

against them while wards and dependents, they can only partially exercise the rights of free government, or give to those who make, execute, and construe the few laws they are allowed to enact, dignity sufficient to make them respectable. While they continue individually to gather the crumbs that fall from the table of the United States, idleness, improvidence, and indebtedness will be the rule, and industry, thrift, and freedom from debt the exception. The utter absence of individual title to particular lands deprives every one among them of the chief incentive to labor and exertion—the very mainspring on which the prosperity of a people depends.”

All judicious plans and measures for their safety and salvation must embody provisions for their becoming citizens as fast as they are fit, and must protect them till then in every right and particular in which our laws protect other “persons” who are not citizens. . . .

However great perplexity and difficulty there may be in the details of any and every plan possible for doing at this late day anything like justice to the Indian, however, hard it may be for good statesmen and good men to agree upon the things that ought to be done, there certainly is, or ought to be,

no perplexity whatever, or difficulty whatever, in agreeing upon certain things that ought not to be done, and which must cease to be done before the first steps can be taken toward righting the wrongs, curing the ills, and wiping out the disgrace to us of the present conditions of our Indians.

Cheating, robbing, breaking promises—these three are clearly things which must cease to be done. One more thing, also, and that is the refusal of the protection of the law to the Indian’s rights of property, “of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

When these four things have ceased to be done, time, statesmanship, philanthropy, and Christianity can slowly and surely do the rest. Till these four things have ceased to be done, statesmanship and philanthropy alike must work in vain, and even Christianity can reap but small harvest.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Why did the federal government repeatedly violate its treaties with the various Indian tribes, according to Jackson?
2. Why did Jackson oppose the granting of immediate citizenship to all Indians?

The Dawes Act (1887)

The relentless advance of settlers into the West created constant tensions with Native Americans and sparked numerous wars during the post–Civil War era. President Rutherford B. Hayes acknowledged in 1877 that most “of our Indian wars have had their origin in broken promises and acts of injustice on our part.” As a result of such growing concern, federal policy toward the Indians seemingly grew more benevolent. The Dawes Act of 1887, named after its sponsor, Senator Henry L. Dawes of Massachusetts, was intended to improve the lot of the Indians by providing them with private property and opportunities for citizenship. But most of the land grants were inadequate, and the emphasis on individual land ownership eroded tribal unity.

From *United States Statutes at Large*, 24:388–91.

An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, that in all cases where any tribe or band of Indians has been, or shall hereafter be, located upon any reservation created for their use, either by treaty stipulation or by virtue of an act of Congress or executive order setting apart the same for their use, the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized . . . to allot the lands in said reservation in severalty to any Indian located thereon in quantities as follows:

To each head of a family, one-quarter of a section;

To each single person over eighteen years of age, one-eighth of a section;

To each orphan child under eighteen years of age, one-eighth of a section; and,

To each other single person under eighteen years now living, or who may be born prior to the date of the order of the President directing an allotment of the lands embraced in any reservation, one-sixteenth of a section. . . .

Sec. 5. That upon the approval of the allotments provided for in the act by the Secretary of the Interior, he shall . . . declare that the United States does and will hold the land thus allotted, for the period of twenty-five years, in trust for the sole use and benefit of the Indian to whom such allotment shall have been made, . . . and that at the expiration of said period the United States will convey the same by patent to said Indian, or his heirs as aforesaid, in fee, discharged of such trust and free of all charge or incumbrance whatsoever. . . .

Sec. 6. That upon the completion of said allotments and the patenting of the lands to said allottees, each and every member of the respective

bands or tribes of Indians to whom allotments have been made shall have the benefit of and be subject to the laws, both civil and criminal, of the State or Territory in which they may reside; . . . And every Indian born within the territorial limits of the United States to whom allotments shall have been made under the provisions of this act, or under any law or treaty, and every Indian born within the territorial limits of the United States who has voluntarily taken up, within said limits, his residence separate and apart from any tribe of Indians therein, and has adopted the habits of civilized life, is hereby declared to be a citizen of the United States, and is entitled to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of such citizens, whether said Indian has been or not, by birth or otherwise, a member of any tribe of Indians within the territorial limits of the United States without in any manner impairing or otherwise affecting the right of any such Indian to tribal or other property. . . .

Sec. 10. That nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to affect the right and power of Congress to grant the right of way through any lands granted to an Indian, or a tribe of Indians, for railroads, or other highways, or telegraph lines, for the public use, or to condemn such lands to public uses, upon making just compensation. . . .

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How might the emphasis on private property in the Dawes Act have conflicted with Native American customs?
2. Why did Congress feel the need to retain title to the land allotments for twenty-five years?
3. To qualify for citizenship under the Dawes Act, Native Americans had to adopt "the habits of civilized life." Assess the meaning and implications of such a standard.

FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER

FROM *The Frontier in American History* (1893)

More than any other scholar, historian Frederick Jackson Turner influenced attitudes toward the role of the West in shaping American values and institutions. Born in Portage, Wisconsin, in 1861, he taught at the University of Wisconsin from 1889 until 1910, when he joined Harvard's faculty. In 1893 he presented his "frontier thesis" to the American Historical Society. Turner claimed that the process of western settlement was the defining characteristic of American society. Yet he concluded that at the end of the nineteenth century the frontier era had ended, and he worried that its beneficial effects would be lost to future generations of Americans. His frontier thesis was widely accepted. Today, however, historians criticize him for ignoring the role of women, evading the moral issues associated with the exploitation of the Native Americans, and asserting a simplistic connection between geography and political ideology.

From *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1920), pp. 1-4, 22-23, 29-31, 32, 37-38.

Immigration -
How we diverged
from England -

In a recent bulletin of the Superintendent of the Census for 1890 appear these significant words: "Up to and including 1880 the country had a frontier of settlement, but at present the unsettled area has been so broken into by isolated bodies of settlement that there can hardly be said to be a frontier line. In the discussion of its extent, its westward movement, etc., it can not, therefore, any longer have a place in census reports." This brief official statement marks the closing of a great historic movement. Up to our own day American history has been in a large degree the history of the colonization of the Great West. The existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the advance of American settlement westward explain American development.

Behind institutions, behind constitutional forms and modifications, lie the vital forces that call these organs into life and shape them to meet changing conditions. The peculiarity of American institutions is the fact that they have been compelled to adapt themselves to the changes of an expanding people—to the changes involved in

crossing a continent, in winning a wilderness, and in developing at each area of this progress out of the primitive economic and political conditions of the frontier into the complexity of city life. Said Calhoun¹ in 1817, "we are great, and rapidly—I was about to say fearfully—growing!" So saying, he touched the distinguishing feature of American life.

* * *

In the case of most nations, however, the development has occurred in a limited area; and if the nation has expanded, it has met other growing peoples whom it has conquered. But in the case of the United States we have a different phenomenon. Limiting our attention to the Atlantic coast, we have the familiar phenomenon of the evolution of institutions in a limited area, such as the rise of representative government; the differentiation of simple colonial governments into complex organs; the progress from primitive industrial society,

¹ South Carolina statesman John C. Calhoun (1782-1850).

without division of labor, up to manufacturing civilization. But we have in addition to this a recurrence of the process of evolution in each western area reached in the process of expansion. Thus American development has exhibited not merely advance along a single line, but a return to primitive conditions on a continually advancing frontier line, and a new development for that area.

American social development has been continually beginning over again on the frontier. This perennial rebirth, this fluidity of American life, this expansion westward with its new opportunities, its continuous touch with the simplicity of primitive society, furnish the forces dominating American character. The true point of view in the history of this nation is not the Atlantic coast, it is the Great West. . . .

In this advance, the frontier is the outer edge of the wave—the meeting point between savagery and civilization. . . . The most significant thing about the American frontier is, that it lies at the hither edge of free land.

* * *

In the settlement of America we have to observe how European life entered the continent, and how America modified and developed that life and reacted on Europe. Our early history is the study of European germs developing in an American environment. . . . The frontier is the line of most rapid and effective Americanization. The wilderness masters the colonist. It finds him a European in dress, industries, tools, modes of travel, and thought. It takes him from the railroad car and puts him in the birch canoe. It strips off the garments of civilization and arrays him in the hunting shirt and the moccasin. It puts him in the log cabin of the Cherokee and Iroquois and runs an Indian palisade around him. Before long he has gone to planting Indian corn and plowing with a sharp stick; he shouts the war cry and takes the scalp in orthodox Indian fashion. In short, at the frontier the environment is at first too strong for the man. He must accept the conditions which it furnishes, or perish, and so he fits himself into the Indian clearings and follows the Indian trails. Lit-

tle by little he transforms the wilderness, but the outcome is not the old Europe. . . .

The fact is, that here is a new product that is American. At first, the frontier was the Atlantic coast. It was the frontier of Europe in a very real sense. Moving westward the frontier becomes more and more American. . . . Thus the advance of the frontier has meant a steady movement away from the influence of Europe, a steady growth of independence on American lines. And to study this advance, the men who grew up under these conditions, and the political, economic, and social results of it, is to study the really American part of our history.

* * *

First, we note that the frontier promoted the formation of a composite nationality for the American people. The coast was preponderantly English, but the later tides of continental immigration flowed across to the free lands. . . . In the crucible of the frontier the immigrants were Americanized, liberated, and fused into a mixed race, English in neither nationality nor characteristics. The process has gone on from the early days to our own. . . .

But the most important effect of the frontier has been in the promotion of democracy here and in Europe. As has been indicated, the frontier is productive of individualism. Complex society is precipitated by the wilderness into a kind of primitive organization based on the family. The tendency is anti-social. It produces antipathy to control, and particularly to any direct control.

The frontier States that came into the Union in the first quarter of a century of its existence came in with democratic suffrage provisions, and had reactive effects of the highest importance upon the older States whose peoples were being attracted there. An extension of the franchise became essential. . . .

But the democracy born of free land, strong in selfishness and individualism, intolerant of administrative experience and education, and pressing individual liberty beyond its proper bounds, has its

dangers as well as its benefits. Individualism in America has allowed a laxity in regard to governmental affairs which has rendered possible the spoils system and all the manifest evils that follow from the lack of a highly developed civil spirit. . . .

The works of travelers along each frontier from colonial days onward describe certain common traits, and these traits have, while softening down, still persisted as survivals in the place of their origin, even when a higher social organization succeeded. The result is that to the frontier the American intellect owes its striking characteristics. The coarseness and strength combined with acuteness and inquisitiveness; that practical, inventive turn of mind, quick to find expedients; that masterful grasp of material things, lacking in the artistic but powerful to effect great ends; that restless nervous energy; that dominant individualism, working for good and for evil, and withal that buoyancy and exuberance which comes with freedom—these are traits of the frontier, or traits called out elsewhere because of the existence of the frontier.

Since the days when the fleet of Columbus sailed into the waters of the New World, America has been another name for opportunity, and the people of the United States have taken their tone from the incessant expansion which has not only been open but has even been forced upon them. He would be a rash prophet who should assert that the

expansive character of American life has now entirely ceased. Movement has been its dominant fact, and, unless this training has no effect upon a people, the American energy will continually demand a wider field for its exercise. . . . yet, in spite of environment, and in spite of custom, each frontier did indeed furnish a new field of opportunity. . . . And now, four centuries from the discovery of America, at the end of a hundred years of life under the Constitution, the frontier has gone, and with its going has closed the first period of American history.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What do you think Turner meant by the term *Americanization*?
2. According to Turner, in what crucial respect did western states differ from those on the Atlantic coast?
3. Turner equated the frontier with the American character. Does his set of national characteristics accurately describe Americans today? Explain.
4. In suggesting that the frontier was ultimately synonymous with a "new field of opportunity," what did Turner imply about other living environments in nineteenth-century American life?

What did he think
the "new field of
opportunity" would be?

20 THE EMERGENCE OF URBAN AMERICA

During the second half of the nineteenth century, two revolutions—the scientific and the urban-industrial—transformed social and intellectual life. The prestige of science increased enormously as researchers announced a dazzling array of new discoveries. Remarkable new technological developments—the telegraph, railroad, and electric dynamos and lights—and spectacular achievements in industrial engineering such as the Brooklyn Bridge and majestic skyscrapers provided conspicuous physical evidence of the transforming effects of science and engineering.

*Modern scientists opened up a gulf of doubt about many inherited truths and spiritual convictions. When the English biologist Charles Darwin published *On the Origin of Species* in 1859, the *New York Times* reported that the book contained “arguments and inferences so revolutionary” that they promised “a radical reconstruction of the fundamental doctrines of natural history.” Darwin’s provocative thesis argued that the “modification” of species occurred through a ceaseless process of “natural selection.” This challenged the biblical story of all animal species originating in an act of divine creation that forever fixed their forms. In Darwin’s world, new species were not “special creations” of God; they emerged randomly from the struggle for existence. Natural selection, he implied, was arbitrary, capricious, and devoid of ultimate meaning—a long, gradual process of intense competition and hereditary development without divine plan or purpose.*

*Darwin’s concept of evolutionary change challenged established beliefs about nature and about providential design and life processes. “If this be truth,” growled one college president, “let me live in ignorance.” As time passed, however, more and more people accepted many aspects of evolutionary naturalism. “This scientific current,” a writer in the *North American Review* concluded, “is moving more or less all schools of thought.” Sociologists such as William Graham Sumner promoted what came to be called social Darwinism, arguing that just as “survival of the fittest” was the balancing mechanism in the natural world, so, too, should unfettered competition and free enterprise determine the fate of human society.*