Iberville, 171.
- ¹⁷⁵ D'Abbadie, "The d'Abbadie Journal," in *A Comparative View*, Brasseaux, 96.
- ¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 101-102. The Indians come to New Orleans first for a visit. D'Abbadie gives the Indians a boat and guides to take them to their new location. The Apalache were somewhat less familiar with their new area than Frenchmen at the time, but it is still interesting to note that instead of Europeans using Indian guides, as Iberville and earlier explorers did, by the mid 1700s, the Indians were sometimes using European guides.
- ¹⁷⁷ D'Abbadie, "The d'Abbadie Journal," in *A Comparative View*, Brasseaux, 111.
- ¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 123.
- ¹⁷⁹ D'Abbadie, Mobile, to Kerlérec, New Orleans, 6 November 1763. In Dunbar and Sanders, 5:293.
- ¹⁸⁰ Iberville, 43-44.
- ¹⁸¹ Ibid., 168. The gods were simply rocks with painted faces according to Iberville. The Indians were afraid to approach them.
- ¹⁸² Ibid., 169.
- ¹⁸³ Périer, Louisiana, to Maurepas, France, 1 April 1730. In Rowland and Sanders, 4:33.
- ¹⁸⁴ Memoir on Indians by Kerlérec, New Orleans, 21 December 1758. In Dunbar and Sanders, 5:222.
- ¹⁸⁵ Perrier and Salmon, Louisiana to Maurepas, 5 December 1731. In Dunbar and Sanders 4: 91.
- ¹⁸⁶ Iberville, 52.
- ¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 74-75.
- ¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 146.
- ¹⁸⁹ D'Abbadie, "The d'Abbadie Journal," in *A Comparative View*, Brasseaux, 101-102. The Indians come to New Orleans first for a visit. D'Abbadie gives the Indians a boat and guides to take them to their new location. The Apalache were somewhat less familiar with their new area than Frenchmen at the time, but it is still interesting to note that instead of Europeans using Indian guides, as Iberville and earlier explorers did, by the mid 1700s, the Indians were sometimes using European guides.
- ¹⁹⁰ D'Abbadie, "The d'Abbadie Journal," in *A Comparative View*, Brasseaux, 111.
- ¹⁹¹ Ibid., 114.
- ¹⁹² Iberville, 171-172.
- ¹⁹³ Bienville, Louisiana, to Ponchartrain, France, 21 August, 1709. In Dunbar Rowland and Albert Godfrey Sanders, *Mississippi Provincial Archives: French Dominion*, vol. 3, 1704-1743 (Jackson Mississippi: Mississippi Department of Archives and History, 1932), 133.
- ¹⁹⁴ Ibid.
- ¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 136.
- ¹⁹⁶ The story that is not told here is that the Indians do not readily recognize the French claims. The Chickasaw, whom Iberville believes he is in alliance with, repeatedly play the French and English off one another in addition to waging war against the Choctaw. The Indians, apparent from the Documents, are bought by whichever nation provides the best and cheapest goods. Allegiances change almost overnight.
- ¹⁹⁷ Royal Decree Commissioning Don Antonio De Ulloa Governor of Louisiana, 21 May 1765, in Lawrence Kinnaid, ed. *Spain in the Mississippi Valley, 1765-1794*, vol. 1, *The Revolutionary Period, 1765-1781* (Washington: United States Printing Office, 1949), 1.
- ¹⁹⁸ Ulloa, Balize, to Don Antonio Bucareli, 25 March 1767, in Ibid., 25-26; El Marques de Grimaldi to Ulloa, New Orleans, 25 June 1768, in Ibid., 54-55; Ulloa, New Orleans, to Grimaldi, 26 October 1768, in Ibid., 77-81; Ulloa, Havana, to Bucareli, 8 December 1768, in Ibid., 83-84.

¹⁹⁹ Regulation of Louisiana Commerce: Royal Decree providing the rules and conditions under which commerce may be carried on between Spain and the province of Louisiana, 23 March 1768, in *Ibid.*, 45-50.

²⁰⁰ Miriam G. Reeves, *The Governors of Louisiana* (Gretna: Pelican Publishing Company, 1980), 23-24.

²⁰¹ Ulloa, New Orleans, to Grimaldi, 23 August 1768, in Kinnaird, *Spain in the Mississippi Valley*, 1:69-70.

²⁰² Philip Pittman, an ensign in the British Army, beginning in 1760, went to Louisiana after the Peace of Paris, in 1763, and served as a surveyor for the new regime. Frederick Haldimand's papers are perhaps the most telling. Haldimand was in command of the Southern District of North America, meaning West Florida, for the English Government, and he frequently called on Pittman to complete surveys and serve as the engineer on expeditions. Pittman stayed in the Lower Mississippi Valley for five years before returning to England. Politics in West Florida were no different from Louisiana, and conflicts often occurred. Pittman was involved in a dispute between the commander of the military and the governor there, and as a consequence, returned to England in 1768 with a tarnished image. He appealed to a friend in Parliament and was given the rank of Captain. After which, he retired and began work on his narrative, *The Present State of the European Settlements on the Mississippi*.

²⁰³ Philip Pittman, *The Present State of the European Settlements on the Mississippi: With Geographical Descriptions of that River, Illustrated by Plans and Draughts* (London: J. Norse, 1770), v.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 3.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 26.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 24.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 35.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 6.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 11.

²¹⁰ Haldimand Papers, reel 5 no. 312, Special Collections, John C. Pace Library, University of West Florida, Pensacola.

²¹¹ Pittman, 40.

²¹² *Ibid.*, 51.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, 20-21.

²¹⁴ Marquette, "Narrative of Father Marquette," in *Discovery and Exploration*, Shea, 23.

²¹⁵ Jean-Bernard Bossu was born in September 29, 1720, into a prominent French family who had a tradition of being surgeons. Bossu shunned the family tradition and joined the military at age sixteen and later transferred to the marine. Bossu was first sent to Louisiana in 1750 where he was at Ft. Chartres for six years before returning to France. His second mission to Louisiana, in 1758, was cut short when he was accused of libel against Governor Kerlérec, and he was recalled to France in 1762. Bossu, however, was exonerated and made one last trip to Louisiana in 1770 and 1771. His observations from his third trip, influenced by his first two trips, are contained in the letters comprising *New Travels in North America*.

²¹⁶ Bossu, Jean-Bernard. *New Travels in North America, 1770-1771*, trans. and ed., Samuel Dorris Dickinson. Natchitoches, Louisiana: Northwestern State University Press, 1982), 39, 41.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 74-75.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 45.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 36-38.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, 9.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, 45.

²²² Bouligny born in Alicante, Spain in 1736, had ties to both France and Spain through his family. Nevertheless, Bouligny and his Spanish family were very loyal to Spain. All but one of his brothers served the nation in either the government or military, and Francisco was no exception. "There was never any question of *patria* – fatherland," for the Bouligny children as they were all deeply committed to the land of their birth. Bouligny entered the Spanish military in 1758, just as the Seven Years' War was beginning for Spain and a new ruler, Carlos III, was taking control. Francisco proved very capable in the military and in 1760, he was transferred to the Royal Guard where he met Alejandro O'Reilly. Carlos III, seeing the need for a standing army in the Americans finally created such a division, and the new lieutenant, Bouligny, was sent to Havana in 1762 as part of the new American forces. After the rebellion, the closest Spanish soldiers to New Orleans were in Havana, and O'Reilly was order to take soldiers from that post and reclaim Louisiana.

Bouligny played the part of interpreter and liaison between O'Reilly and the old French government, even serving as translator in the trials of rebels accused of treason. After the smoke cleared, Bouligny settled into his new

command as adjutant major of the Spanish battalion. He spent the remainder of his days in Louisiana, marrying, acquiring land, rising in rank in the military and even serving in the capacity of governor for a short time. Boulogny did not always agree with his superiors though, and he missed being promoted on a number of occasions. Almost every governor, excluding O'Reilly, found some fault with Boulogny. In May 1773, Boulogny was under house arrest, in the administration of Luis de Unzaga, for not completing paperwork correctly and giving more severe penalties for first time deserters than required in Spanish regulations. Because he still had O'Reilly on his side, Boulogny was only warned. Shortly thereafter, Boulogny left for a short trip to Spain and he wrote his memoir for the government while there. Minister José de Galvez took Boulogny's observations to heart, creating numerous new policies from his recommendations and appointing him lieutenant governor in 1777. The current governor, Bernardo de Galvez, though not fond of Boulogny, tolerated him until their differences were too great. They disagreed on what course of action should be taken against the English and other aspects of the colonial regime. Governor Galvez hindered Boulogny in his plans as lieutenant and many of Boulogny's policies that might have benefited the colony, as outlined in his memoir, were not carried out.

²²³ Francisco Boulogny, *Louisiana in 1776: A Memoria of Francisco Boulogny*, trans. Gilbert C. Din (New Orleans: Louisiana Collection Series, 1977), 43-45.

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, 65.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*, 65.

²²⁶ Torre, Havana, to Bucareli, 2 May 1776, in Kinnaird, 1:231; Patrick Henry, Williamsburg, to the Governor of Louisiana, 20 October 1777, in *Ibid.*, 241; Rutledge to Galvez, 23 January 1778, in *Ibid.*, 250; Galvez to Henry, 6 May 1778, in *Ibid.*, 272.

²²⁷ Henry, Williamsburg, to the Governor of Louisiana, 14 January 1778, in *Ibid.*, 248; Act of Possession of East Bank of the Mississippi River North of the District of Natchez, 22 November 1780, in *Ibid.*, 401.

²²⁸ James Pitot was baptized Jacques-Francois Pitot in Normandy, France in 1761. He settled in Saint-Domingue at the age of twenty-one but returned to France when the great slave revolt of 1791 broke out. His return, however, coincided with the height of Robespierre's bloody reign of terror, and Pitot tried to return to Saint-Domingue. The area where he had formerly lived was taken by the rebels, and Pitot was forced to continue to North America where he settled in Philadelphia and became a naturalized American citizen in 1796. Since Americans were allowed to conduct commerce in Louisiana after 1788, Pitot moved to New Orleans and remained there until his death in 1831. Pitot became a well-known merchant and after the Louisiana Purchase, he served in various governmental capacities. Before the United States' acquisitions though, Pitot assumed that France would regain Louisiana, and he wrote his *Observations* to establish ties he hoped would be beneficial to his commercial interests.

²²⁹ Jacques-Francois Pitot, *Observations on the Colony of Louisiana from 1796-1802*, trans. and ed., Henry C. Pitot (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1979), 5-6.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*, 80-81.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, 58, 70, 80. Pitot also discusses trade and uses only the word 'Indian' on pages 60, 67, and 80-7.

²³² *Ibid.*, 128.

²³³ Miro to Cruzat, 24 March 1786, in Lawrence Kinnaird, ed. *Spain in the Mississippi Valley, 1765-1794*, vol. 2, *Post War Decade, 1782-1791* (Washington: United States Printing Office, 1946), 171-173; Miro to Du Breuil, 25 January 1787, in *Ibid.*, 191; De Blanc to Miro 5 August 1788, in *Ibid.*, 259; Baron de Carondelet, New Orleans, to Luis de Las Casa, 30 October 1794, Special Collections, John C. Pace Library, University of West Florida, Pensacola.

²³⁴ Pitot, 5.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, 43-45, 47-54.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*, 54.

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, 55, 56, 57.

²³⁸ Unzaga, New Orleans, to Grimaldi, 8 June 1770, in Kinnaird, 1:170; Bucareli, Havana, to Arriaga, 17 August 1770, in *Ibid.*, 180; Grimaldi, San Ildefonso, to Unzaga, 25 August 1770, in *Ibid.*, 181.

²³⁹ Boulogny, 65-66.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 67.

²⁴¹ Miro to Cruzat, 24 March 1786, in Lawrence Kinnaird, ed. *Spain in the Mississippi Valley, 1765-1794*, vol. 2, *Post War Decade, 1782-1791* (Washington: United States Printing Office, 1946), 171-173; Miro to Du Breuil, 25 January 1787, in *Ibid.*, 191; De Blanc to Miro 5 August 1788, in *Ibid.*, 259.

²⁴² Baron de Carondelet, New Orleans, to Luis de Las Casa, 30 October 1794, Special Collections, John C. Pace Library, University of West Florida, Pensacola.

²⁴³ Bossu, xx

-
- ²⁴⁴ Ibid., 39.
²⁴⁵ Ibid., 68.
²⁴⁶ Ibid., 58-59.
²⁴⁷ Ibid., 58-59.
²⁴⁸ Ibid., 116-117.
²⁴⁹ Pittman, 37.
²⁵⁰ Ibid., 37.
²⁵¹ Bossu, 31
²⁵² Ibid., 53-54.
²⁵³ Ibid., 54.
²⁵⁴ Ibid., 40.
²⁵⁵ Unzaga, New Orleans, to Grimaldi, 8 June 1770, in Kinnaird, 1:170; Bucareli, Havana, to Arriaga, 17 August 1770, in Ibid., 180; Grimaldi, San Ildefonso, to Unzaga, 25 August 1770, in Ibid., 181.
²⁵⁶ Bouligny, 68.
²⁵⁷ Miro to Cruzat, 24 March 1786, in Lawrence Kinnaird, ed. *Spain in the Mississippi Valley, 1765-1794*, vol. 2, *Post War Decade, 1782-1791* (Washington: United States Printing Office, 1946), 171-173; Miro to Du Breuil, 25 January 1787, in Ibid., 191; De Blanc to Miro 5 August 1788, in Ibid., 259.
²⁵⁸ Baron de Carondelet, New Orleans, to Luis de Las Casa, 30 October 1794, Special Collections, John C. Pace Library, University of West Florida, Pensacola.
²⁵⁹ Ibid.
²⁶⁰ Carondelet, New Orleans, to Enrique White, 10 October 1793, Ibid.
²⁶¹ Waldman, 287-304.
²⁶² James Axtell, "The Ethnohistory of Early America: A Review Essay," in *William and Mary Quarterly* 35, no. 1 (1978): 112.
²⁶³ Craig S. Womack, *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 3.
²⁶⁴ Ibid.