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ABSTRACT

This thesis is a criticism of chroniclers. As is said at the end of the introduction, this research not only criticizes poor investigative work (whether it be intentionally malicious, or simply lazy) from the past, but also reinforces a standard of expectation for those who wish to go into any field of research and/or writing. As writers are the last defense against the erasure of history, it stands to measure that there should be a higher expectation of those of them granted the authority to chronicle history. However, it is obvious based on the case studies of Native American lynchings throughout the thesis, that there continues to be a problem with accuracy and execution in the field of historical chronicling. For this reason, this thesis was written to contend with such criticisms. This thesis provides a historiography on literature about lynching, over twenty case-studies on Native Americans who were lynched, a small grounded history on some multi-naming traditions, and a question about the importance of spectatorship in public, communal acts of violence.
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Chapter One: Introduction of Terms and Philosophies

The largest mass hanging in the history of the United States occurred on December 26th, 1862. On that day, thirty-eight Dakota Native Americans were hanged after a hasty military tribunal was held to sentence 303 of the Native men, and Abraham Lincoln even more hastily commuted 264 of the Dakota. I begin this paper, here, on that fateful day in Mankato, Minnesota, because this is where I typically start my classroom conversations. I begin here, at the end for many of the men of the Dakota tribe, because I want my students and readers to start asking what their role in history is and what their roles could be. For instance, many of my students do not know a single person’s name from this massive execution barring President Abraham Lincoln (even though another name for the Dakota Uprising is “Little Crow’s War”). The scope of this ignorance of Native American history became apparent to me at this point as I began to realize that it covered not only the events surrounding the executions, but also the individual identities of Native Americans.

One such question I like to ask is, “Why do you think the Dakota men were hanged?” Generally, the responses are typical, I would claim, of a student in the American education system: “Did the Indians attack a “white” colony?” Of course, this answer is the sanitized and brutally simplified version that the system has fed, time and again, to budding students. I then will typically explain that the American government had encroached upon Dakota land and violated treaties that led to mass starvations and hardships for the Native Americans. Generally, the students take it in stride because they are used to the “revisionist” history. However, I do not end there.
I like to then explain to my students *how* the thirty-eight men were killed. This is done not to make a spectacle of the violence, but to aid in the most important point of my first lecture. When I explain to my students that the mass execution was “performed” in a spectacular situation of violence from a single scaffold platform, my students are rightfully shocked. “Why go to such effort to massacre a large number of men at once? Did the town build a new scaffold just for this event?” These are fabulous questions that I usually receive from my very confused students, because many think they are coming to speak about the syllabus on that first day of class, and are wondering how it is they signed up for this. I like to then explain that after the Dakota men were pronounced dead, the bodies were buried in a mass grave on a riverbank and I ask them if they think there is a purpose to burying men in a grave *en masse*. My students are much more shy, typically, on that first day, so I always give them a moment to ponder before someone, that one brave student, finally asks, “Is it so that the grave won’t have a name?” It is a great question, one I cannot answer for sure, but something I like to jump on and ask the students to speculate further with. I believe that they were buried *en masse* in order to leave them nameless. A mass grave removes the possibility of individual identification; equally so, the Dakota men have been left nameless in the history books, just as they were left nameless without a gravestone to mark their place of rest. I begin my classes, whether it be an English or History class, at this event because I believe it is an interdisciplinary example of how important our role is as writers. Writing is a form of immortalization. If there is no record of a life, whether it be physical or through memory, how can someone *live* on? For this reason, I always begin by explaining the power my
students have to them. From there, I further clarify how I expect them to continue and change their research habits. I ask them to double check and make sure names are spelled correctly, I ask them to explain how it is that they “cannot find an author” in a book they have chosen to research, and I ask them to question the intentions of the writer(s) they speak to. In doing so, I realized that I must also adhere to the same advice. If I ask my students to question textbooks—and to subsequently question the writers of these history textbooks—I must do the same.

It was easy to figure out what I wanted to write about because I knew the topics I liked to teach. I am interested in spectacular violence and how violence is chronicled. What I was unsure of was what I could write about within this topic. For instance, should I take the legal historian route and write about executions, or should I look at extralegal violence? Almost immediately, my question was answered when a student asked, “Did you know Native Americans were lynched?” I did know, but seeing the look in their eyes made me realize that I may be in the minority of persons who did, in fact, know. The Dakota War and subsequent hanging of thirty-eight Dakota men was done, technically, legally, so they were not examples of lynching but of a massive power differential between Native Americans and the American government. However, I realized that the violences enacted against Native Americans were almost always considered legal, in my memory, probably because of this power differential. I thought, then, about instances of legal violence I had found to be suspiciously spectacular. For instance, an example of a “legal” murder would be the case of Hannah Ocuish, who is the youngest person legally executed in America and thus, as a Pequot, she is also the
youngest Native American child legally hanged in the United States. At the age of
twelve, Hannah was accused of and tried for the murder of Eunice Bolles, a six-year-old
daughter of a wealthy farmer. Knowing that Ocuish had an intellectual disability did not
sway the court from executing the Native American Pequot girl. The pastor who gave the
sermon, Henry Channing, and who was the Unitarian clergyman and author who spoke at
the execution, admitted that he:

preached at [her] 1786 execution, publishing the sermon under the title *God
Admonishing His People of their Duty ... a Sermon ... Occasioned by the
Execution of Hannah Ocuish, a Mulatto Girl, Aged 12 Years and 9 Months, for
the Murder of Eunice Bolles, Aged 6 Years and 6 Months.*

In the sermon, the parents of Hannah were criticized and reminded not to neglect their
children’s religious studies. The text, *God Admonishing his People of their Duty, as
Parents and Masters*, has a particular literary tone about it. Instead of Channing setting
up the work as a retelling the history of this trial, Channing sets it up like a detective
novel. The possible intention behind such a decision might be that Channing was looking
to sell the spectacle of the event, instead of simply chronicling something most might
find problematic as the story is about the hanging of a twelve-year-old child. For
example, Channing writes:

> On the 21st of July, 1786, at about 10 o’clock in the morning, the body of the
> murdered child was found in the public road leading from New-
> London to Norwich, lying on its face near to a wall ... The neighborhood turned
> out to hunt for the murderer; Hannah was questioned and claimed that she had
> seen four boys near the scene of the crime. When a search failed to turn them up,
> Hannah was interrogated again, and then taken to the Bolles home to be charged
> with homicide in the presence of the dead child. She burst into tears and

---

1 Henry Channing, *God Admonishing His People of their Duty ... a Sermon ... Occasioned by the Execution of Hannah Ocuish, a Mulatto Girl, Aged 12 Years and 9 Months, for the Murder of Eunice Bolles, Aged 6 Years and 6 Months.* (New-London, T. Green, 1786).
confessed. Only at this late point in the narrative is the reader offered a sequential account of the crime. Five weeks earlier, Eunice had reported Hannah for stealing fruit during the strawberry harvest, and Hannah had plotted revenge. Catching sight of her young enemy headed for school one morning, Hannah had lured Eunice from her path with a gift of calico, then beat and choked her to death.²

The hanging was, technically, legal. It was done in 1786, however, so this was before the professionalization of law enforcement in the United States. What this means, of course, is that the investigators involved in this murder case would have been local people who were, more than likely, higher up in the social ladder. That being said, this still constitutes as a hanging and not as a lynching because it was considered lawful.

However, the reason the tone of such a document matters is because this text on the hanging, one of the few primary accounts left, is extremely biased against Native Americans; especially because the Native Americans did not subscribe to the religion of the writer, Henry Channing. The hanging is a multi-faceted issue of spectatorship. From the onset, we, the readers of the primary documents, are reading a text clearly biased against non-monotheistic religions and also a text which was written by a person in the town, but not someone who might have taken the account of the child with any sympathy because Hannah: 1) Killed a white child who was born into a wealthy family; 2) Was not from a wealthy family; 3) Had an intellectual disability. This case, while complicated for many reasons, is a case of law (technically).

Lynching is much more complicated. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, lynching is defined as: “To condemn and punish by lynch law. In early use, implying chiefly the infliction of punishment such as whipping, tarring and feathering, or

² Channing, “God Admonishing.”
the like; now only, to inflict sentence of death by lynch law.” Lynch Law is defined as, “The practice of inflicting summary punishment upon an offender, by a self-constituted court armed with no legal authority; it is now limited to the summary execution of one charged with some flagrant offence.” A more known example of lynching is Olaf, whose story will be spoken about more in Chapter Three, though it may be too far a stretch to say that this lynching is more well-known just because the public event occurred in front of over five hundred people. Due to the historical lack of knowledge on these events and cases, I will have to foreground most of the theory I work with by looking at writers such as Saidiyah Hartman and Sandy Alexandre because their perceptions on the writings of lynching have informed my work thus far, even though they primarily deal in the theory of African American lynchings.

As I am informed by two predominantly literary theoreticians, this paper does not always follow the traditional historical narrative format. As such, I do try to foreground my historical topic in such a way as to be accessible to audiences from a variety of disciplines, but the main problem with such a task is the topic of Spectatorship. Spectatorship is one of the most important parts of lynching, itself, and there is a looming difficulty of assigning rules/laws to the activity. For instance, Spectatorship is a convoluted and complex topic because Spectatorship proffers an apparent contradiction. The Spectator exerts power over a situation or event by being physically present, but, by

---


definition, does not act. Thus, the Spectator is an agent who acts without action; the Spectator exerts power through presence alone, calling into question heretofore accepted definitions of the historical agent. The Spectator is the one who engages in an interaction without direct interference; the one who exists without interactive action, through presence alone. The Spectator follows within the mob and exerts power without the necessity for speech or individual action. Spectatorship is a universal structure of power among human societies, providing the necessary mechanism to understand communal regulation among disparate communities, which is significant in the case of the geographically rambling and culturally diverse communities throughout the South and West. This is a problem I face when utilizing the Intellectual history portion of this information and trying to write to these issues. However, even studying through a broader “American History” lens has many of its own complications because some historians believe that Southern History is distinct within American history. The case studies from both Chapter Three and Chapter Four go across the United States and cannot be relegated to only “Southern” or “Western” history because the action of lynching cannot be relegated to a specific region.

Chapter Two is dedicated to laying the foundational groundwork behind some of the theory and history that this thesis rests upon. From authors Sandy Alexandre, Saidiyah Hartman, and Amy Wood, this chapter grapples with existing theory laid out in African American lynching studies to try to create a conversation between the robust history on African American lynching studies to the less-than-robust history of Native American lynching studies. To do so, this chapter will lay the framework of Alexandre
in *Properties of Violence* next to Harman’s earlier work *Scenes of Subjection*. Following this, the chapter will then delve into the more practical imagery posed in Amy Wood’s *Lynching and Spectacle*. This will allow for a deep-dive connection into the primary sources found in the next section.

In Chapter Three, I intend to more clearly distinguish between lynching and hanging across the United States. I will be looking into ten case studies of lynchings which were, without a doubt, outside of the law. To do so, I will first provide a straightforward factual narrative in Chapter Three. This will mean answering questions about political issues of the region, and it will include looking at the victim and their connection to the location they are in. Were they travelers? Were they locals? Were they full-blooded Native Americans or, as was the case with Hannah Ocuish, were they “half-breeds” according to the news articles? These sorts of questions matter not only because the context of the story matters, but also because the importance of these individuals not being named cannot go unnoticed. This will not be so in Chapter Four.

In Chapter Four, the goal will be to examine ten nameless victims of lynching. I will try to configure just as comprehensive stories around the instances of extralegal violence, sans the name of the victim. The ultimate goal of this chapter is to breathe the story of these persons back into the history books, and also to ask why the name may be missing in the first place. I do this for a number of reasons, but mostly because I have noticed a trend in a lack of naming of these Native Americans, and a lack of historical work done around them. I have a few theories as to why there is little to no work on the atrocities committed against Native Americans as it pertains to lynching, which I will
explore at the end of this thesis. For now, there is a gap in the education system, and the only way to fill it is to speak about it, write about it, and, of course, produce other forms of art about it, and this gap is the lack of knowledge on Native American violences, as a whole.

In Chapter Five, the conversation will turn to naming practices of Native Americans, as a more general collective. To do so, I will begin this section with a conversation on what a name means by using Jean-Jacques Rosseau as a base to explain social power, language, and reason and how that works within the framework of the product: a name. Within this research, important voices on the topic of multi-naming practices of Native Americans, such as Sara Huggins and Dr. Waugaman, will be studied to better explicate how the lack of crediting a name to a victim of lynching may help to make the victim “twice-murdered.” The second portion of this chapter will ask how not naming a victim may hinder the historical record. One of the most important reasons for this conversation is that it will compare namelessness to groundlessness and see if there is an inherent social connection between the two statuses.

This will then bring the reader to Chapter Six. This chapter will connect the twenty-three total case studies done on the named and unnamed Native American victims


5 This also fits into Michel-Rolph Trouillot’s *Silencing The Past*. Particularly on page twenty-six, Trouillot says, “Silences enter the process of historical production at four crucial moments: the moment of fact creation (the making of sources); the moment of fact assembly (the making of archives); the moment of fact retrieval (the making of narratives); and the moment of retrospective significance (the making of history in the final instance).” I might contest that being “twice-murdered” fits rather well into all of these points. The event is the creation of the fact. The newspaper finding comments is the second. The newspaper being published is the third. I am, by the virtue of writing and speculating on this event, participating in the fourth.
of lynching between chapters three and five, and put them into the context of theoretical questions posed mainly by students and professors of African American lynching by looking at one of the most important parts of lynching: the spectator. In this portion, I will participate in a thematic engagement between the terms Voyeurism, Spectatorship, and Honor, and then offer my own thoughts on how spectatorship affects the responsibilities of the person performing, or witnessing, the action of lynching. I will then extend this argument to encapsulate those normally considered inactive spectators in this section, such as those who watch lynchings from the background, and/or those who photograph the lynching.

Most of the chapters proceed in a chronological fashion. This helps to situate legal systems, political problems and practices, as well as to most simply explain these atrocities in a way palatable for the reader. Due to many of the criticisms I make throughout this paper against historical chroniclers (i.e. newspaper article writers and historians), I make it a point to write with intentionality and foreground this information with as much primary documentation as possible. The end goal of this research is not only to criticize potentially poor investigative work (whether it be intentionally malicious, or simply lazy) from the past, but also to reinforce a standard of expectation for those who wish to go into any field of research and/or writing. As writers are the last defense against the erasure of history, it stands to measure that there should be a higher expectation of those of them granted the authority to chronicle history. However, it is obvious based on the case studies of Native American lynchings throughout the thesis,
that there continues to be a problem in accuracy and execution in the field of historical chronicling.
Chapter Two: Literary Background and a Short Historiography

Many works of literature and history have formed this thesis. In many ways, this literature most closely follows Sandy Alexandre’s formulation of writing because I also attempt to write to an interdisciplinary audience. Organizationally, this chapter will similarly follow Alexandre’s construction of text. For example, Alexandre begins with a historiography in her Introduction and Chapter 1 which covers a multitude of timelines and genres of work. Some notable scholars include Michel-Rolph Trouillot, Ida B. Wells, Dylan Pennigroth, Amy Wood, Colin Dayan, Saidya Hartman, Stephan Palmié, Brent Hayes Edwards, Grace Hale, Stephanie Smallwood, and Marisa J. Fuentes, who all provide invaluable work that identifies and addresses the role of white supremacy in the production of historical knowledge. These various authors come from a wide range of disciplines, largely because this was Alexandre’s goal. She very explicitly claims that *The Properties of Violence* was written as an “interdisciplinary study with a broad appeal” because she wants to show how lynching, as a tactic and tool of violence and fear, “has been able to gain a foothold in these multiple fields of study.”

The book, similarly to the thesis, opens with the above academic context in a historiographical setting, and then Alexandre proceeds to go into the more philosophically engaging questions of: What space is black space? Are black bodies even self-possessed? As Alexandre adds to Grace Hale’s work, “even the very bodies of African Americans were subject to invasion by whites” and these very bodies have

---

become “foreign” and “strange” because of this constant inability for black persons to claim “a place” of their own, and instead finding themselves relegated to a space to be used by white “owners”. Alexandre’s approach in looking at black bodies as objects of possession in light of lynching is an observation that strongly situates art such as James Allen’s and Toni Morrison’s within the historical context. Alexandre is not asking her readers to think of black bodies merely as possessed by white bodies, she is telling them that black bodies are objects of spectacle and nature. The black body is something spectated at from afar until it is destroyed by a social construction: “the defining moment in…visual culture [is] that moment when we realize that the seeming natural visual image is in all actuality a social construction.” To historically contextualize this, black bodies have been manufactured to be fungible so as to be possessable, and easily adapted for the pleasure of white spectators. As Alexandre explains, “lynching’s leavings—its collateral damages” persist because, as she rightly articulates, justice cannot prevail from within the same system of violence that existed during the time of slavery, lynching, and Jim Crow segregation. Once again, Alexandre is telling the audience how black bodies cannot find justice, nor peace, in the same system which institutionally backed slavery. Black bodies are, to this day, still suffering the after-effects of slavery and punishment, economic depravity, and, of course, groundlessness. This largely literary approach is not without historical context. Even more importantly, possibly, the question persists as to how historians are to write about enslaved (and even free) black subjects without replicating

8 Ibid, 132.
9 Ibid, 14.
the violence of slavery, racial oppression, and archival reproduction, as Saidiyah Hartman brings up in her book *Scenes of Subjection*. The question, unfortunately, remains unanswered in Alexandre’s book, and yet it also allows this author to look into another nuanced question: How do Native Americans fit into this already situated framework, and why is there so little narrative on this topic thus far when there is such robust commentary on the dispossession of African Americans in the context of lynching?

In Saidiyah Hartman’s *Scenes of Subjection*, Hartman tells her readers that continuing to subject dead victims to past lynchings through photographs, postcards, and dramatic reenactments, is akin to asking these bodies to perform their deaths solely for the entertainment it brings to white persons. Scholars have not yet applied this conceptual insight to the lynching of Native Americans. Specifically, Hartman grounds much of her research and commentary on how the roots of slavery ground her position on bodily fungibility and dispossession in the black community. However, Native Americans experienced lynching during and prior to the Jim Crow era, and Native Americans also suffered from prejudices against their physical appearances and cultural backgrounds in similar ways to African Americans. For instance, in a clipping from the *Sacramento Daily Record Union* on April 30th of 1890, there is a section that details the lynching of "Tacho."

Tacho was lynched by an angry group of ranchers in Banning, California from a telegraph pole because, they claimed, he stole a horse and some cattle.\(^{10}\) This is an eerily

\(^{10}\) *Sacramento Daily Record Union*, (*Library of Congress "Chronicling America" digital newspaper project. April 30, 1890)*,
similar narrative to some of the cases found in Alexandre’s work. Alexandre almost callously tells the reader that “lynching is exile on the cheap” and then immediately jumps into a conversation on how economic precarity leads white men to lynch and how black bodies, no longer productionally useful, are literally stripped of their human skin at the pleasure of white men because black bodies are still the main source of entertainment for the white populace, even though the form of entertainment has gone from the production garnered from slavery to the social productivity found in lynching.\textsuperscript{11} Utilizing the bannister of extralegal violence for the sake of “preserving economic prestige” is very much within the purview of white supremacy during the Jim Crow era, though the commentary on the entertainment value of such violence is a dark facet of history generally regarded within texts on racial persecutions. For example, in \textit{Lynching and Spectacle: Witnessing Racial Violence}, Amy Louise Wood describes the lynching of Henry Smith: “The mob paraded [Henry Smith] through the city streets before bringing him to the scaffold, where men […] tortured him for nearly an hour before burning [Smith] to death…These spectators were not merely curious onlookers; rather, the sheer size of the crowd reflected that common heart and single impulse toward retribution.”\textsuperscript{12} Lynching is about more than the death of a man or woman on a scaffold. Lynching is about the public entertainment value and the passing on of communal expectations to black bodies as much as it is to white bodies. However, Native Americans, much like Hispanics and Asian Americans, are generally forgotten in these conversations save for a

\begin{footnotes}
  \footnotetext[11]{Alexandre, \textit{The Properties}. 23.}
\end{footnotes}
few footnotes in history. One reason for this is that Native Americans, like Mexicans and Chinese victims, were falsely put into a bipartite categorization by the Tuskegee Institute at the historically black college in Tuskegee, Alabama: black or white. This is an injustice to not only the marginalized groups whose members are forgotten, but also to the black community itself.

The largest injustice (after the actions of violence, themselves) is the lack of attention these acts of violence have to this day. Michael J. Pfeifer, a history professor at the City University of New York’s (CUNY) John Jay College of Criminal Justice, suspects that the 137 Native Americans identified in the MonroeWorksToday map project (which describes not only where the Native Americans were lynched, but also the reason given for the extralegal violence) is too small a number. As recently as 2018, Pfeifer unearthed over twenty more cases of lynched Native Americans that had previously been ignored in historical examples of extralegal violences. The literature is largely silent on the spectacular/entertainment quality of Native American lynching. There are small, but notable, spaces for African Americans lynchings to be spoken about in literatures and in art, because African Americans were the primary recipients of these acts of violence, but the easily comparable nature of the two groups is largely absent in the conversation on extralegal violences. To be fair, there is literature on how Native Americans were viewed (similarly to black persons during these times) as bestial and primitive, someone less than human—less than white humans—and thus there is an opportunity for comparison and extension on this conversation to make the connections which seem obvious, yet are absent. For instance, in Hannah Durston’s story, written by Cotton Mathers, there is a
very positive reception to Durston’s killing and scalping of the ten Native Americans who had kidnapped her. Among the killed by Durston were six children, whom she did not regret her actions against. So much positive reception followed from the town, even, that Durston’s statue in Concord, New Hampshire is largely considered the first public memorialization of an American woman (and this statue is one of three built in her honor between 1861 and 1879). This is to say, there is a precedence in seeing public celebration occur for acts of violence enacted against Native Americans. Memorials still exist to serve in furthering the agenda the memorials substantiate with their very existence and, thus, these memorials push for a transcendent and continued spectacle of violence occurring in the United States against Native American groups and individuals. How does memorialization fit into Native American lynching stories, however?

Newspapers and postcards make up memorialization techniques of moments in time. They can pose complicated questions like, “Why is a person calling a lynching a “Barbeque” while smiling at the event?” or more simple questions like, “Why did the editor not catch the misspelling of a name?” Throughout the process of chronicling history, Native Americans have been vastly overlooked even though they suffered similar atrocities to that of African Americans during periods of lynching, even if, quantifiably, the number of African Americans lynched far outweighs that of Native Americans. However, and most interestingly, Native Americans victims have more often been

---

anonymous or misnamed when their murders are chronicled. To begin, I first turn to the primary documents I have found on the topic, beginning with Native Americans who have been named, to create a base for the reader to understand how similar the cases are between named and unnamed Native American victims of lynching.
Chapter Three: Case Studies of Named Native Americans Who Were Lynched

Native Americans were lynched. This statement should be neither controversial nor shocking. The most basic understanding of Native Americans’ and European colonists’ interaction in the United States is beset with phrases and words like, “small pox,” “rape,” and “genocide.” Yet, the historical record on Native American lynching in the United States between the 1840s and early 1900s, while not silent, is quiet compared to the robust historical literature on African American lynching. From Saidiyah Hartman to Sandy Alexandre, books on the violence against African Americans have flooded the literary market, though there are only maybe ten dense, book-length records on Native American lynchings and lynching sites. However, even the previous sentence is too generous because assigning a description to these texts as books on Native American lynchings would be an overstatement. While these texts, such as Lynchings in Oklahoma: Vigilantism and Racism in the Twin Territories and Oklahoma, 1830-1930 and Rough Justice: Lynching and American Society, 1874-1947, are invariably important in contextualizing the history of lynchings in the United States, both of these texts are general overviews of lynching which happen to have sections on Native Americans included within the bindings. Even a book solely on Native Americans, The Seminoles, by Edwin McReynolds, only covers a few extralegal violences enacted against Native Americans, and contextualizes them with art and cultural histories of the indigenous group which split during the Seminole Wars. The lack of a true text on Native American lynchings in the United States is both surprising and not surprising, given how businesses
such as Disney have trivialized and monolithically categorized Native American oral histories, cultural histories, and geographies.

In understanding why a single dense text on the history of Native American lynchings may not yet be written (while there is a saturation of texts in the market on African American lynching) it is first important to state the most obvious hindrance in writing such a piece: Lynching is seen as a continuation of slavery in America. The historical frequency of enslavement by white persons against Native Americans and African Americans in the United States are, yes, at vastly different percentages. While Native Americans slaves did exist, the sheer number of African slaves vastly overwhelms that of Native American chattel slaves. Frankly, this means that there is a strong historical connection between slavery and lynchings, chronologically, which can be worked into a text rather easily. The second point to make is that the number of African Americans lynched far exceeds the number of lynched Native Americans in the United States. While there is no single reason for extralegal violence (i.e. accusation of rape, murder, theft were all considered reasons for extralegal violence by the “right” mob), the perpetuation of such violences against African Americans numerically outweighed the violences against any other single minority (i.e. Asian-Americans, Italians, Mexicans, etc.). However, these ideas on the history of lynching need to be further complicated because simply saying that Native Americans were lynched less than African Americans is not reason enough for the history of their part in lynchings to be ignored.

While it is true that roughly 90% of lynchings which occurred on American soil were of African Americans, Native Americans were also victims of these extralegal
violences and, generally, Native Americans were almost always mischaracterized or only passively characterized by news outlets, government records, and grave stones. For instance, Native Americans were generally left “unnamed” or given a “nickname” by newspaper clippings who either could not find the actual name of the individual, or simply did not care to. While these clippings may be the best documents on the violent event currently, it is interesting to see how many different reporting areas registered these mob violences as lynchings against a white person when the extralegal violence in question occurred against a Native American. This particular conundrum makes it exceedingly difficult to figure out if the lynched was, in fact, white or Native American when doing research, and begs the question of why these violences were recorded in that manner.

Another issue a historian might confront is that there is very little information available on capital punishments for Native Americans in total. When looking at violences against Native Americans, it is difficult to determine if the violence enacted is in fact a “lynching” or a “legal hanging,” and it is very difficult to ascertain the customary capital punishment procedures against Native Americans. The lack of documentation problematizes differentiations between legal hangings and special cases of extralegal violence.¹⁴

¹⁴ Lynchings are generally regarded as extralegal, or something done without the consent of the authorities and a fair judicial process. This is not necessarily the case with hangings, though hanging is one way a lynching can occur.
The third issue a historian may confront is if the person whom the violence was enacted against could not be named, and their ethnicity could not be qualified correctly (because they were marked as white), it stands to reason that their tribal membership would not be inventoried. This lack of inventory severely impacts sociocultural distinctions among tribal groups, and hinders any research which may look to explore the nuances of executions, criminality, and violences. This can be seen in David Baker’s “American Indian Executions in Historical Context.” Therefore this thesis will attempt to create a larger commentary solely on Native American lynching victims to fill this significant gap, but also to better create a cultural narrative surrounding lynching violences and explore these sometimes thoughtless decisions by academics and journalists. This specific chapter will work in a chronological fashion from 1848 to 1901 to look at ten documented Native American lynchings. In this chapter, I will look to compare the political histories of the lynched as well as the motivations behind the mob attacks as recorded by the primary sources behind the incidents, while giving these case studies a chance to have the stories of the lynched at the forefront of the conversation.

In 1848, Wisconsin was finally admitted as a full-fledged state in the American Union. Prior to this separation, Minnesotans had been fervently pushing to withdraw from Wisconsin and “establish their own political entity.” This attempt at state separation may seem like it has little to do with Native Americans, yet these political tensions led to further encroachment on Native American lands during this time period.

---

despite a “treaty” enacted in 1804 which should have prevented this sort of violation. The political turmoil between Native American groups, more specifically the Sauk and Fox groups, and the Wisconsin officials began in 1804 when the Wisconsin government forced the Sauk and Fox tribes in modern-day southern Wisconsin territory to cede traditional Native American land claims in a treaty neither the Sauk nor the Fox tribes agreed to. Tensions climbed until the 1825 Treaty of Prairie du Chien. This treaty, which was created and facilitated by the United States government, was an attempt by the government to stop warfare amongst the tribes by establishing specific boundaries between Native American groups in Wisconsin. The reason for this attempt at pacification is simple: the inter-tribal warfare amongst Native American groups was bad for the fur business. However, as can probably be assumed, this illusion of peace could not last when the government was continuing to trespass upon Native American land without the consent of the tribes. The Black Hawk War of 1832 followed, and the Menominee (which was considered the largest Native American population of Wisconsin at the time) suffered a loss of nearly 11,600 acres of land along the lower Fox River because of a forced land sale by the Wisconsin government. This sort of dispassionate business invasion and outright thievery led to horrific and gruesome murders of Native Americans in years following, while the governor tried to modernize the land the state outright stole from the tribes (see Appendix 1). One such example of a lynching in this

area occurred in June of 1848 in the St. Croix Valley. According to the Wisconsin Tribune newspaper, a twenty-two-year old Anishinaabe man, Paunais, was accused of murdering a white man who was a business (probably fur) trader. A mob hanged the man, illegally trying him, in front of up to three hundred spectators. Some of the spectators, according to the article, were his mother, brother, wife and several tribal leaders (see Appendix 3-6). The Wisconsin Tribune's report is as follows:

The citizens are without a state or even a territorial government, with no courts or judges to hold them, and so frequent has been the case that Indian murderers of white men have gone unpunished that ...citizens were determined to ...show to the Chippeways [Anishinaabe] that their barbarous acts can no longer be committed with impunity.

What is most interesting about the case, as among most cases of violences enacted against a minority in the United States, is the automatic villainization of not just the accused murderer, Paunais, or “Little Saux”, but also the Native American (Indian) population. However, the fear of Native Americans in Wisconsin is not entirely unexpected when Native Americans were trying to fight the trespass onto their traditional lands. Violence against minorities out of fear of minorities is a common trope in American history.

---


One such example of these sorts of preventative actions can be seen during the California Gold Rush (1848-1855). This period in California history was fraught with violences against minorities during the same period of time in which Little Saux was being hanged under the accusation of murdering a white male trader. In California, white miners ruthlessly exploited Native American workers, but even worse was the cold-blooded slaughters of Native Americans which occurred as early as 1849 but were publicly endorsed by the California governor, Peter Burnett, in 1851:

The love of fame, as well as the love of property, are common to all men; and war and theft are established customs among the Indian races generally, as they are among all poor and savage tribes of men, as a means to attain to the one, and to procure a supply of the other. When brought into contact with a civilized race of men, they readily learn the use of their implements and manufactures, but they do not readily learn the art of making them…The white man, to whom time is money, and who labors hard all day to create the comforts of life, cannot sit up all night to watch his property; and after being robbed a few times, he becomes desperate, and resolves upon a war of extermination. This is the common feeling of our people who have lived upon the Indian frontier. The two races are kept asunder by so many causes, and having no ties of marriage or consanguinity to unite them, they must ever remain at enmity.

That a war of extermination will continue to be waged between the races until the Indian race becomes extinct must be expected. While we cannot anticipate this result but with painful regret, the inevitable destiny of the race is beyond the power or wisdom of man to avert.  

Thirty-years later, in April of 1881, Native American men were still be exterminated in cruel, public, and extralegal ways. After being accursed of murder and rape, Francisco Jimeno from Lompoc, California was lynched in front of a crowd of one hundred people. As can be seen in the Morning Press article of 1881, Jimeno told his version of the story

---

22 Peter Burnett. “State of the State Address” (State of the State Address), https://governors.library.ca.gov(addresses/s_01-Burnett2.html)
and when he did not give a satisfactory account of the murder of Mrs. Sargent, the crowd tied a noose around his neck, wrapped it around the tree branch, and pulled his feet off the ground for forty seconds. After violently torturing Jimeno, the crowd believed it had the right and responsibility to lynch the man to death (see Appendix 7-13). While the accusation of murder and rape are far too often the reasons inciting mob violences, these violences were normally perpetuated in front of crowds and these crowds often tortured the victim prior to “enacting justice” and then boasted about their retribution in a media format (i.e. Newspaper, journals, postcards, etc.). However, there are often discrepancies to this point.

One such discrepancy occurring in Lawrence, Kansas in March of 1886 is the story of Mungall. Twice, the Mungall case was reported on by first the Lawrence Daily Journal and then the Indian Chieftain within a time span of a few days. The first instance of reporting comes from the Lawrence Daily Journal (see Appendix 14, A and B):

A Would-be Ravisher Hung:

KANSAS CITY, March 5.—A Times Vinita, I. T., special says: A professional exhorter named Mungall came here recently and began a series of meetings. He was quartered at the house of an Indian citizen, and slept in a room with several other members of the family. During the night Mungall made an assault upon a young orphan girl in the room, but before he could execute his purpose he was discovered and taken a prisoner. The next day a party of neighbors took him out for trial, and returned without him, saying he had "escaped."23

---

23 Lawrence Daily Journal, (Lawrence, Kansas. March 6, 1886), 1.
However, in the March 11th, 1886 story reported by the *Indian Chieftain* (arguably the most important Newspaper for the Cherokee Nation at the time), the story has a few more details which previously escaped reporting (see Appendix 15):

HE "ESCAPED"—A gentleman from over in the Mud Springs neighborhood, near Horse creek, brings the particulars of an affair deserving of publication, but which was slow in getting out. As told, some time ago, a preacher named Mungall, from Missouri, began holding meetings in the section named, and one night was taken home by Mr. Lamar, a well-known citizen. Mungall was given a bed with an Indian named Run-About-Pig, the room in which they slept was also occupied by an orphan girl twelve years old who lived with the family. Some time during the night when the preacher thought his companion asleep, he arose and going stealthily to the bed occupied by the little girl, clapped his hand over her mouth to prevent an outcry, and attempted an outrage upon her. The conclusion of the villain as to his bed-fellow proved incorrect, and in an instant Run-About-Pig had the old scamp in his power. After the affair had been noised about the settlement, the neighbors held a consultation and quickly decided on taking Mungall out and trying him. Accordingly the offender was taken out to the woods but in a short time the court and attendants returned with the information that the prisoner "got away from them." Whether he went up or down our informant did not know, but he seemed satisfied that Mungall would create no more disturbance in that locality.24

There are a few interesting details beyond the name of the potential victim. The first is the presence of the court and attendees leaving the woods in a “satisfied” mood. While it is understandable that these men and (possibly) women felt comforted knowing that Mungall would not come back, it is unlikely they would satisfactorily feel this way without having actually lynched the man. This particular case is interesting in this regard because, unlike the first three examples, this spectacle begins and ends at the scaffold. The spectacle does not continue *after* the lynching. This lynching is a town secret, something winked about in public and communally agreed upon by the range of citizens,

but not necessarily something they would want to flaunt to outsiders or through the media. It is an interesting example of when the town secret is meant to stay within the town. Other towns have no such compunctions, as in the 1889 lynching of Olaf in Iowa.

In 1889, Olaf was accused of raping Mrs. Frank Glassman. In the *Iowa State Republican*, the blasé newspaper line Olaf “was lynched by a mob, and hanged to a tree” does not even begin to speak about the spectacular nature of Olaf’s lynching. For instance, Olaf, more similarly to Paunais and not comparable to Mungall, was definitely hanged in front of over a hundred spectators. In fact, Michael James Pfeifer’s *Rough Justice: Lynching and American Society, 1874-1947*, claims that Olaf was lynched in front of over five hundred witnesses, and not only once. According to Pfeifer, Olaf was hanged twice (see Appendix 16-17).^{25} Used in many instances of accusation against African Americans, the charge of harming white women was one of the strongest publicly-endorsed methods white men felt able to use as a reason for lynching. So much so, popular media such as *The Guardian* refer to the reasoning as a “trope”: “The trope of the hypersexual and lascivious black male, especially vis-a-vis the inviolable chastity of white women, was and remains one of the most durable tropes of white supremacy.”^{26}

These instances of public-backed mob violence are visible in both the cases of Olaf and Mungall, for instance. However, another 1889 case shows a very different side of

---


lynching, something rare even amongst African American victims: a female lynching victim.

Mrs. John Puckett from Oklahoma is one of the few recorded instances of lynching against Native American women. In *Lynching of Women in the United States: The Recorded Cases, 1851-1946*, Kerry Segraves articulates that Mrs. John Puckett was called a “half-breed” and was lynched after having been accused of many crimes, though it is unknown at this point of whether the perpetrators were white, Choctaw, or a combination of the two groups. The report is as follows:

Reports from the Choctaw nation, Indian Territory in Oklahoma Territory, stated that on the night of February 15, 1889, John Puckett and his wife were taken from their cabin on Lyon Creek by a party of men and hanged. A stepson of Puckett’s was severely flogged and afterwards tied to a tree, in which position he remained for 48 hours before being discovered. The Pucketts were charged with numerous crimes and had been ordered to leave the nation several months earlier. According to the report, the pair was “half-breeds,” of Cherokee extraction.  

However, one of the more interesting portions of this, and something I will hope to engage more thoroughly during the second, third, and fourth chapters of this thesis, is the chart found in the 1926 US Senate Judiciary Committee hearings on lynching. In the chart denoting the murders/deaths of the area as well as the possible charges, Mrs. Puckett is not only described as a “white” woman (she is not described as a half-breed, Cherokee, nor Indian) but she also has no charges listed against her, in direct contradiction to what Seagraves copied to her own research based on the oral report given.

---

Violences enacted against women were traditionally not lynchings and were not public with very few exceptions. Generally, women were victims of sexual assault and harassment, whereas lynching was typically reserved for men. However, lynchings against Native American men were not only traditionally made public; they were intentionally made spectacles. These events were so much the spectacle, trains would sometimes even change the times of arrival and departures so more people could stop and watch the event without missing church the next day as can be noted in this section:

Lynching was community sanctioned. Lynchings were frequently publicized well in advance, and people dressed up and traveled long distances for the occasion. The January 26, 1921, issue of the Memphis Press contained the headline: "May Lynch 3 to 6 Negroes This Evening." Clergymen and business leaders often participated in lynchings. Few of the people who committed lynchings were ever punished. What makes the lynchings all the more chilling is the carnival atmosphere and aura of self-righteousness that surrounded the grizzly events.

Railroads sometimes ran special excursion trains to allow spectators to watch lynchings. Lynch mobs could swell to 15,000 people. Tickets were sold to lynchings. The mood of the white mobs was exuberant—men cheering, women preening, and children frolicking around the corpse.

In 1890, as the California The Morning Call newspaper says on Wednesday April 30th, a man named “Tacho” was illegally hanged for thievery. The vigilantes enacted their own form of justice by pulling him from a boxcar at the local railroad depot, dragging Tacho nearly a mile down the track, and hanging the accused from a telegraph.

---

pole with no police backing. After knowingly reporting on this, the The Morning Call thought it was appropriate to call Tacho, who was a California native, a “desperado of the worst type” (See Appendix 19). This says quite a bit about the ways in which Native Americans were being regarded seventy-five years after the Wisconsin 1825 Treaty of Prairie du Chien. In paraphrasing David Kulczyk’s *California Justice: Shootouts, Lynching and Assassinations in the Golden State*:

On December 14, 1894, William “Billy” Dean, a Native American, was lynched by unknown persons in the town of Happy Camp, California. Billy Dean was taken and lynched while supposed to be in the custody of Constable Fred Dixon. This particular case does not seem too different from the above accusations and results. Billy Dean had been accused of shooting his co-worker, William Baremore, on December 5th. Justice, accordingly, did not come swift enough for the mob and at least a dozen masked men supposedly stormed the room and disarmed Constable Dixon. The mob tied Dean’s hands and carried him to the Wheeler Building which was under construction where they strung him up by the neck from a derrick. His body was left hanging until 11:00 a.m. That day’s headline in the *Scott Valley News* boasted, "He Is Now A Good Indian. Billy Dean Kills a White Man Without Cause and Is Summarily Hoisted to the Happy Hunting Ground."

The reference made here to the “Happy Hunting Ground” is, at once, offensive and pertinent to understanding the sentiment behind the almost sadistic manner in which these newspaper article writer’s spoke about Native Americans. The “happy hunting ground” is how many of the Great Plains tribes of American Indians, including the Oglala Lakota, perceive of the afterlife. While the newspapers may, at once, be looking to possibly provoke the tribes or goad readership, the fact of the matter is that the people who chose

---

to participate in mob violences were summarily going against the “law” to enact vengeance.

One such instance of blatant disregard for the law is the case of Paul Holy Track, Alex Cadotte, and Phillip Ireland. All three young men had been implicated in the murder of a white family. Alex Cadotte was granted a retrial, and the mob decided to lynch these men and prevent them from possibly going free if the retrial were to work in their favor. Legal delays led to frustration, surely, but it is shockingly consistent that the newspaper articles did not seem to take issue with the mob violences. In November 1897, for example, the masked men (similar to the Billy Dean case) stormed the Williamsport, North Dakota jail, and hanged the three boys from a nearby beef windlass (a windlass is a device used to hoist cattle carcasses). In this case, one would think that the sympathy of the readers should be with the Native Americans due to the extreme reaction of the mob, but none of the literature speaking on the topic refers to any sort of public denouncement after the fact.31

This lack of public outcry not only occurred in this singular case. For example, in the 1898 Oklahoma public torture of two Seminole men, Palmer Sampson and Lincoln McGeisey, there were hundreds of spectators who came to view the live burning. The two Native American men were posthumously declared innocent of the charge of murdering Mary Leard thanks to C. Davis’ research into the matter. However, during the

time period, the most important, and possibly only, public denouncement on the vigilanthism that occurred came from the Acting Attorney General, himself, which is why I credit this particular example as two separate cases of Native American violence (even though I have other paragraph denoting groups of persons hanged at a time as a singular event). In the American Indian and Alaskan Native Documents in the Congressional Serial Set: 1817-1899, the documents regarding J.K. Richard’s and C.R. Brooks’ conversation is a fascinating look into how important the violences enacted outside of the law were being taken in response to the murder of the two Seminole men (See Appendix 21). C.R. Brooks’ response to the burning of the Native Americans:

Please authorize the marshal here by wire to use all the men and money necessary to make arrests for burning Indian boys. There are about 300 conspirators. Will issue warrants under section 5519, Revised Statutes United States, if you think proper.

[Telegram.]

C. R. BROOKS,
United States
Attorney

Brooks accepted the possibility that there might be over three hundred arrests made of white men and women who witnessed and engaged in the murder of the two men. In the research done on the topic so far, this is almost completely unprecedented. On a positive note, this change can show the tonal shift on the topic of lynching in the United States.

Even if it cannot be conclusively determined that Native Americans were becoming more respected, this sort of action on the part of the US government helps to show how it was becoming far less acceptable to simply enact vengeance, communally, without upholding the law. This is, of course, only on paper, but it may illustrate that American culture was beginning to place greater emphasis on national unity relative to communal honor and separation. Three years after the murder of the Seminole boys, Modoc County, California saw five men extralegally punished for petty theft. However, also once again, the government tried to find those in the mob and bring them to justice.

This last case of vigilante justice is another lynching by a group which occurred in California in 1902. Five men accused of petty theft were ceremoniously hanged by a mob group ranging between thirty and fifty persons. In this case, much like the last case, the primary document sources are not just about the details of the event nor is it a racially charged place for readers to write in about their superiority. Instead, this article followed Governor Gage’s reward money and plea to help find the people responsible for these murderers so the lynchers can be brought to justice (see Appendix 22-27). In following these lynchings from 1848 to 1902, there are many connections between the lynchings that do not seem available at first glance. Beyond the fact that these particular lynch victims have names, many of them were very obviously not going by culturally representative names. These victims were sometimes called “half-breeds” and thus, it stands to reason that they were possibly victims due to not only their Native American heritage, but also because they are walking proof of previous miscegenation. Half-breeds, like African Americans in the late 1800s, would be in positions of economic and
social precarity. By lynching these persons, for whatever crime they are accused of, the townspeople were also using this lynching as a podium for future expected behaviors. This is not relegated to a single region, as can be seen throughout this work. From California to Oklahoma, the true connection is not geographical between these lynchings, just as we can assume from African American lynchings from the same time period.

Overall, there are a lot of continuities in the political spheres which surround the height of lynchings across the United States at this time. Most of the incidents involve high-profile violences, like murder and rape, with few exceptions. Most of the lynchings are performed on males and are performed in front of a large audience, and all of them are done within a fifty-five year time-frame. A few discontinuities I have found in this research are that these molds do not always fit. For instance, it is not known if Mungall was murdered in front of a large group of people, and Mrs. John Puckett is a woman, qualified as white and not a criminal, who was murdered in a rage of mob violence. I believe, however, there is more of a story to tell in those who are unnamed, which is the topic of the next chapter.
Chapter Four: Case of Studies of Unnamed Native Americans Who Were Lynched

As is said at the beginning of this thesis’ third chapter there are several historical problems concerning Native American lynchings. For instance, it is difficult to determine if the violence enacted against Native Americans is in fact a “lynching” or a “legal hanging,” and it is very difficult to ascertain the proper capital punishment procedures against Native Americans because of a lack of documentation on certain violent events; namely whether or not the hanging was legal at the time, but then posthumously deemed illegal due to cultural pressures or a change in legislation. Another potential problem could be that the person who was lynched was not named properly, or at all. What is meant by “properly” is that this research has seen many names appear for lynch victims which are different from government/legal names. In certain tribes, the Seminoles and Miccosukee’s in South Florida, for instance, there are usually multiple names given to any member over the duration of their life regardless of gender, sexual orientation, or any other distinction. As Sara Huggins of the Seminole Tribe of Florida explains:

Seminoles and Miccosukee Indians go by different names depending on [a variety] of issues. For instance, I have my birth name for the tribe which is Fanookhoy, but the name on my government document is “Sara”. My name until the birth of my son was “Fanookhoy,” which was a name bestowed upon me by an elder. Even more, after the birth of my son, I now am known as “Hashkashee’s Enwaache/Wachee” or, “Hashkashee’s Mother.” These examples, of course, do not scratch the surface of complexity which comes from naming in our community.

For instance, many natives go by nicknames around non-natives and other natives. My son, for example, is named "Hashkasheeanee" according to the tribe’s cultural records. He is a baby, currently, and will certainly receive more names as he becomes older. However, even now he has three other names which
we call him. His “government” name is Alexander, but he is called “Alex” for short by certain non-natives and natives, alike. He also has a shortened version of his Native name, “Hashkashee.” Overall, he will receive at least two more names in his lifetime according to our cultural ways which are tied, specifically, to maturation within the community.

This can be seen in the example of my brother. For men versus women, in the tribe, men receive more names over time in comparison to us. My brother was born “Valentino” according to government documentation. However, he also received a birth name which we have forgotten, as is tradition once the man received his “man” name. His man name is “Fooshkachet” and he will also go by a different name after the birth of his first child. So, for example, if his child were named Shelby then he would go by Shelby Entaate/taste, which means “Shelby’s Father”. This shows how strongly we not only hold to traditions and naming, but also how important family is to us. We literally go by the name of our children because we are so connected to them. They root us to this Earth as we age.\textsuperscript{33}

Huggins’ commentary brings the conversation back to the problem of lacking documentation: If the victim whom the violence was enacted against could not be named, and their ethnicity could not be qualified correctly (because they were marked as \textit{white}), it stands to reason that their tribal membership would not be inventoried. David Baker’s book certainly raises this issue of how inadequate documentation erases the group and its nuances from other tribal groups. Though not all tribes act in the same fashion as Huggins’, it stands to reason that many of these victims (most likely \textit{all} of the lynching victims) had a name which they went by, a tribe which they were directly/indirectly related to, and features which were expressly deleted from the cultural commentary due to the lack of effort on the journalists’ part (for instance, if their government name was different from their Native name). It appears that frequently, if the contemporary writer was not ignorant, they were malicious in their attempt to write an article without any serious regard for accuracy and truth. This lack of inventory severely impacts

\textsuperscript{33} Sara Huggins, \textit{Multi-Naming Traditions}, (December 12, 2019).
sociocultural distinctions among tribal groups and hinders any research which may look to explore the nuances of executions, criminality, and violences.

This chapter, then, will continue to create a larger commentary on Native American lynching victims by filling in this significant gap, and also to better create a cultural narrative surrounding lynching violences. As with the previous chapter, this chapter will also work in a chronological fashion, though it will work from 1848 to 1904, and look at ten documented Native American lynching victims, who are left nameless in the lines of the primary documents written specifically about their murder. The goal will be to show the connections and discontinuities in journalism, and also to once again bring life into the stories which are forgotten or neglected by modern scholars.

As stated in the previous chapter, in 1848, Wisconsin was finally admitted as a full-fledged state in the American Union, a significant political event which caused severe destabilization between Wisconsin and Minnesotans. This instability between the political entities led to further encroachment on Native American lands in Minnesota and Wisconsin, concurrently. Further encroachment was due to the greed and desire of Wisconsin officials looking to make money in the lumber industry, which they successfully achieved according to the Chippewa County Tourism Council, which shows Wisconsin as having a booming lumber industry. In *The Roots of Rough Justice: Origins of American Lynching*, Michael J. Pfeifer describes the lynching of an Ojibwa

---

35 William Lass, “Minnesota’s Separation From Wisconsin” (*Minnesota History*).
man, who is never named, and the retribution the tribe sought against the lynchers. In this instance, the lumberjack whom the Ojibwa man “stabbed” is named as “Martial Caznobia.” According to Pfeifer’s research the Ojibwa man stabbed Caznobia because the lumberjack attempted to assault the Ojibwa man’s wife (see Appendix 1). There are a few interesting connections to make between this example and the corresponding example from the previous chapter. First, both the Ojibwa man and the twenty-two-year-old, Paunais/Little Saux were accused of murdering a white man whose work was in trade in back-to-back months (June and July, respectively). Economically, the Anishinaabe and Ojibwa tribes were both in financial and political opposition to the traders and state governments forcibly encroaching upon Native American territory. Several facts omitted in Pfeiffer’s account appear in Richard Current’s The Civil War Era, 1848-1873: History of Wisconsin: 1) Michael Caznobia recovered from his “fatal wound;” and 2) The men who lynched the Ojibwa man got away unscathed before justice could be met in a legal system and 3) According to the date in Current’s text, the lynching occurred in 1849, not 1848 (see Appendix 2-3). The Ojibwa man’s story is so unclear due to false historical information and, of course, it is fascinating to think about this one last point: why was Michael Caznobia, the man who apparently died, but did not actually die in Richard Current’s version of the story, named but the Ojibwa man who

was mercilessly and, accordingly, falsely accused of murder not given a name? As I concluded the paragraph on Paunais in the last chapter: Violence against minorities out of fear of minorities is a common trope in American history, and erasing the victim’s name out of history is a systemic issue against Native Americans in the United States.

On April 8th, 1853, the Pioneer and Democrat of Olympia, Washington reported that “one of the Indian murderers of Young, was to have been executed in a summary manner, at Seattle, some time during the present week.” Similarly to what will be seen in the next paragraph of unnamed Native American victims, the news blurb on the victim is brief and quasi-factual, unlike the spectacularity of Francisco Jimeno’s lynching in front of over one hundred witnesses. The blurb is factual in that it discusses the murder of the Native American who was extralegally “executed” by a mob, but while “Young,” the supposed white victim, is named, the Native American “murderer” is not. The name was not found in previous articles in the newspaper, either. Bereft of many details unlike Jimeno’s story of extreme violence and torture, the blurb is written for those who would support Young. Thus, the Newspaper is writing for an audience who would back the execution of the unnamed Native American. However, interestingly enough this article does not speak about what happened to the other “Indian murderer(s)” and, thus, it is further incomplete beyond just lacking the name or tribe of the unnamed Native American.

38 History of Northern Wisconsin, Containing an Account of its Settlement, Growth, Development, and Resources; an Extensive Sketch of its Counties, Cities, Towns and Villages, Their Improvements, Industries, Manufactories; Biographical Sketches, Portraits of Prominent Men and Early Settlers; Views of County Seats, etc., (Chicago, Western Historical Company), 195. https://archive.org/details/historyofnorther00west/page/194/mode/2up P. 195.

American victim (see Appendix 4-5). Details, on the other hand, overburden the story of Francisco Jimeno. The lack of details in the *Pioneer and Democrat* article is interesting in juxtaposition to Jimeno because while the details bring light to further atrocities against lynching victims, the way in which Jimeno’s story is written can be seen as an attempt to further entertain white audiences. However, as can be seen in the next paragraph, other authors took the route of “less is more” when describing hangings bereft of details.

Careless research has led to many incomplete stories, as could be seen in the case of Mungall, the Native American who “got away” from the “satisfied” crowd. Take, for instance, Alexandra Harmon’s 1998 *Indians in the Making: Ethnic Relations and Indian Identities Around Puget Sound*. Harmon off-handedly comments, “Natives probably killed James McCormick while he explored Lake Union, and Seattle residents subsequently hanged two Indian suspects.”⁴⁰ This comment is further substantiated in four separate sources which describe the event in just as simplistic terms, as can be seen in the notes. If the reader were to turn to Michel-Rolph Trouillot’s *Silencing the Past*, they would notice that this is an issue from the earliest creation of archival sources. Trouillot writes, “Silences enter the process of historical production at four crucial moments: the moment of fact creation (the making of sources); the moment of fact
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assembly (the making of archives); the moment of fact retrieval (the making of narratives); and the moment of retrospective significance (the making of history in the final instance).” In this instance, Harmon is recognizing the silence from the “fact creation,” “fact assembly,” and “fact retrieval” moments. He, while in the process of “retrospective significance” notes that “Natives probably killed” but “probably” is not a fact. He is merely sitting on the silence of the historical record and compounding the problem created in the earliest creation of archival sources. However, this problem further proves that the issue of namelessness is something that academics do not necessarily grapple with, they merely speculate. Also, newspapers are compounding the issue by not doing their due-diligence at the second and third stages (“fact assembly” and “fact retrieval”) because they do not question the veracity of the claims from eyewitnesses. For instance, why would an incited mob be fine with Mungall escaping after, by their allegations, attempting to rape a child? If the crowd was riled to the point of extralegal violence, they would not be “fine” with this person escaping. The same sort of predicament is noted in the lack of care given to the research on the McCormick case. If James McCormick’s name is known, and the Native Americans were found, why did no one think to ask any questions about names? Tribes? Reasons for travel? By simply copying and pasting information, with little to no attempt to question why Native Americans are being left nameless in the aftermath of these extraordinarily violent

---

41 Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*, (Beacon Press, Boston Massachusetts, 1995), Clemson University Library E-Online Resources: [https://www-fulcrum.org.libproxy.clemson.edu/epubs/t848q95r?locale=en#/6/6.xhtml00000003]!/4/4/1:0.
events, newspaper writers are turning in incomplete stories and historians are further perpetuating this erasure.

Richard Current’s *The History of Wisconsin: The Civil War Era, 1848-1873*, also brings up another important point by using the example of the 1869 Native American hanging of an unnamed victim:

“A year later lynchers made short work of an Indian who, according to the Kilbourn City *Mirror*, had murdered a Frenchman in the cranberry marsh north of Necedah and had been jailed in New Lisbon. ‘On Sunday a masked mob came down from Necedah, forcibly entered the jail, and, taking the Indian out, hung him to the nearest tree.’”

Current describes the lynching of a Native American who had been accused of murdering a European. He describes the location of the event, and the brutality of the mob as they “forcibly” entered the jail just as the violence is one of the key factors in the lynching of Olaf. Olaf, the man who was apparently “lynched twice”, was violently and brutally murdered in front of a crowd of over five hundred persons. His death was not, then, a rapid event, unlike the description invoked by this small passage on the unnamed Native American who was hanged on the nearest tree. In this incident, it is extremely important to note that while Current does not seem to sympathize with the mob lynching the Native American, he is unable to find the name of the lynched victim. Once again, the Native American is left nameless in the face of violent atrocities. However, for the first time in

---

42 *Milwaukee Sentinel*, (September 30, 1868): Quoting the *Wisconsin State Journal*, September 28, 1868); January 20, January 23 (quoting Edward Huggins to Ezra Meeker, April 15, 1903, Ezra Meeker Papers, Washington State Historical Society, Box 5, Folder 17; Gibbs to McClellan, March the Monroe Sentinel, January 20), October 2, 1869 (citing the Kilbourn City *Mirror*, September 29, 1869); June 1, 1871; there is a good chance this footnote from Richard Nelson Current’s *The History of Wisconsin : The Civil War Era, 1848-1873* is inaccurate due to the fact that the lynching supposedly occurred in 1869, yet the newspaper article is dated 1868. However, the newspapers were not available to clarify and check for certainty.
this chapter, the white victim is also left nameless. However, the European victim, the “Frenchman” is still more clearly identified than the Native American who is relegated to the defining term “Indian.” In other newspapers, even if the Native American is not named their tribal affiliation is sometimes mentioned.

In fact, many times the story of the spectacle was kept extraordinarily short. For instance, in September 1875, according to Hubert Howe Bancroft’s 1887 *Popular Tribunals*, a single line was all which was relegated to the extralegal punishment of a Native American (see Appendix 6-7). The line: “At Cherry Creek, Nevada, in September 1875 a native criminal was taken from the sheriff and executed by the people.”

This writer used absolutely no story-telling or passion in opposition to the case of Mrs. Puckett from the previous chapter. The facts are laid out in Bancroft’s book, even though the facts are telling the reader that community members were breaking the law in such a way as to overrun the sheriff and enact mob justice. This is a terrifying thought which does not seem to warrant any extrapolation beyond the basics of the facts presented at the time. This lack of care is probably because the mob enacted communal thought against a Native American. Previous to the “at Cherry Creek” line which can be seen above, Bancroft wrote:

> There the sheriff took them, and while on the way to Hiko one of them, Bill’s brother, broke away and escaped. -Bill was then taken from the sheriff by the people and conducted to Hiko. He confessed to many murders, one of which implicated a savage called Moquitch, who was sent for, and the two hanged. This was not the worst of it; this is not the disgraceful part of the story. Full of rage and vile drink, after the hanging of the two aboriginals the people of Hiko went to a

---

camp near by and massacred seven natives, some of whom were guilty and some
innocent. This was most dastardly; and had the diabolical deed been perpetrated
by savages upon whites, all the world would have lifted its hands in horror, and a
regiment of soldiers would have been sent by government to annihilate the nation
to which the murderers belonged. How fortunate to be born white!\textsuperscript{44}

In this portion of the text, Bancroft gives more detail to the situations surrounding the
murder of Native Americans. Bancroft, as opposed to the many others who may have
written to the topic previously, seems to truly sympathize with the Native Americans, but
does not clarify that the fortune is with those who are born “all white,” which is an
important distinction when women like Mrs. John Puckett are, accordingly, being
 lynched for being a “half-breed.”

In \textit{The Arizona Sentinel} article from June 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 1878 another instance of accused
violence and murder against a white victim saw to the hanging of two Wallapi Native
Americans:

The court of Judge Lynch has been in session in Arizona. Two Wallapai Indians
accused of murdering John Curiton, at Hackberry were hanged at Tom Ship’s
ranch. At Gillette, one Setright was arrested for striking a man on the head with a
bottle, then without apparent cause he shot Sam Weir through the head. He was
chased and captured by the people who took him from Deputy Sheriff Burnett and
his assistant L. G. Taylor, the latter receiving a bullet in his head. John Hamilton
was shot near Chavez Pass by Tom House the mail carrier from Rock Springs
Station to Navajo Springs. The cause of the murder is not known.\textsuperscript{45}

Within this small blurb in a newspaper containing over seven large pages, there is quite a
bit of information to parse out. Maybe the most important topic to initially bring to the

\textsuperscript{44} Hubert-Howe Bancroft, \textit{Bancroft's Works Popular Tribunals vol. 1}, (Brigham Young University,

\textsuperscript{45} \textit{The Arizona Sentinel}, (June 22, 1878), 1. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn84021912/1878-06-22/ed-1/seq-1/#date1=1878&sort=date&date2=1878&words=Indian+Indians&language=&sequence=0&lccn
forefront is the tone. “The court of Judge Lynch has been in session” is a sentence fraught with an almost sickly comical tone reminiscent of the “Happy Hunting Ground” comment made by David Kulczyk in the California Justice: Shootouts, Lynching and Assassinations in the Golden State and the “desperado of the worst type” statement written about the Native American lynch victim Tacho. Another issue to take up is the fact that, once again, the white victim and the location of the accused violence occurred are named, but neither of the Wallapai Native American victims of the hangings were. Another issue to bring up is the capitalization of “Setright” for no apparent reason unless it is a name, yet the record is silent on whom “Setright” could have been… another white victim? The name of one of the Native Americans? Also, another victim is named—Sam Weir. However, the way the blurb is written is confusing at best because the following sentence bespeaks this unnamed “he” who was chased and captured by “the people” (maybe a mob) and then the unnamed “he” possibly shot the Deputy Sherriff’s assistant in the head. At that point, yet another random murder by Tom House, whom the article does not speak to further. In all, it is very much possible that the only sentences dealing with the hangings of the Native Americans are the first two, and “Setright” is a known figure in the community at the time. This being said, relegating the lynching of two Native Americans to two small sentences in an oversized newspaper, one of the sentences possibly being written as comical, come off as crude. Another especially problematic portion of this blurb is that the white victim was, once again, named, but the Native Americans were not even though in the following sentences, Setright and Tom Hamilton are named as potential murderers. There is a vague shroud of mystery which
surrounds the accusations against Native Americans due to the lack of clarity and the missing pieces of extremely important information in cases of illegality performed by mobs (see Appendix 8-9).

Very similarly to the 1881 lynching of Paul Holytrack, Alex Cadotte, and Phillip Ireland, there was a lot of confusion in the *Los Angeles Herald* in 1884 (see Appendix 10). For instance: “An Indian confined in jail here for outraging a white woman near Spokane Falls a few days ago, was taken from jail last night by a body of masked men and lynched” sounds very secretive and not exactly premeditated, as is the case with most newspaper phrases like, “under the shroud of night” and “masked men” when the Washington State University Archives mentions different information about the event.\(^{46}\)

In Larry Cebula’s Northwest History webpage, Cebula explains that Joanne Percy, an EWU graduate student, scanned a letter which was written by Charles Ratcliffe to his lover Louise Bressler. Before the lynching occurred, accordingly, Ratcliffe writes:

> You [Louise] are the hope of my youth . . . when night comes I always think of you” and how Ratcliffe looks forward to the day "when you [Louise] will be my dear little wife.

> Oh Louise, will I tell you of the dreadful thing that happened here yesterday and what I fear is going to happen tonight. A woman riding alone between Cheney and Spokane about dark was met by two Indians and dragging out of the wagon by the fiends after accomplishing their purpose left her insensible. hundreds of men turned out and today the principle was caught and is now in jail. Tonight an attempt will be made to lynch him. I sincerely hope they will although it is an awful thing to do. I saw him as he passed the office just a few minutes ago. Maybe I ought not to have told you this, but it is not worse than has been

\(^{46}\) *Los Angeles Herald*, (Volume 22, Number 8, 9 September 1884, *California Digital Newspaper Collection*), https://cdnc.ucr.edu/cgi-bin/cdnc?a=d&d=LAH18840909.2.6&e=-------en--20--1--txt-txIN------
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committed in Ill not many days ago. Truly the way of the transgressor is hard” (see Appendix 11).

This story greatly contrasts with the dark rider story most newspapers went by at the time. Hours before the lynching, a man not involved in the plot of the lynching (Ratcliffe) knows of the event, and, of course, if he knows of the event, then the town sheriff and other political members probably know of the event. However, the story is told in the newspaper like the event was entirely mob-related, passionate, and unconnected from the town’s principals, etc. The story was a ruse to shield the community from responsibility, keeping the community members’ honor in away from the murderous actions, removing them to a level of spectation different from that of knowledgeable spectator. By this, I refer to the fact that spectator levels change when the crowd knows of the outcome before the event. The newspapers are helping to create a façade, if it can be called such, and, still, the victim is not named. To name the victim is to help humanize the victim. The name, as is brought up in Sara’s story at the beginning of this chapter, is a connection to a tribe, lineage, and, of course, familial role. It speaks to family and heritage. By not giving name to the victim, it is easier to demonize him and the other faceless barbarians known as “Indian”. Just like the murder of the three boys from the previous chapter, there is no public denouncement of the violence, and, in fact, there seems to be a political conspiracy for mob justice.

In another instance of violence found in The New York Times in March of 1888 in Butte, Montana, “word was received that the settlers north of Flathead Lake had

---

47 Manuscripts, Archives, and Special Collections, (Washington State University Libraries, Cage 1771).
discovered the murder of three white men committed last Summer by Kootenai Indians, and had armed themselves to go in search of and punish the murderers,” which resulted in two unnamed Kootenai Indians being lynched (see Appendix 12-14). In the newspaper, the writer says, “it seems they have accomplished their purpose” and calls the unnamed Indians “murderers” though there is no description of who/how/or with what the “Indian murderers” actually killed another human being. Whereas Palmer Sampson from the corresponding paragraph in the last chapter was summarily urged by C.R. Brooks, posthumously, to find the lynchers, there is no such call to action in this story. For example, while these Native American unnamed men are only described by their affiliation to the Kootenai tribe, and their crimes are alleged with no evidence and a lot of hearsay, Palmer Sampson was also murdered with over one hundred witnesses to the event. However, Brooks went about trying to negotiate a way to fix relations with Seminole Indian tribe by putting on a face of outrage.

On October 16th of 1892, a Native American male was lynched for the “criminal assault” of an eight-year-old girl. This story is similar to that of Lincoln McGeisey, the Native American male murdered without trial for the death of Mary Lead (even though he was posthumously declared innocent along with Palmer Sampson). For instance, McGeisey’s case and this case of the unidentified victim of lynching once again show historical connection suffered in extralegal violence. According to the Sunday New York Times article, the unnamed 1892 victim was lynched from a telephone pole and was

---

unable to articulate any argument against the accusation because he could not, by the
newspaper writer’s own admission, speak (see Appendix 15-16). As I previously noted
in Chapter Three, the charge of harming white women is one of the strongest publicly-
backed justifications white men felt able to use to violently harm men of color in the
South. These instances of public-backed mob violence are visible in both the cases of
Olaf and Mungall, for instance, and now in the case of this unnamed victim who was
unable to have a trial in which he might actually have been translatable. Moreover, the
child was not the one to pick out the man who assaulted her according to the article. It
merely states that an Indian showed up before and then after the event in the same town.
Easily this Native American could very well have been confused with another Native
American. Also, the child might not have been involved in naming her assailant which
means that the assailant could have been “chosen at random” by a mob, or, of course, the
event could have been entirely made up. And, as is before noted in the case of the
Ojibwa man from the first case study in this chapter, the “white victim” is named, but the
supposed assailant is not.

On October 31, 1903, four Native Americans were shot and killed, yet only two
of them were named in *The South Dakotan: A Monthly Magazine, Volume 6, Issue 6:
Black Kettle and Eagle Feather* (see Appendix 17). The two unnamed Native American
victims, however, are extremely important to the overall story. In the *Cheyenne Daily
Leader no. 93 “Government Leader Says Converse Country War Was Wrong to Indians”

---

from November 26, 1903, the Native Americans are being defended by certain state officials and journalists stipulating that the actions taken by the Native Americans were probably in self-defense against the racial hatred and bias carried by whites in the area (see Appendix 18-19). While the two named Native Americans were prominent leaders in the Native American community, the two unnamed Native Americans who were also shot and killed after being accused of murder and stock theft, were victims of lynching. Due to the prominence of the named Native Americans, political heads sought negotiations on how to ameliorate tensions between the tribe and corresponding town just as they did in the situation from the previous chapter involving Calvin, Frank, James, and Martin Hall along with B.D. Yahtis’s hanging for petty theft. Also, noted previously, a lynching does not necessarily have to be a hanging. In this particular action, the two unnamed lynching victims were victims of gunshot wounds. However, due to the prominence of the two known leaders (Eagle Feather and Black Kettle), some whites saw this as senseless and readers and writers were able to sympathize with the Native American victims.

As I ended my last chapter, there are a lot of continuities in political journalism which surrounded the story-telling of lynchings. Again, most of the lynchings were done following an accusation of high-profile violences, like murder and rape, with few exceptions. This was true even in the cases where the “victim” did not die of the wounds such as in the first case of nameless lynching victims in this chapter. Unlike the last chapter, there is very little written on the level of spectatorship involved in these cases because many of these spectacles are not written about beyond a few sentences. In these
cases, what is more interesting in the story is what is specifically left out. For instance, were the names that hard to find? Newspapers are communicating details of extralegal violences, yet the names of the lynching victims are ceremoniously dropped yet the names of the white “victims” are not. There is, of course, something even more to be said about these questions, which is what my next chapter will examine.
Chapter Five: Multi-Names and No Names

Names are a manifestation of power. They exist as part of the social existence, and are an essential part of language. For this, I turn to Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality* (1755):

Let us disregard for a moment the immense space that there must have been between the pure state of nature and the need for languages. And, on the supposition that they are necessary, let us inquire how they might have begun to be established. Here we come to a new difficulty, worse still than the preceding one. For if men needed speech in order to learn to think, they had a still greater need for knowing how to think in order to discover the art of speaking. And even if it were understood how vocal sounds had been taken for the conventional expressions of our ideas, it would still remain for us to determine what could have been the conventional expressions for ideas that, not having a sensible object, could not be indicated either by gesture or by voice.\(^\text{50}\)

In this passage, Rousseau says that man is neither inherently social nor inherently rational, and therefore language and reason are products of socialization. Socialization, in turn, is a product of the fear of death as Rousseau states on page forty-four:

Although his fellowmen were not for him what they are for us, and although he had hardly anything more to do with them than with other animals, they were not forgotten in his observations. The conformities that time could make him perceive among them, his female, and himself, made him judge those he did not perceive. And seeing that they all acted as he would have done under similar circumstances, he concluded that their way of thinking and feeling was in complete conformity with his own. And this important truth, well established in his mind, made him follow, by a presentiment as sure as dialectic and more prompt, the best rules of conduct that it was appropriate to observe toward them for his advantage and safety. Taught by experience that love of well-being is the sole motive of human actions, he found himself in a position to distinguish the rare occasions when common interest should make him count on the assistance of his fellowmen, and those even rarer occasions when competition ought to make him distrust them. In the first case, he united with them in a herd, or at most in some sort of free association, that obligated no one and that lasted only as long as the passing need

\(^{50}\) Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality* (1755), 30-32.
https://epdf.pub/basic-political-writings.html
that had formed it. In the second case, everyone sought to obtain his own advantage, either by overt force, if he believed he could, or by cleverness and cunning, if he felt himself to be the weaker.\footnote{Ibid., , 46}

To reiterate, socialization is a product of the fear of death, and socialization is what breeds language and reason; thus, since naming is an essential aspect of language, names are manifestations of social power. Yet, if naming is a product of socialization, language, and reason then it stands to generalize that people who are not respected with a name are subject to a social death which are, by definition, beyond their control because it is of the collective. They are outcast, forgotten, meaningless, committed to oblivion. By this regard, when Native American men and women are lynched without being chronicled, they are twice murdered. In other words lynched Native Americans who are not granted their position in a historical context by the virtue of name are both physically and socially murdered, or, as I stated previously, twice murdered. However, an interesting point can be taken from more literary examples.

Frequently taking the form of an elegist, Lydia Huntley Sigourney wrote a poem in 1815, “Indian Names.” Within this poem, Sigourney problematizes the fact that Native Americans are being ignored and erased in textbooks, even as typical “Native American” names are used for lakes, roads, and towns. For instance, in lines 1-8:

\begin{verbatim}
Ye say they all have passed away,
That noble race and brave,
That their light canoes have vanished
From off the crested wave;
\end{verbatim}
That ’mid the forests where they roamed
There rings no hunter shout,
But their name is on your waters,
Ye may not wash it out

Sigourney posits that Native Americans should be tied to the natural world.\textsuperscript{52} However, Native Americans are being systemically erased/murdered socially and physically. While Native Americans considered themselves connected to the natural world in many ways (some would argue “in more ways” than white colonizers), it is the authority of naming which qualifies the inherent tie people have to places, cultures, and traditions. For instance, in the above example, Sigourney points out that Native American names are used for certain bodies of water like Okeechobee in South Florida. The researcher can turn to a location like Lake Keowee, located in South Carolina, a man made lake which has covered over a site once known as “Keowee Village,” and was the capital of the Lower Cherokee tribe at one point in history before British colonization.\textsuperscript{53} The examples can continue, but the story of lynched victims stops when their names are no longer known. It is especially difficult to understand how so many histories of Native Americans are lost to the pages of history when many Native Americans have multiple names. For this reason, this chapter will act in two ways: First, It looks to bring forth a conversation on groundlessness as it pertains to Native Americans by looking at how nicknames impact the historical record; and second, it will theorize the intent behind

\textsuperscript{52} Lydia Huntley Sigourney, “Indian Names” from \textit{Moral Pieces in Prose and Verse} (1815).
\textsuperscript{53} "Anderson-Oconee-Pickens County SC Historical Roadside Markers". Archived from the original on 2008-05-30.
ignoring or hiding the identities of lynching victims, even with the knowledge that many Native American tribes use multi-naming traditions.

When thinking about Native American nicknames or multi-naming, Sara Huggins’ comment from the previous chapter first comes to mind, but Dr. Elisabeth Pearson Waugaman, a faculty member in the New Directions writing program at the Washington Center for Psychoanalysis, does as well. For instance, in Waugaman’s 2015 article “The Multifaceted Native American Naming Tradition” in the magazine *Women, Their Names, & The Stories They Tell*, Waugaman writes:

Native Americans have a fluid naming tradition—i.e., they can earn new names. A Native American wise woman explained this concept to me with nature imagery. Some people are like lakes; they change very little during their lifetimes. Others are like rivers that may change dramatically from their small beginnings to become mighty rivers that travel all the way to the sea. Native American children are given names that suit their personalities. If a name is given and proves to be a bad fit, the child’s name is changed. At adolescence, the given name may be changed again. As the adult progresses through life, new names can be awarded. Family and society award the new names, which provide the individual with a strong social bond to community as well as family. This naming tradition helps to motivate the individual to grow throughout life.

A Native American name can reflect your personality, what you accomplish, or what happens to you. The name Dancing Wind sounds beautiful to our ears, but Native Americans know that the dancing wind is an image for the tornado. This name warns of a volatile, angry disposition. It serves as a warning to others as well as an incentive to Dancing Wind to earn a new name. The name Bear is a common name like John. If the name is changed to Wounded Bear, society knows the individual is suffering and needs special care. If an individual accomplishes great things, a new name like “Eagle Eye” may be given to recognize the individual’s clear-sighted perception as well as a special connection between heaven and earth, i.e., with the spiritual world. The Native American naming
tradition inspires the individual to strive to be better, to heal, and to evolve. The bond between society and the individual is very personal.\textsuperscript{54}

Simply put, Native Americans use their name(s) to construct a story of their time on Earth and the connection they have to their surrounding nature, culture, and traditions. One example of this appeared in Chapter Four when Sara Huggins brought up that her son has three names: Alexander, Alex, and Hashkasheeanee. The name recognized by the tribe, Hashkasheeanee, will not typically be a name which follows the child to adulthood. Throughout the maturation process, Hashkasheeanee will most likely be renamed as his characteristics become more clear to his elders. This is, of course, not something typical in the United States outside of Native American tribes, as Waugaman says:

Our Western naming tradition is quite different. Children traditionally received the name of relatives—a custom that looks to past history and culture. As children we may have a nickname or a series of nicknames which provide a sense of evolution, but once we grow into our full given name, there is a sense of being “all grown-up,” an implied stopping point. We can continue our sense of evolution by adding various degrees to our names, which indicate that we have developed certain fields of expertise, which are not, however, a measure of our character. As opposed to the Native American naming tradition, modern society has traditionally turned more to external, rather than internal, inspiration for naming the individual.\textsuperscript{55}

In many ways, the process of naming is connected immediately to the natural world and the social environment in which the child is brought up. These names like Hashkasheeanee are sacred because they are ever-evolving and growing just as the child is. The name is attached to the person, but the name is not the person. For those who


\textsuperscript{55} Waugaman. “The Multifaceted.”
suffer traumatic experiences, such as those suffered by Tayo in Leslie Marmon Silko’s *Ceremony*, being allowed to be reborn/renamed can be a religious experience such as that which Christians feel after baptism. However, in certain circumstances of lynching which are chronicled, there are examples which can be drawn forth to prove that multi-name victims existed. For instance, if one were to go back to Chapter Three of this thesis, one would once again be confronted with the lynching of the twenty-two-year old Anishinaabe man, Paunais, who was accused of murdering a white man who was a business (probably fur) trader in June of 1848 in the St. Croix Valley. Paunais, or “Little Saux”, is a man who was called by two different names within the same article in the *Wisconsin Tribune* article. The legwork done by the writer shows the ability of the name(s) to be found. Of course, there are multiple other examples of Native American lynch victims who had multiple names recorded for the record. One can be found in Marilyn Ziebarth’s “Judge Lynch in Minnesota” article in the story of Gogoonce, also known as Albert Smith, who was lynched by a mob before his brother was shot (see Appendix 1). In this instance:

In Brainerd in 1872, after preliminary courtroom investigations about a woman presumed to be dead, Gegoonce (Albert Smith) was hanged and his brother Tebekokechickwabe shot after he crawled up the hangman’s rope. The event, which brought more than 100 angry Ojibway to town the next day, led to an incident facetiously labeled the Blueberry War.57

---


What can be taken from this example is two-fold: 1) The lynching of Gegoonce occurred only after a “woman was presumed dead” but there is nothing about allegations that Gegoonce (or, he and his brother) affected the death of the woman in this particular article. Also 2) Gegoonce’s brother, Tebekokechickwabe, presumably, would have a second name which was not recorded because his brother had a second “typically Western” name. Ziebarth also articulates this same juxtaposition prior in the article when she writes, “Just before statehood, a group of armed men near Little Falls hanged two Indians and a mixed-blood man—Charles Gebabish, “Jimmy,” and Joe Shambeau—for suspected murder.” The same conundrum of two names versus a single name can be noted in this single source.

This brings up the larger, more looming, question for the passage: How do naming, nick names, and not writing the names, impact the historical record? The first, and maybe most obvious, predicament is that newspaper article writers may choose to give only one name in the story. For instance, a small blurb could read, as it does in the case of Tebekokechickwabe, “his brother Tebekokechickwabe shot after he crawled up the hangman’s rope.” This reading of the name impacts how the reader takes in the information. For instance, during this time period of 1872 when Tebekokechickwabe was shot, the name “Tebekokechickwabe” would be something more unrelatable to the white readers of the newspaper. However, by choosing not to put Tebekokechickwabe’s “government name” or “white” name, the writer was able to create a level of separation between that of the victim and that of the reader. Furthering such a question can occur with the article portion on Gegoonce.
In the portion on Gegoonce, “Gegoonce (Albert Smith) was hanged”, there is not so much of a separation between the audience, presumably, and the name Albert. However, the writer chose to put both names. This can be for a variety of reasons, but two of the strongest possibilities are that Gegoonce might have been well-known in the community, but better known by “Albert”. Using both Gegoonce and Albert may better be able to create a separation from the town by reminding the townspeople of Albert’s roots. A second option might very well be that the information was just more readily available and the newspaper article writer did not have to look far for a story. The third question, “not naming” is a bit more interesting because it brings the reader back to Tebekokechickwabe.

While the writer provides the name “Tebekokechickwabe” to their reader, she omits the other names. As previously noted, many tribes have a multi-naming tradition. Tebekokechickwabe, more than likely, had multiple names that he could go by. One was probably, like Albert Smith’s, something more palatable to the presumed white audience this article is geared towards. By choosing to omit the name, or never thinking to put in non-readily available information, the writer has created a further distance between the victim Tebekokechickwabe and the reader. This leads the chapter into its second portion: what is the intent behind ignoring or hiding the identities of lynching victims even with the knowledge that many Native American tribes use multi-naming traditions?

This portion is more speculative than previous sections and chapters has been because it deals with what the absence of a name means, not only to those who have been personally and physically victimized, but also what the absence of a name would mean in
the larger context of the historical record. As Huggins and Waugaman explain, multi-naming processes exist and are still common in Native American traditions. By not giving credence to the names of the victims, documenters and chroniclers are not only erasing the individual story of the victim and the story of the tribe they are affiliated with, the writers are negligently erasing the tie these victims have to living and deceased relatives. As well as denying the historical and familial connection, these writers are perpetuating the groundlessness which comes during and after lynching, whether the true reasoning be unconsciously or consciously connected to malicious intention.

Groundlessness plays an extremely important role in how historians and writers chronicle the lives of Native Americans because, as so many histories do, the history of a people follows them genealogically as well as geographically. Seminoles, Black Foot, Cherokee, Lakota, and other tribes that make up a rich variety of Native American traditions in the United States are geographically enthralling because these persons have been both possessed and dispossessed of land and name, and continue to be encroached upon up to the modern day. This is not an aftermath of lynching alone, but lynching was a tool which helped to perpetuate this sense of physical, geographical groundlessness. For instance, Chapters Three and Four speak to government encroachment on Native American land in Wisconsin and Minnesota due to capitalistic endeavors revolving around lumber. Encroachment continues to this day in oil drilling and pipelines throughout the United States. Lawsuits are filed annually across the nation trying to further protect Native American land from the threat of the US government. Protecting
the little land Native groups have been able to fight for and win comes at a cost.

However, there is no greater cost to these Native groups than the loss of burial grounds.

Burial traditions vary across the various Native American groups in the United States. Navajo’s have a more “no-frills” burial tradition, with few people attending the funeral so as to prevent the spread of death while also possibly burning the deceased’s possessions. Sioux tribes, more generally, have a burial tradition as well, but do not turn to burning the possessions. What is most interesting about the burial traditions, however, is that similar to Western traditions, Native Americans who buried their dead also used markers to depict information on the deceased. For instance, the Ojibwa tribe used many pictograms on their gravestones for important persons within the tribe. Within these pictures on the grave posts, information like family name and tribe can easily be deciphered. The deceased’s information was not erased, but chronicled on a memento of the Native American’s life. In many cases, information is even more imparted to the viewer of the grave location if one were to know what the pictures meant. For instance:
In the image above, it is noted on the “Warpaths To Peacepipes” website that the pictogram explains:

At the top of the grave post is the symbol of the reindeer representing the family clan name. Note that the reindeer is depicted upside down. Any Native American symbols that were portrayed upside down or reversed signified that they had died or been killed.

The seven sloping marks on the left denote that he had led seven war-parties…

The figure picturing the head of a moose denotes a mighty conflict he had experienced with this type of animal.

The symbols of the arrow and pipe indicate his influence in war and peace.59

This small post tells the story of a human who died, but gives credit to the family name/tribe. In taking away the name of the victim of lynching, chroniclers are keeping the history of the victim from being remembered at all. The person who is lynched, and whose body is never recovered by those who could pass the name forward (theoretically), dies in total, and as said before, this refers to the point made on “dying twice”. As well as

59 Ibid.
the death of the individual, the family name may die with the victim. The ancestral stories, traditions, naming processes (and the stories behind each name) die with an unmarked gravestone and the title “Unnamed Native American.”
Chapter Six: Chronicling Spectation and Groundlessness

This chapter will connect the twenty-three total case studies done on the named and unnamed Native American victims of lynching between chapters three and five and put them into the context of theoretical questions posed by scholars of African American lynching by looking at one of the most important parts of lynching: the spectator. In this section, I hope to participate in a thematic engagement between three terms: Voyeurism, Spectatorship, and Honor, and to then offer my own thoughts on how spectatorship affects the responsibilities of the person doing the lynching, along with those who watch the lynching from the stands, and, of course, the person who chooses to photograph the lynching. My end-goal for this chapter is to engage with the theory I have spoken to thus far (i.e. Native Americans are groundless due to a lack of chronicling attention, are also victims of spectations and physical lynching, and that Native Americans are sometimes victims of murder twice) and show how groundlessness must also factor into how Native Americans are perceived in the modern day and also in history due to the legacy of lynching.

To explain properly, this chapter will participate in a thematic engagement between two terms: Primary Spectatorship and Secondary Spectatorship. The ways in which these terms may be defined for this paper are as followed: Primary Spectatorship is a form of Spectatorship in which the witness must be in close enough physical proximity to act as witness to the event. For Primary Spectatorship, specifically, it is about close distance to the scene of execution and the objectified, as will be better explained in the next section. Secondary Spectatorship is also bent upon a physical distance demarcation,
and reliant on the Spectator being a witness outside of “real-time” and “real-space”.

These Secondary Spectators are the individuals who watch the public execution on film after the fact and who rely on the film, itself, to accurately portray “true” events. By engaging with these levels of Spectatorship, I hope to bring out a new perspective on Native Americans and Groundlessness. In theory, I hope to show that not only are there various forms of Spectators, but there are also varying traditions of Groundlessness.

*Primary Spectatorship*

As is said above, Primary Spectatorship is a form of Spectatorship in which the witness must be in close enough physical proximity to act as witness to the event. For instance, one such example is the hanging of two Seminole men, Palmer Sampson and Lincoln McGeisey, in 1898 Oklahoma. In 1898, there were about three hundred spectators who came to view a “live event” on the burning of the two Native American men. As previously noted, Sampson and McGeisey were posthumously declared innocent of the charge of murdering Mary Leard, thanks to C. Davis’ research into the matter. However, the most important action to recall, at this moment, is the documentation between J.K. Richard and C.R. Brooks. C.R. Brooks was the Acting Attorney General at the time and in the *American Indian and Alaskan Native Documents in the Congressional Serial Set: 1817-1899*, C.R. Brooks responds to the burning of the Native Americans by stating:

Please authorize the marshal here by wire to use all the men and money necessary to make arrests for burning Indian boys. There are about 300 conspirators. Will issue warrants under section 5519, Revised Statutes United States, if you think proper.
Brooks was not a primary spectator close to the scene of execution and the objectified. He did not attend the event. The more important note, then, would be the “300 conspirators” portion added to this section. Those three hundred witnesses are, by the definitions offered in this piece, Primary Spectators. Primary Spectatorship, of course, is most easily translated to being “someone who can physically witness/sense the event, in-person.” This is important because, generally, it is in this level of spectatoration where persons like C.R. Brooks can call the witnesses, who may not have touched Sampson or McGeisey, “conspirators.” However, a federal court and jury may judge these “three hundred conspirators” as mere “accessories” to the burning. In this case, I disagree. I believe that those who witness and do nothing are not mere accessories, because their inaction in the moment communally reinforces the extralegal action. For this, I turn to Robert Elder and Bertram Wyatt-Brown.

Passivity and forced subjugation are similar ideas, but with varying degrees of agency tied to them. Communal subjugation is enforced by the convoluted term of Honor which is hastily defined as:

essentially the cluster of ethical rules, most readily found in societies, of small communities, by which judgments of behavior are ratified by community consensus. Family integrity, clearly understood hierarchies of leaders and
subordinates, and ascriptive features of individuals and groups are guides for those evaluations.60 Several works, including Bertram Wyatt-Brown’s *Southern Honor* (which I quote above) and Robert Elder’s *The Sacred Mirror*, examine how honor/shame culture functioned in the nineteenth-century American South. One subject of these studies is community rituals and punishments whereby members of the community publicly assigned honor or shame, reinforced community mores and established or strengthened social hierarchies (of race, gender, or class). The insights from these works can be appliable to the lynching of Native Americans and it also helps to understand how the studies of honor and shame can be more broadly spread beyond the regionality of the South.

Wyatt-Brown, in particular, suggests that members of the community who “passively” observe community-sanctioned acts of violence or shaming on an individually cannot be truly passive. In honor/shame culture, the very presence of these persons as spectators provides social legitimacy or sanction to the event. The position of honor, much like the position of Spectatorship, is external and has to do with the communal conceptualization of internal agency. For instance, if a person’s “Honor” is smeared by word of mouth, that person must either act in accordance with the primal code to defend said Honor (perhaps in a physical altercation for men) or lose all sense of Honor for themselves and their family. This action, as argued by Robert Elder, of ignoring a challenge to one’s Honor is a form of shamelessness. Shame, shamelessness, and guilt are forms of *communally determined judgements*. Thus, *inaction* and enforced

60 Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South*, (Ann Arbor, MI: Scholarly Publishing Office, University of Michigan, 1982), XV and 3.
action are typical models in which to determine the system of agency and Spectatorship within the South. If, for example, a person is witness to the hanging of Sampson and says, “stop”, they are no longer “inactive.” They are now part of the script, play, action taking part. They become an actor. However, those who are silent are also active. For this, I turn to Sartre to explain the roles of a Spectator versus an Actor.

The Spectators are those who give weight to acts of offense or criminality (lynching) with their Spectatorship. It is on behalf of the power of Spectators that the actors concerned in any historical event are compelled to play their part on the historical stage. The Honor that Wyatt-Brown (and those who found inspiration from his ideas such as Robert Elder) characterized only exists when there are Spectators who witnessed, or could have witnessed, acts of communal shaming. The Spectators, for the purposes of clarity, are the fuel to fire for every duel and every lynch mob. Duels were had to reinstate each party’s Honor in the eyes of the community, the members of which were aware of (or potentially aware of) some transgression of the accused. Lynch mobs satisfy the community’s supposed need for justice/retribution or are used in order to enforce social and racial hierarchies. These messages of communal expectation can only make sense when the messages and acts of violence are made public; have witnesses. If there are no Spectators to judge, then duelists are performers in an empty theatre, and the lynch mobs would consist of two psychically active men—one to hold the victim while the second tied the noose—in an empty act of murder without communal payoff or acceptance. The Spectator may also serve as an example of Sartre’s “voyeur.” In a description of human existence in Sartre’s Being and Nothingness, Sartre describes
humans as existing as true subjects only when they are engrossed in the actions of others, without being directly observed themselves. This stipulates that the Spectators are simply people who watch actions taking place. Sartre describes voyeurs as observant beings, following the actions of others through a metaphorical keyhole, treating those they are observing as objects, and thus granting a particular type of power to the voyeur. For historical purposes, the “voyeur” is understood as the Spectator who is engrossed in the actions of others. The observed/victims are classified as historical actors, who are rendered as objects due to the observational and judgmental qualities of the Spectator. Those who spectate at a lynching are just as guilty as those who tie the noose, in the moment. That is what C.R. Brooks sought to emphasize: there is no difference between Spectator and Actor. They are equally guilty.

To conclude, Primary Spectators are those who witness an event in real-time and real-distance. It is not someone who views a photo or video after an event has taken place. For this reason, I, for instance, could not be a Primary Spectator simply because of the primary documentation researched for this paper. Those documents (i.e. postcards, newspaper articles, journals, etc.) as my primary source of information, push this writer into the category of Secondary Spectator.

---

Secondary Spectatorship

Secondary Spectatorship is where most research for historical and journalistic needs rest. Secondary Spectatorship, as is said above, is also bent upon a physical distance demarcation, and reliant on the Spectator being a witness outside of “real-time” and “real-space”. In these sorts of incidences information is coming from a different level of distance. In Primary Spectatorship, the overall role of the Primary Spectator is mostly unchanging. They witness, actively or passively, an event. They act, even in moments of inaction, by their very participation. Secondary Spectatorship is more complicated because of time and distance.

For instance, in Chapter Four, the unnamed man lynched in 1884 according to the Los Angeles Herald is described in different fashions depending on the source. In the Los Angeles Herald:

“An Indian Lynched. San Francisco, Sept 7.—A Portland, Oregon, special says: A special to the Oregonian from Cheney, Washington Territory says: An Indian confined in the jail here for outraging a white woman near Spokane Falls a few days ago, was taken from jail last night by a body of masked men and lynched. The Indians here are very sullen and are putting on war paint. They declare that the lynched Indian was innocent and trouble is feared.”

The account in this article differs markedly from a description of the same even (event?) in Charles Ratcliffe’s letter to his young lover, Louise:

Oh Louise, will I tell you of the dreadful thing that happened here yesterday and what I fear is going to happen tonight. A woman riding alone between Cheney and Spokane about dark was met by two Indians and dragged out of the wagon by the fiends after accomplishing their purpose left her insensible. Hundreds of men

---

62 Los Angeles Herald, California Digital Newspaper Collection. (Volume 22, Number 8, 9 September 1884). https://cdnc.ucr.edu/cgi-bin/cdnc?a=d&d=LAH18840909.2.6&e=-------en--20--1--txt-txIN-------1.
turned out and today the principle was caught and is now in jail. Tonight an attempt will be made to lynch him. I sincerely hope they will although it is an awful thing to do. I saw him as he passed the office just a few minutes ago. Maybe I ought not to have told you this, but it is not worse than has been committed in Ill not many days ago. Truly the way of the transgressor is hard” (see Appendix 11).

Ratcliffe posits that the lynching was premeditated and known about in advance, whereas the article describes the event as entirely mob-related, passionate, and unconnected from the town’s principals, etc. The story was a ruse to shield the community from responsibility, keeping the community members’ honor unstained by the murderous actions, removing them to a level of spectation different from that of knowledgeable spectator. If one were to only see the letter from Ratcliffee to Bressler, however, or only to see the Los Angeles Herald article, they would have completely different images of the events. This is important. Primary spectators are important because of the weight they bring to an event such as lynching. Primary spectators give credence and are actors on the stage, even if they say and do nothing at all, because they fill up the background and without them there would be no stage. Secondary Spectators, however, are reliant on the information. Thus, Secondary Spectators are able to claim removal and thus responsibility from the action even as they are, normally, the ones who try to reconstruct the events for the modern audiences of the time. In restating a previous point I made in this paper, Secondary spectators are the individuals who do not watch a scene in person. They watch the public execution through the filming of the execution after-the-fact and are reliant on media form, itself, to accurately portray “true” events.

63 Manuscripts, Archives, and Special Collections, (Washington State University Libraries, Cage 1771).
Secondary Spectatorship also provides a lens to further understand how events of the past can affect the present which is why historians rely so heavily on this form of spectatorship: for instance, the photograph of Henry Smith led to the retelling of the tragic method in which Henry Smith was “brought to justice” through extralegal violence in Amy Wood’s *Lynching and Spectacle*. In *Lynching and Spectacle: Witnessing Racial Violence*, Amy Louise Wood describes the lynching of Henry Smith: “The mob paraded [Henry Smith] through the city streets before bringing him to the scaffold, where men […] tortured him for nearly an hour before burning [Smith] to death…These spectators were not merely curious onlookers; rather, the sheer size of the crowd reflected that common heart and single impulse toward retribution.”64 In the moment, the witnesses to the event are Primary Spectators. However, Wood and those who research this event are known as Secondary Spectators due to the removal from the event over distance and time. By re-articulating such an event using the photo representation and by corroborating newspaper clippings, the Spectator does not need to be physically present at the event to try and parse out a clear idea of what occurred. However, as with most photographs or newspaper clippings, there is a problem when using this method of memory because it is typically using a singular perspective. Once more perspectives

---

64 Amy Louise Wood, *Lynching and Spectacle: Witnessing Racial Violence in America, 1890-1940*, (Chapel Hill: Univ Of North Carolina Press, 2011), 71; This portion on Henry Smith, of course, goes back to the conversation on honor in the South. If honor, then, is to be upheld or defined by the state, the state (or, in this case, Deputy Vance) must punish that which it has dubbed dishonorable in a public fashion, just as Vance and the police officers judged Henry Smith to have acted dishonorably. Henry Smith, then, is simply an instrument in Paris, Texas’ attempt to establish a standard of honor. Henry Smith was publicly tortured and murdered because Deputy Vance chose to make a Spectacle out of Henry Smith because Vance had the power and authority to make a crime out of being black: something Vance defines as distinguishable from human, especially in the Bishop’s articulation of the “gorilla ferocity” Smith uses against Vance’s daughter. As an act commemorated through photographs, in this instance, perspective becomes a looming issue because it constrains the perspective of history in too small a frame.
come together, the more reliable the information becomes. However, no one Secondary Spectator is as trustworthy as that of an honest Primary Spectator. This would mean, of course, that reliability is always called into question when a Secondary Spectator is the one positioning the story of the events.

Groundlessness

In defining “groundless” I refer to the Oxford English Dictionary’s definition for the term: “destitute of foundation, authority, or support; having no real cause or reason; unfounded”. Groundlessness is extremely important in determining the status of those who were specifically targeted and victimized by the action of lynching. So, what does it mean to be groundless? Throughout this thesis, the goal has been to mark how history has steadfastly ignored or misremembered the violences enacted against Native Americans. For example, if the reader returns to Chapter Four, they could once again read about the unnamed Native American in the James McCormick murder case found in Alexandra Harmon’s 1998 *Indians in the Making: Ethnic Relations and Indian Identities Around Puget Sound*. Harmon writes, “Natives probably killed James McCormick while he explored Lake Union, and Seattle residents subsequently hanged two Indian suspects.”

---


However, as I noted in the chapter, the “victim”, James McCormick, is named, and the Native Americans “who killed McCormick” were found. In four of the incidents mentioned in Chapter Four, the victims were named. In one of the instances where there was “no name” for the “victim of a/the Native American(s), the person was given a geographic signifier (i.e. “Frenchman”). In two of the instances, the “victim of the Native Americans” were women, and in another, the “victim of the Native American” was a child. This is all to say that the “victims” of the accused Native Americans were given ties to a community in the blurbs, no matter how short. These connections could be names, locations, or age signifiers to the community. The community, also, probably already knew the supposed victim. The Native Americans, however, were almost never qualified in those instances. These writers helped to further perpetuate a distance between the Native American lynch victims and the readers of the article. What is interesting is that the separation between Native American and victim is not predicated on the victim being a white American.

One such example of a systemic and intentional designation of other to Native Americans appears in Chapter Four when Richard Current’s *The History of Wisconsin: The Civil War Era, 1848-1873*, speaks about the 1869 Native American hanging of an unnamed victim:

“A year later lynchers made short work of an Indian who, according to the Kilbourn City *Mirror*, had murdered a Frenchman in the cranberry marsh north of Necedah and had been jailed in New Lisbon. ‘On Sunday a masked mob came
down from Necedah, forcibly entered the jail, and, taking the Indian out, hung him to the nearest tree.”

Current describes the lynching of a Native American who had been accused of murdering a European. As I said before, Current describes the location of the event, and the brutality of the mob as they “forcibly” entered the jail. In this incident, it is extremely important to note that while Current does not seem to sympathize with the mob lynching the Native American, he is unable to find the name of the lynched victim. Once again, the Native American is left nameless in the face of violent atrocities. At this point, that was the first time in this chapter that the white victim was also left nameless in the retelling of the event. However, the European victim, the “Frenchman,” is still more clearly identified than the Native American who is relegated to the defining term “Indian.” This above is all to say that Native Americans are typically relegated to no geographic, physical, linguistic, cultural, or personal connections in documentation. This is problematic for the future of the tribes because the people within the tribes have little to no real protection from those who might choose to take up these actions again, in a communal fashion. Whereas African Americans have been given specific legal protections, Native Americans have to ride on the backs of these protections as a protected “minority” within the US, but they have government separations from the law of the land, at times. Coupling this with historical context, it makes sense that Native

---

67 Milwaukee Sentinel, (September 30, 1868): Quoting the Wisconsin State Journal, September 28, 1868); January 20, January 23 (quoting Edward Huggins to Ezra Meeker, April 15, 1903, Ezra Meeker Papers, Washington State Historical Society, Box 5, Folder 17; Gibbs to McClellan, March the Monroe Sentinel, January 20), October 2, 1869 (citing the Kilbourn City Mirror, September 29, 1869); June 1, 1871; there is a good chance this footnote from Richard Nelson Current’s The History of Wisconsin : The Civil War Era, 1848-1873 is inaccurate due to the fact that the lynching supposedly occurred in 1869, yet the newspaper article is dated 1868. However, the newspapers were not available to clarify and check for certainty.
American burial grounds are at the highest risk of infrastructural encroachment by the United States government. The modern problems that Native Americans face may heavily come in the aftermath of lynching, relocation, and, of course, isolation.
Conclusion

The Dakota War of 1862 is a portion of history important to the studies of Native Americans, but it was not, technically, extralegal. My work throughout this paper has hopefully substantiated that there is a difference between extralegal lynching and legal hangings, but I hope that it has also shown how difficult it may be to trust the legal system and information dissemination systems put in charge of chronicling these events. Historical characters like Henry Channing, the Unitarian clergyman and author who spoke at the execution of Hannah Ocuish, are not persons who write in a tone sad to have witnessed the hanging of a child in 1786. He wrote for an audience, not to purge himself of a horrific action he witnessed and took part in. These “legal” hangings done before 1786 are equally complicated to extralegal lynchings because they were done before the professionalization of law enforcement in the United States. What this means, of course, is that the investigators involved in this murder case would have been local people who were, more than likely, higher up in the social ladder. This realization speaks back to the literary theoreticians who foreground much of this research.

Chapter Two grappled with existing theories of lynching laid out by African American lynching theorists such as Sandy Alexandre, Amy Wood, and Saidiyah Hartman. Within this chapter, I hopefully conveyed that there were a number of similarities that could be bridged between that of African American and Native American lynch studies; especially as they pertain to the spectators. This led into Chapter Three and Chapter Four’s case-studies of named and unnamed Native American lynching victims. In Chapter Five, I was better able to articulate how a lack of chronicling names
is even more complex to Native American victims that other groups (i.e. Mexicans, African Americans, Chinese, or Italian groups) because of multi-naming systems which exist across many of the Native American tribes of the United States. This portion was then further articulated against the social idea of “twice-murdered” and “groundlessness” which immediately led into the conversation in Chapter Six. Finally, this chapter looked heavily at how groundlessness, namelessness, and the spectator all work together during and after events of lynching. I most especially hope that the writing portion articulating how inactive spectators are still culpable and not mere accessories to murder makes a dent in how witnesses have been previously perceived. Overall, there were many lofty theories and ambitions to this paper, but one true underlying and basic target within this paper: not only did I look to criticize potentially poor investigative work (whether it be intentionally malicious, or simply lazy) from the past, but I also looked to reinforce a standard of expectation for those who wish to go into any field of research and/or writing. I truly believe that writers are the last defense against the erasure of history. It stands to measure that there should be a higher expectation of those of them granted this power.
APPENDICES:
CHAPTER THREE APPENDIX

The improvement of the Fox and Wisconsin rivers will be entitled to your consideration. To aid this great work, and perfect this important mineral link of communication between the Mississippi river and the lakes, Congress has made a liberal grant of land.

The agricultural, lumbering and commercial importance of that portion of the state to be effected by this improvement would seem to require that some steps should be taken to carry out the object of the grant. Your attention is therefore directed to the subject.
WAR WITH THE CHIPPEWAS.

By the steamboat Doctor Franklin which came down from St Croix on Saturday last, we learn that the prospect of a war with the Chippewa Indians is threatening.

Some time since we published a statement of the murder of a man by the name of Drake, near the Falls of St Croix, and also that three other men were missing, and supposed to have been murdered by Indians. The supposition has proven true; for besides the confession of the
Indian himself, who committed the deed, as well as the testimony of others it appears that the three men were killed by a Chippewa.

The inhabitants of the Falls of St. Croix last Saturday week, having got possession of the Indian, hung him upon a tree until he was dead. This has exasperated the Chippeways, and they threaten vengeance upon the whites.

Large war bands of these Indians are collecting in the vicinity, and measures of defence are being taken. Captain Eastman of the 1st infantry, commanding Fort Snelling, has turned over to the use of the citizens of St. Croix, several cannon, a quantity of ammunition, and a number of stands of arms to be used if necessary against the Indians.

A requisition has been made for 200 regular troops from Jefferson Barracks, to proceed forthwith to that district to repel any descent the Indians may make upon the whites. A portion of the company of Capt. Eastman are under his command at Wabash prairie, assisting in the removal of the Winnebagoes; the remainder guard Fort Snelling.

It is feared by many that a war with this powerful tribe of Indians will ensue, but we trust not, though appearances are truly threatening. We state the above facts not as an alarmist, but facts well authenticated, by a gentleman who was present at the time of the execution. An officer of the army informs us that the requisition for troops has been made.
In regard to the act of the inhabitants in “Lynching” the Indian and giving him what he deserved, punishment by death, no one is disposed to censure.— The citizens are without a state or even territorial government, with no courts or judges to hold them; and so frequent has been the case that Indian murderers of white men have gone unpunished, that it appears the citizens were determined to establish a precedent that would show to the Chippeways that their barbarous acts can no longer be committed with impunity.—Patriot.
RETRIBUTION.

Lompoc's Shame and Lompoc's Redemption.

FULL PARTICULARS OF SANTA RITA'S BLOOD-CURDLING HORROR.

Confession of the Scoundrel and His Immediate Execution.

Fig. 7. Morning Press Image. 5 April 1881. California Digital Newspapers, https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=MP18810405&e=--------en--20--1--txt-txIN--------1.
A Press reporter reads the following article from Longears, recording the death of Mrs. Huma. The report is dated April 5, 1881, and describes the death of Mrs. Sturges, a woman who was struck by a club over the head and subsequently died.

had evidently dragged his victim through the grass and brush.

DIAGRAM.

The following diagram shows the exact location of the various scenes in the tragedy. It is engraved from a sketch prepared upon the spot by a Press reporter:

EXPLANATION.
A. Place where the murder was committed, as shown by the blood, etc.
B. Trail where the victim was dragged.
C. Spot where the body was found, the trail being 478 steps long.
D. Spot where the club with which the murder was committed was produced.
E. Place where the hat was hidden, under the leaves of the live oak tree.
F. Sheep corral.
G. The spot where the pail was pointed out by the Indian.
H. Live oak tree where he was hung.
I. Cabin belonging to corral.
J. Horse trail leading from where the corpse was found to the cabin.
K. Course pursued by the murderer in showing where the various articles were.

* * * Represents groups of live oak trees in the vicinity.

Fig. 11. Morning Press Image, 5 April 1881. California Digital Newspapers, https://cdnc.ucr.edu/?a=d&d=MP18810405&e=-------en--20--1--txt-txIN-------1.
The telegram from Mrs. Sobieski read: "Respected Sir, I am writing you to inform you of a tragedy that has occurred in our town. A young girl, whose name is unknown, was brutally murdered last night. The body was found in an isolated area near the town center. The murder was残忍的, and the killer is still at large. We are doing our best to investigate the case, but we need your help. Please send us any information you may have. In the meantime, we will do our best to ensure the safety of our citizens. Yours sincerely, Mrs. Sobieski."
Fig. 14-A. *Lawrence Daily Journal* Image. March 6, 1886. Newspapers from Lawrence, Kansas, Page 1, https://www.newspapers.com/image/59640733/?terms=lawrence%2Bdaily%2Bjournal
Fig. 14-B. *Lawrence Daily Journal* Image. March 6, 1886. Newspapers from Lawrence, Kansas, Page 1, https://www.newspapers.com/image/59640733/?terms=lawrence%2Bdaily%2Bjournal
Fig. 15. Indian Chieftain Image. March 11, 1886. Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers, Oklahoma Historical Society, Page 1, https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn83025010/1886-03-11/ed-1/seq-1/#date1=1886&sort=relevance&rows=20&words=CHIEFTAIN+Indian+INDIAN&searchType=basic&sequence=0&index=10&state=&date2=1886&proxtext=Indian+chieftain &y=0&x=0&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=5
Fig. 16. Iowa City Weekly Republican Image. July 3rd, 1889. Iowa City Public Library Website, https://iowacity.advantage-preservation.com/viewer/?k=frank%20glassman&i=f&by=1889&bdd=1880&d=0101180-12311925&m=between&ord=k1&fn=iowa_city_weekly_republican_usa_iowa_iowa_city_18890703_english_8&df=1&dt=2&cid=2702
An Indian who assaulted Mrs. Frank Glassman, near Bedford, Iowa, was lynched by a mob, and hanged to a tree.

Fig. 17. *Iowa City Weekly Republican* Image. July 3rd, 1889. Iowa City Public Library Website, https://iowacity.advantage-preservation.com/viewer/?k=frank%20glassman&i=f&by=1889&bdd=1880&d=01011808-12311925&m=between&ord=k1&fn=iowa_city_weekly_republican_usa_iowa_iowa_city_18890703_english_8&df=1&dt=2&cid=2702
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Offense charged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi—Continued.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Dec. 1915</td>
<td>Cordelia Stevenson</td>
<td>Her son burned white man's barn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alma House.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rankin County</td>
<td>Apr. 1921</td>
<td>Rachel Moore.</td>
<td>In search for her brother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickens</td>
<td>Sept. 1923</td>
<td>Jessie Winner (white)</td>
<td>Murder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Paralee Collins.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>Dec. 1895</td>
<td>Mrs. W. E. Holton (white)</td>
<td>By vigilantes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Plains</td>
<td>June 17, 1914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyapaha County</td>
<td>Mar. 18, 1895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morganton</td>
<td>Mar. 1897</td>
<td>Mrs. Joe Perry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Apr. 1915</td>
<td>Laura Nelson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon Creek</td>
<td>Feb. 1899</td>
<td>Marie Scott.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okemah</td>
<td>Mar. 1911</td>
<td>Mrs. John Puckett (white)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagoner County</td>
<td>Mar. 1914</td>
<td>Eliza Goode.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleton County</td>
<td>Dec. 1895</td>
<td>Mrs. Oliver Wideman.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake City</td>
<td>Feb. 1898</td>
<td>Rose Carson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Nov. 1898</td>
<td>— (white)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>Nov. 1898</td>
<td>Mrs. Martin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>Dec. 1899</td>
<td>— (white)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellerree</td>
<td>Jun. 1910</td>
<td>Mrs. Wm. Whaley (white)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiptonville</td>
<td>Jan. 1889</td>
<td>Jessie Dillingham.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner County</td>
<td>Feb. 1902</td>
<td>Mrs. John Crocker (white)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jellico</td>
<td>Mar. 1903</td>
<td>Mrs. Abe Phillips.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersburg</td>
<td>Mar. 1905</td>
<td>Hannah E. Phillips.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevier County</td>
<td>Mar. 1897</td>
<td>— (white)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>Dec. 1911</td>
<td>Floatina Sullita (white)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokeyville</td>
<td>Feb. 1894</td>
<td>Mrs. James Mason.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharton</td>
<td>May 1895</td>
<td>Mary Jackson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampete County</td>
<td>July 1895</td>
<td>Sarah Cabaniss.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beigerfield</td>
<td>Aug. 1893</td>
<td>Tenola Cabaniss.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catula</td>
<td>Oct. 1895</td>
<td>Bessie Cabaniss.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Feb. 1912</td>
<td>— (white)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsville</td>
<td>June 1918</td>
<td>— (white)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowans Depot</td>
<td>Oct. 1897</td>
<td>Mrs. T. Arthur (white)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln County</td>
<td>Dec. 1894</td>
<td>Ella Watson (white)</td>
<td>Cattle stealing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater</td>
<td>July 1889</td>
<td>— (white)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 19. *The Morning Call* Image. April 30, 1890. Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers, Page 8, Image 8, https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn94052989/1890-04-30/ed-1/seq-8/#date1=1890&index=15&rows=20&words=APRIL+CALL+MORNING&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=California&date2=1890&proxtext=the+morning+call+april&y=0&x=0&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1.

Fig. 20. Hilleary, Cecily. “Paul Holytrack (top row, second from right) and Phillip Ireland (bottom row, far right), suspects in the February 1897 murder of a white settler family in Emmons County, N.D. Holytrack, Ireland, and Alex Cadotte (not pictured) were lynched by townspeople.” VOA News. April 25th, 2018. https://www.voanews.com/usa/remembering-native-american-lynching-victims
KILLING OF MRS. LAIRD BY SEMINOLE INDIANS.

LETTER FROM
THE ACTING ATTORNEY-GENERAL,

TRANSMITTING,

IN RESPONSE TO RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF JANUARY 20, 1898, COPIES OF ALL PAPERS AND CORRESPONDENCE IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE RELATING TO THE KILLING OF MRS. LAIRD IN THE SEMINOLE NATION, AND THE SUBSEQUENT BURNING TO DEATH OF McGEISY AND SAMPSON BY A MOB.

JANUARY 28, 1898.—Referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1898.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt at this Department of a resolution of the Senate of the United States of January 20, 1898, requesting information of this Department as to what steps have been taken to ascertain the facts in relation to the killing of a woman in Oklahoma Territory by Seminole Indians and the burning to death of two Seminole Indians by a mob in said Territory, and also as to what steps have been taken to punish the alleged offenders.

In response to this resolution, copies of all papers and correspondence in this Department relative to the killing of Mrs. Laird in the Seminole Nation and the subsequent burning to death of McGeisy and Sampson by a mob are herewith sent.

Very respectfully,

J. K. Richards,
Acting Attorney-General.

The President of the Senate.

[Telegram.]

SOUTH McALESTER, Ind. T., January 12, 1898.

To ATTORNEY-GENERAL, Washington, D. C.:

Newspaper reports of Seminole uprising wholly unfounded. No trouble there.

Bennett, Marshal.

Fig. 21. 55th Congress, Second Session. Digital Commons. https://digitalcommons.law.ou.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=7694&context=indianserialset
Fig. 22. Imperial Press Image. June 08, 1901. Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers, Page 7, Image 7.
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conviction of each one of the ring-leaders, and $400 respectively for the arrest and conviction of each one other than a ring-leader actually aiding and abetting in the commission of said crimes—the total of said several sums not to exceed in any event the aforesaid sum of five thousand dollars.

Said rewards to be paid only in case of arrest within six months from the date hereof, and upon subsequent final conviction of the perpetrator or perpetrators.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of state to be hereunto affixed, this second day of June, A. D. 1901.

[Seal] HENRY T. GAGE,
Governor.

Attest: C. E. Curry, Secretary of State.

act gently and promptly on the liver, kidneys, stomach and bowels. They cure sick headache, constipation, biliousness, stomach disorders, sallow complexion, and are the only pills that will also purify and enrich the blood. Sold in 10ct. and 25ct. boxes by all druggists. Every box guaranteed.
This was the case in Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin, in July 1848, when a crowd of whites hanged an Ojibwa man who had stabbed a drunken lumberjack, Martial Caznobia, in an altercation over Caznobia’s attempt to sexually assault the Ojibwa man’s wife. A large group of Ojibwas came to the settlement demanding that the murderers be handed over to them or they would burn the town, a situation defused when a Native interpreter negotiated for the transportation of the ringleaders of the white mob downriver to authorities in Prairie du Chien for prosecution under American law.\textsuperscript{75} Similarly, a group

Tension between the races was fairly constant, and from time to time violence broke out. On July 4, 1849, several lumberjacks left their holiday celebration in a Chippewa Falls saloon for some fun at a nearby wigwam. When one of them, Martial Caznobia, attempted to take liberties with a Chippewa woman, her husband drove him off with a knife, inflicting a supposedly fatal wound (Caznobia recovered from it). A mob of whites hanged the Indian to the limb of a pine tree. More than a thousand of his fellow tribesmen then descended upon the town and threatened to burn it unless the killers were turned over to them. Finally the chiefs agreed to let the mob leaders be punished according to the white man’s law. Three men were arrested and put on a boat to be sent to Prairie du Chien for trial. They escaped on the way.\textsuperscript{62}


present proportions of the supply, in a stream whose rafting logs, as on less turbulent waters, is utterly impossible, could not have been appreciated or understood by lumberman inexperienced in such unusual conditions. But that these almost insuperable obstacles have been overcome by the construction of the Paint Creek system of piers, dams and booms, speaks in no uncertain way of the indomitable energy, perseverance, ability and confidence with which the present generation of lumbermen are equipped to meet the growing demand of the world for wood. 

When the new firm took the mill, it had two twelve foot saws, one lathe and one shingle mill, the capacity being almost 16,000 feet per day.

On the 4th of June, 1847, the drenching flood for which the valley is noted came upon this young and struggling firm. The usual Spring rise in the river did not occur that year and the supply of logs which had been hauled on the Yellow River were hung up there. On the 5th, the long looked for rain came and in such a generous and copious way that by noon the day the river at the Falls was several feet higher than it has ever been since, even in the memorable flood of 1880 which carried down two bridges here. All the season's supply of lumber was swept away, and as there was no boom at Beef Slough, with its capacious saw to take it in, it floated on and on, probably most of it passing through the delta of the Mississippi, to be borne on the bosom of the Gulf Stream, until finally, waterlogged, it would sink off the banks of Newfoundland, there to be covered by the ever-depositing sediment, to form coal for man's use, some millions of years from now. This thought may be some compensation for those who witnessed the depressing sight of seeing their hard-earned earnings carried from their grasp with no possible power to prevent it.

At this juncture in the affairs of the firm, Mr. Bass withdrew, and he and his wife went to St. Paul, an embryonic city at that time, and securing land on the site of the present city, the legitimate result followed. He became one of the heavy men of St. Paul. Mr. Allen used his credit to rebuild and to pay for gatherings of what staves could be found along the river bottom. As to the loss at the Falls it is sufficient to say that the warehouses and structures placed in the river the previous season, to stop and hold the logs, were washed away. Nothing was left but the bare mill; its rafts and bound logs were demolished or filled with gravel. Ten thousand logs from the Yellowstone went down the river that day. In 1848 the Sioux came up on invitation of the Chipewa and held a council. They went through the ceremony of burning the hatchet and smoking the pipe of peace. A dinner was served the next day. Both sides presented eternal peace and friendship, evidently with mental reservations. Wabashag, Big Thunderer, Red Wing and others were there.

Some time in the summer of 1848, a wealthy gentleman by the name of Blooming, from Galena, which was then the largest city on the Mississippi, north of St. Louis, sent up a party of men to fix a site for a saw-mill and soon came on himself and began operations at the lower part of Eagle Rapids. He soon sickened of the undertaking and sold out to Mr. Allen at the Falls, returning to Galena. The team and supplies were brought to the Falls, and as many of the men as chose remained. Among these men were the two "Jim's." Hurley and Inglar. Hurley was married, and he built a house and a saloon, said to be the first in the whole valley. On the 4th of July, 1849, a party from the saloon, who had been drinking freely, among them Martial Camoel, went to the wigwam of an Indian, and attempting to take liberties with his squaw, was repelled by the husband's driving a knife to the hilt into his body. He was taken to the Hurley House and was supposed to be dying. As it was on Sunday morning, a large crowd congregated. Some one yelled, "Let us hang the d—d Indian." A rush was made for his place, a rope was brought, he was taken out and hanged to the limb of a pine tree. Mr. Allen remonstrated with all his power against the outrage, well knowing that the very existence of the settlement was thus placed in jeopardy. The news spread instantly, and 1,500 enraged Indians came down upon the place, resolved to burn it, unless the murderers should be turned over to them. The exertions of George P. Warren, a Chippewa interpreter, and James Erntinger, and their confidence in and respect for Mr. and Mrs. Allen alone prevented the execution of the threat, and after an explanation that no wrong was intended against the Chippewa nation, that it was the result of fire-water, the chiefs concluded that they would be satisfied if the ringleaders should be arrested and tried according to our laws. Tom Inglar and two others were accordingly placed on a boat to be sent to Prairie du Chien for trial. Eight bears volunteered as an escort. On reaching the vicinity of the Sioux, the fear of their friendly enemies seized them, notwithstanding their late treaty of peace, and they returned. The prisoners kept on and never reported in person again on the river. Camoel recovered and made no unnecessary delay in relieving the village of his presence.

Previous to 1847, not a man came except in the lumber interest; but that year a sturdy Herman George Meyer—seeing the cost of boiling up flour and feed and other farm products, resolved to raise them right here. Allen and Bass assisted him to get up his implements, and in other ways. He opened a farm with grain, wood and water, six miles northwest from the town, and demonstrated the value of the land for agricultural purposes. The farm was afterwards sold to William Henneman.

Some time in 1848, Capt. Stover Rives, of Maine, who had been living in Janesville, and his brother Moses, bought of Mr. Allen an interest in the mill, and came on with his family. He remained here, when Mr. Allen purchased his interest. Moses still remained. The firm was then H. S. Allen & Co.

During this period, and, indeed, up to this time and years afterwards, Mr. Allen made vigorous efforts to secure some means of transportation up the river. Going down was comparatively easy, but returning was a serious affair, as the haggard and footstomping raftsman,
It is reported that one of the Indian murderers of Young, was to have been executed in a summary manner, at Seattle, some time during the present week.

Measures are about being taken to require “indemnity for the past,” and “security for the future,” to the white inhabitants along the Sound.

Fig. 5. Pioneer and Democrat Image. April 08, 1854. Library of Congress "Chronicling America" digital newspaper project.
brought to Belmont. There the sheriff took them, and while on the way to Hiko one of them, Bill’s brother, broke away and escaped. Bill was then taken from the sheriff by the people and conducted to Hiko. He confessed to many murders, one of which implicated a savage called Moquitch, who was sent for; and the two hanged. This was not the worst of it; this is not the disgraceful part of the story. Full of rage and vile drink, after the hanging of the two aboriginals the people of Hiko went to a camp near by and massacred seven natives, some of whom were guilty and some innocent. This was most dastardly; and had the diabolical deed been perpetrated by savages upon whites, all the world would have lifted its hands in horror, and a regiment of soldiers would have been sent by government to annihilate the nation to which the murderers belonged. How fortunate to be born white!

At Cherry Creek, Nevada, in September 1875 a native criminal was taken from the sheriff and executed by the people.

At break of day the 17th of December 1875, as two men were passing Carson cemetery they saw swinging from the gate frame the figure of a man. Returning horrified to town, they told what they had seen, and soon crowds were pouring along the road in that direction. It was ascertained the body was that of a noted desperado named Samuel Burt. The ominous number “601” pinned to the breast showed that the dread Vigilance Committee had been abroad the night before. Robbery and incendiaryism had been prevalent of late, and in all large villages Burt was chief. He had been frequently ordered to leave town, but had refused to go. Those who hanged him were disguised. They took him from the Emory engine-house, where he had been accustomed to sleep for some time past. He made no disturbance when awakened by the fearful summons, “Get up quickly and dress yourself; you are wanted.” He seemed to realize all in an instant, and did as he was bade in all things, quietly and quickly. It was a good desperado at the last.

About the 1st of July, at Ward, Nevada, a native having attempted violence upon a white girl eleven years of age, the citizens told his countrymen they must attend to it, whereupon they took their erring brother and hanged him; and the little white girl was pacified.

As late as midsummer of this year, 1877, both at Winnemucca and Virginia, as well as in other parts of Nevada, the Vigilance Committee was still in active existence. At Winnemucca early one morning in July a robust ruffian figure was found suspended from the limb of a dead tree in the burnt district with the calabashic “601” pinned to his back. Between the good and the bad there is eternal antagonism.

Fig. 6. Bancroft, Hubert-Howe. *Bancroft’s Works Popular Tribunals vol. 1*. Brigham Young University, 1887.

At Cherry Creek, Nevada, in September 1875 a native criminal was taken from the sheriff and executed by the people.

Fig. 7. Bancroft, Hubert-Howe. *Bancroft’s Works Popular Tribunals vol. 1*. Brigham Young University, 1887.
The Court of Judge Lynch has been in session in Arizona. Two Wallapai Indians accused of murdering John Curiton, at Hackberry were hanged at Tom Ship’s ranch. At Gillette, one Sefright was arrested for striking a man on the head with a bottle, when without apparent cause he shot Sam. Weir through the head. He was chased and captured by the people who took him from Deputy Sheriff Burnett and his assistant L. G. Taylor, the latter receiving a bullet in his head. John Hamilton was shot near Chavez Pass by Tom House the mail carrier from Rock Springs Station to Navajo Springs; the cause of the murder is not known.
An Indian Lynched.

SAN FRANCISCO, Sept 7.—A Portland, Oregon, special says: A special to the Oregonian from Cheney, Washington Territory, says: An Indian confined in jail here for outraging a white woman near Spokane Falls a few days ago, was taken from jail last night by a body of masked men and lynched. The Indians here are very sullen and are putting on war paint. They declare that the lynched Indian was innocent and trouble is feared.

Fig. 10. An Indian Lynched. September 1884. Los Angeles Herald, California Digital Newspaper Collection, (Volume 22, Number 8) https://cdnc.ucr.edu/cgi-bin/cdnc?a=d&d=LAH18840909.2.6&e=-------en--20--1--txt-txIN-------1.

Fig. 11. “Manuscripts, Archives, and Special Collections.” Washington State University Libraries, Cage 1771.
Fig. 13. “Kootenais on the Warpath: The Result of Lynching Two Indian Murderers.”
https://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/1888/03/28/103172811.html?pageNumber=1
KOOTENAI ON THE WARPATH.

THE RESULT OF LYNCHING TWO INDIAN MURDERERS.

BUTTE, MONTANA, MARCH 27.—A few days ago word was received that the settlers north of Flathead Lake had discovered the murder of three white men committed last summer by Kootenai Indians, and had armed themselves to go in search of and punish the murderers. It would seem that they had accomplished their purpose, for a letter containing the following extract was received from a resident of that section yesterday:

"Here we are all up at Lakinson on account of the Kootenai scare. All the families from Elliott's down, except Henry Bartlett's, are here. Those above Elliott's, on this side, have gone to the Sheldon schoolhouse. Those on the east side have retired to Ashley. The trouble arose from the lynching of the Indian murderers at Dennis Mills. Though nothing definite has been learned it is understood that the Kootenais have taken the warpath. A squad of men from Selish is guarding the Point of Reeks; another from our own party is defending the Los Ferry, and we are seeing to the Big Forks forts. Don't be worried, for we do not expect serious trouble. Nothing has been heard from that section since then, and it is presumed that there have been no active hostilities. Still the Kootenais are a revengeful tribe, and if provoked would scarcely be above taking a few white scalps if opportunity offered.

The New York Times
Published: March 28, 1888
Copyright © The New York Times

Fig. 15. “An Indian Lynched.” October 16, 1892. The New York Times, https://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/1892/10/16/104148850.html?pageNumber=1
An Indian Lynched.

Ash Fork, Arizona, Oct. 15.—Lizzie Nichols, eight years old, while on horseback yesterday, was dragged from her horse by an Indian and nearly choked to death, besides being kicked and badly bruised. Her garments were nearly torn off, but she managed to escape from her captor three times.

The girl’s mother, dismayed at her long absence, started after her and found her in a fainting condition, owing to an attempted criminal assault.

The Indian returned to town yesterday. An angry crowd collected, and, despite his groans and protests in broken English, seized and hanged him to a telegraph pole. He was then riddled with bullets and the body left hanging. At the inquest a verdict was rendered of death from hanging and gunshot wounds by parties unknown.
Finally Sheriff W. H. Miller organized a posse and set out in search of the Indians. The posse came upon the Indians camp on Beaver creek but it was saved by all save the squaws and children. The squaws were busy preserving meat for the winter. The entire camp was arrested and sent to Newcastle in charge of Lieut. Hilton. Then the posse set out in search of the braves. They were located on Lightning creek, just at dusk.

Sheriff Miller tried to have the Indians submit to arrest quietly, but they refused. They were under the leadership of Eagle Feather, a graduate of Carlisle, and Black Kettle, a noted warrior.

When the sheriff finally called on Eagle Feather to surrender he refused and Black Kettle suddenly raised his rifle and shot the sheriff, killing him. Members of the posse then opened fire on and shot down, Black Kettle. For a time the ensuing fight was a hot one. Both sides sought cover and the redskins held their ground in the darkness until Eagle Feather was shot in both legs. Then they stole away one at a time and the whole party set out in the direction of the Bad Lands in South Dakota.

Besides Sheriff Miller, Deputy Sheriff Waalkenburg was killed being shot in the neck and bleeding to death. Several braves besides Black Kettle were killed and a number including the wounded Eagle Feather, were taken prisoners. The whites sent couriers for help and camped for the night, guarding their prisoners.

As soon as possible Sheriff John Owens of Newcastle organized another posse and set out to intercept the fleeing reds before they could get into the Bad Lands, where they would be comparatively safe from pursuit. Once in the Bad Lands the reds could hide and return one by one to the reservations and it would be almost impossible to identify them.

On Monday came the report that Sheriff McDermott with still another posse had had a severe fight with a band of Indians near the Horseshoe Ranch about fifty miles east of where Saturday's fight took place. It was reported that ten of the Indians were killed and nine taken prisoners, and that none of the posse was injured.

Only the influence of the older men, who realize the folly of war, keeps the younger braves who are yet on the reservations from leaving and joining their brethren who are roaming at liberty and who may almost be said to be on the warpath.
CHAPTER FOUR APPENDIX

JUDGE LYNCH IN MINNESOTA

At least 20 people have met Judge Lynch in Minnesota. Sources to document these extralegal events, however, are widely scattered and far from official. Furthermore, some lynchings surely went unrecorded, especially if victims were dispatched before being turned over to the authorities.

In 1849, before Minnesota became a territory, a mob in the St. Croix Valley illegally tried and then hanged Paulina, an Ojibway accused of murdering a white trader (see pages 56-57). Just before statehood, a group of armed men near Little Falls hanged two Indians and a mixed-blood man—Charles Gebabis, “Jimmy,” and Joe Shambeau—for suspected murder. Lone white men in the villages of Lexington and Monticello received the same treatment for alleged murders in the two following years.1

In 1865 John L. Campbell, of mixed ancestry, was hanged after an irregular citizens’ court trial for murder in Mankato, and the next year two Yankee trappers wearing native and woodsman clothing were strung up by Germans in New Ulm after drunken interchanges. In Brainerd in 1872, after preliminary courtroom investigations about a woman presumed to be dead, Gessonice (Albert Smith) was hanged and his brother Tebokokechickwabe shot after he crawled up the hangman’s rope. The event, which brought more than 100 angry Ojibways to town the next day, led to an incident facetiously labeled the Blueberry War.2

Ten years later, a large crowd of Minneapolisites hanged a white tramp accused of molesting and murdering a young girl. Otter Tail County citizens similarly dispatched 15-year-old John Trivitt, who allegedly borrowed a double-barreled shotgun to rob and murder two visitors to Perham. In 1886 a mob hanged John W. Kellihor, also known as Reddy or Big Red, in Detroit (Lakes), and in 1893 mobs lynched a white man accused of rape near Duluth and an Indian accused of murder at Cass Lake. Three years later two white tramps believed to be murderers were hanged in Glencoe.3

Between 1889 and 1918, the nation suffered at least 3,224 deaths by lynching, more than three-quarters of them of African Americans (but none in Minnesota). About 7 percent occurred in northern states, 88 percent in southern states, and 5 percent in western states.4

By 1920 almost a quarter-century had passed since Minnesotans had resorted to violence under the pretense of administering justice, and the number of lynchings nationwide by five-year periods had been declining steadily since the 1890s. Then, the nighttime hangings in Duluth of three young African-American circus workers horrified the state and the nation. This incident led to the passage in 1921 of a strong state antilynching law that compensated relatives of victims and suspended police officials who failed to protect prisoners from mobs. No lynchings have been reported to have occurred in Minnesota since that time.5

—Marilyn Ziebarth

2 Trenerry, Murder in Minnesota, 43, 45-47, 76-84.
4 Thirty Years of Lynching, 29, 31d.
5 Thirty Years of Lynching, 30; Frank Shay, Judge Lynch: His First Hundred Years (New York: Ives Washburn, 1958), 202-203. While lynchings have almost vanished, racially
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