

1989

Blacks and the Seminole Removal Debate, 1821-1835

George Klos

 Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/fhq>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Florida Historical Quarterly by an authorized editor of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Klos, George (1989) "Blacks and the Seminole Removal Debate, 1821-1835," *Florida Historical Quarterly*. Vol. 68 : No. 1 , Article 5.

Available at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/fhq/vol68/iss1/5>

BLACKS AND THE SEMINOLE REMOVAL DEBATE, 1821-1835

by GEORGE KLOS

THE rise of Jacksonian democracy in the United States during the 1820s and 1830s led to a national program of Indian displacement for the benefit of white settlers and land speculators. Disputes between whites and Indians over the possession of black slaves was a very prominent feature of Indian removal from Florida. Unlike Indian removal in other parts of the United States, land was not the main issue; thousands of acres of public land could be had in Florida without dispossessing the Seminoles. Mediation of white-Seminole slave disputes failed, in part, because the federal Indian agents often owned and speculated in slaves themselves and thus were compromised by personal interests. Also, many blacks worked for the Seminoles as influential interpreters and advisors.

Even before the acquisition of Florida by the United States in 1821, blacks were involved in white-native conflicts. The combination of blacks and Seminoles was important in the international affairs of the region, from the 1810-1814 plot to take East Florida from the Spanish by force, to the 1816 Negro Fort incident on the Apalachicola River and Andrew Jackson's Florida campaign of 1818.¹ After 1821, the problems between whites, Seminoles, and black allies of the Seminoles changed from an international issue to an internal one; the Florida Indians could now be dealt with unilaterally by the Americans.

George Klos is a graduate student in history at Florida State University and is employed at the Florida State Archives.

1. Kenneth W. Porter's *Negro on the American Frontier* (New York, 1971) is a compilation of articles first published in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* and *Journal of Negro History*, among others. Rembert W. Patrick, *Florida Fiasco* (Athens, 1954), covers the East Florida campaign of 1811-1813 and includes a chapter on the blacks living with the Seminoles of Alachua. Mark F. Boyd, "Events at Prospect Bluff on the Apalachicola River, 1808-1818," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 16 (October 1937), 55-96, and John D. Milligan, "Slave Rebelliousness and the Florida Maroon," *Prologue* 6 (Spring 1974), 4-18, cover the Negro Fort incident.

Settlers coming into Florida found, according to a correspondent in *Niles' Weekly Register*, "the finest agricultural district within the limits of the United States." He described the area between the Suwannee and St. Johns rivers as "combining the advantages of a mild and healthy climate, a rich soil, and convenient navigation."² William P. DuVal, Jackson's successor as territorial governor of Florida, warned Secretary of War John C. Calhoun that "it will be a serious misfortune to this Territory if the Indians are permitted to occupy this tract of country." DuVal recommended moving the Indians of Florida to the domain of the Creeks, "to whom they properly belong," or to land west of the Mississippi River.³ Writing to Florida Indian agent John R. Bell, Calhoun noted, "The government expects that the Slaves who have run away or been plundered from our Citizens or from Indian tribes within our limits will be given up peaceably by the Seminole Indians when demanded." Calhoun instructed Bell to convince the Seminoles either to join the Creeks or "to concentrate . . . in one place and become peaceable and industrious farmers."⁴

Governor DuVal, along with Florida planters James Gadsden and Bernard Segui, met with Indian representatives in September 1823 at Moultrie Creek south of St. Augustine. The Seminoles agreed to cede their land in north Florida to the United States and to receive a large tract farther south with recognized boundaries. Part of the negotiations required the listing of Indian towns and a census of their inhabitants. Neamathla, the leader of the Seminole delegation, listed thirty-seven towns with 4,883 natives. He objected, however, according to Gadsden, to specifying "the number of negroes in the nation."⁵

The Moultrie Creek agreement reserved for the Seminoles the area from the Big Swamp along the Withlacoochee River

2. *Niles' Weekly Register* 21 (September 29, 1821), 69.

3. William DuVal to John C. Calhoun, September 22, 1822, in Clarence E. Carter, ed., *Territorial Papers of the United States*, 27 vols. (Washington, DC, 1934-1969), *Florida Territory*, XXII, 533-34. (Hereafter cited as *Territorial Papers*.)

4. Calhoun to John R. Bell, September 28, 1821, *Territorial Papers*, XXII, 219-21.

5. *American State Papers*, 38 vols. (Washington, DC, 1832-1861), *Indian Affairs*, II, 439.

BLACKS AND THE SEMINOLE REMOVAL DEBATE 57

south to the “main branch of the Charlotte [Peace] river,” some fifteen to twenty miles inland from the coast. The Indians were to receive \$5,000 per year for twenty years. Article seven bound the Indians to be “active and vigilant in preventing the retreating to, or passing through, of the district assigned them, of any absconding slaves, or fugitives from justice” and to deliver all such people to the agent and be compensated for their expenses.⁶

The United States government representatives, in their report accompanying the treaty, recommended that military posts be established around the contours of Indian country “to embody such a population within prescribed limits, and to conquer their erratic habits . . . [and to] further induce an early settlement of the country now open to the enterprise of emigrants.”⁷

In giving up their north Florida land, the Indians were relinquishing an area of fertile soil, good rainfall, and temperate climate. Many of the early settlers migrated from elsewhere in the South and, with slaves that they brought with them, established cotton, sugar, and tobacco plantations and farms. Many Piedmont and Tidewater elites moved to Florida and created a new hierarchy in the territory.⁸ Between 1825 and 1832, 433,751 acres of public land were sold in Florida. Some 5,000,000 acres were still available in 1833. The territorial Legislative Council, in an 1828 resolution to Congress, requested that the price per acre for public land be reduced to attract more settlers. The legislators argued it was a national security move to increase population.⁹

The 1830 census listed 34,730 Floridians, 15,501 of whom were slaves and 844 “free colored.”¹⁰ The Comte de Castelneau, a French visitor to Florida in the 1830s, observed the local planter as “accustomed to exercise absolute power over his slaves[.]

6. The treaty is printed in full in Charles J. Kappler, ed., *Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties* (Washington, DC, 1904-1941), 5 vols., II, 203-06.

7. Indian commissioners to Calhoun, September 26, 1823, *Territorial Papers*, XXII, 750.

8. Julia F. Smith, *Slavery and Plantation Growth in Antebellum Florida, 1821-1860* (Gainesville, 1973), 18. Michael G. Schene, *Hopes, Dreams, and Promises: A History of Volusia County, Florida* (Daytona Beach, 1976), 30-39, details the sugar enterprises set up in a county near the Seminole boundary.

9. *American State Papers: Public Land*, VI, 630, 663; *ibid.*, V, 46.

10. *Abstract of Returns, 5th Census* (Washington, DC, 1832), 44. Indians, and the blacks living among them, were not counted.

he cannot endure any opposition to his wishes." Whites of modest means, he said, were "brought up from childhood with the idea that the Indians are the usurpers of the land that belongs to them, and even in times of peace they are always ready to go hunting savages rather than deer hunting. . . . [T]hese men know no other power than physical force, and no other pleasure than carrying out their brutal passions."¹¹

Blacks living with the Seminoles became a point of contention for whites because the Seminole system of slavery was not as harsh or rigid as the Anglo-American system: a comparatively lenient system in such close proximity might offer slaves of whites an alternative that their owners could not tolerate. A Seminole was more a patron than master, for the Seminole slave system was akin to tenant farming. Blacks lived in their own villages near Indian villages and paid a harvest tribute consisting of a percentage of the yield from their fields to the chief. Blacks, an Indian agent reported, had "horses, cows, and hogs, with which the Indian owner never presumed to meddle."¹²

In the 1820s, there were approximately 400 blacks living with the Seminoles. Only about eighty could be identified as fugitive slaves. Jacob Rhett Motte, an army surgeon stationed in Florida in the 1830s, noted, "They had none of the servility of our northern blacks, but were constantly offering their dirty paws with as much hauteur, and nonchalance, as if they were conferring a vast deal of honor."¹³ They could "speak English as well as Indian," the trader Horatio Dexter reported, "and feel satisfied with their situation. They have the easy unconstrained manner of the Indian but more vivacity, and from their understanding of both languages possess considerable influence with their masters."¹⁴ Only a few black Seminoles were bilingual, and those who were became influential in Indian councils. Fur-

-
11. Arthur R. Seymour, trans., "Essay on Middle Florida, 1837-38," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 26 (January 1948), 236, 239.
 12. Wiley Thompson to Lewis Cass, April 27, 1835. *American State Papers: Military Affairs*, VI, 534.
 13. Jacob Rhett Motte, *Journey into the Wilderness: An Army Surgeon's Account of Life in Camp and Field during the Creek and Seminole Wars, 1836-1838*, James F. Sunderman, ed. (Gainesville, 1953), 210.
 14. Mark F. Boyd, "Horatio Dexter and Events Leading to the Treaty of Moultrie Creek with the Seminole Indians," *Florida Anthropologist* 6 (September 1958), 81-92.

thermore, much has been made of the "equality" of the black Seminoles, but it would be more accurate to say that some blacks were more equal than others. Seminole society had blacks of every status whether they were born free, the descendants of fugitives, or perhaps fugitives themselves. Some were interpreters and advisors of importance; others were warriors and hunters or field hands. Inter-marriage with Indians further complicated black status. But even a black of low status among the Seminoles felt it was an improvement over Anglo-American chattel slavery.

People living near the Seminoles became acquainted with the Indians and their black interpreters usually through trade. Seminoles visited stores and plantations despite the legal prohibition on leaving the reservation. Blacks often crossed the prescribed boundaries, and some white-owned slaves had spouses and other relatives living in Indian country. John Philip, a middle-aged "chief negro" to King Philip, leader of an Indian band, had a wife living on a St. Johns River plantation. Luis Fatio was owned by Francis Philip Fatio, one of the most prominent planters in East Florida. Luis's first contact with the Seminoles was on the plantation. His older brother ran away to Indian country, and Luis learned one of the Indian languages during his brother's periodic visits to the slave quarters. One day Luis went on a visit to Seminole country and never returned.¹⁵

There were others like Luis. Alachua County slaveowners estimated 100 runaways among the Seminoles, complaining that black Seminoles (the planters apparently saw a difference between them and runaways) "aided such slaves to select new and more secure places of refuge."¹⁶ Owen Marsh visited several "Negro Villages" looking for runaways, and he noted that the number of runaway slaves among the Seminoles could not be determined "from the Circumstances of their being protected by the Indian Negroes. . . . [T]hese Indian Negroes are so artfull [sic] that it is impossible to gain any information relating to such property from them."¹⁷

15. Porter, *Negro on the American Frontier*, 240-41; Kenneth W. Porter, "The Early Life of Luis Pacheco Nee Fatio," *Negro History Bulletin* 7 (December 1943), 52.

16. House Exec. Doc. 271, 24th Cong., 1st Sess., 31.

17. Owen Marsh to Thomas L. McKenney, May 17, 1826, Office of Indian Affairs—Letters Received, National Archives Microcopy 234, roll 800. (Hereafter cited as OIA-LR.)

Governor DuVal admonished the Seminoles in January 1826 for not returning runaway slaves. "You are not to mind, what the negroes say; they will lie, and lead you astray, in the hope to escape from their white owners, and that you will give them refuge and hide them. Do your duty and give them up. They care nothing for you, further than to make use of you, to keep out of the hands of their masters." DuVal further rebuked the Indians telling them that "thus far the negroes have made you their tools, and gained protection, contrary to both justice and the treaty, and at the same time, laugh at you for being deceived by them. Your conduct in this matter is cause of loud, constant, and just complaint on the part of the white people. . . . Deliver them up, rid your nation of a serious pest, and do what, as honest men, you should not hesitate to do; then your white brothers will say you have done them justice, like honest, good men." Should the Seminoles refuse, DuVal warned, the army will take the blacks by force, "and in the confusion, many of you may lose your own slaves."¹⁸

Tuckose Emathla (John Hicks), a principal spokesman for the Indians, replied to DuVal's criticisms. "We do not like the story that our people hide the runaway negroes from their masters. It is not a true talk. . . . We have never prevented the whites from coming into our country and taking their slaves whenever they could find them and we will not hereafter oppose their doing so." At another meeting that year, Tuckose Emathla voiced the main Indian complaint regarding slaves. "The white people have got some of our negroes, which we expect they will be made to give up."¹⁹

Besides the black communities on Seminole land, other groups of blacks and Indians lived outside the treaty boundaries, and still others left Florida altogether. Owen Marsh, in his investigation of Seminole country, reported that many runaway slaves had departed for the Bahamas and Cuba, and a Darien, Georgia, slaveowner complained to the secretary of war that his escaped slaves left Florida via "West India wreckers" working

18. House Exec. Doc. 17, 19th Cong., 2d Sess., 18.

19. *Ibid.*, 20; Tuckose Emathla to James Barbour (transcribed by Gad Humphreys), May 17, 1826, OIA-LR, roll 800.

BLACKS AND THE SEMINOLE REMOVAL DEBATE 61

the Atlantic coast.²⁰ Two other settlements in southwest Florida were described by John Winslett who was tracking three slaves of a Georgia planter. He was told at Tampa Bay, "it would not be safe to pursue them much farther without force; that a band of desperadoes, runaways, murderers, and thieves (negroes and Indians, a majority runaway slaves)" lived on an island south of Charlotte Harbor. Blacks and Indians who had been there told Winslett of "another settlement of lawless persons (Indians and absconded slaves) on a creek between Manatia [Manatee] River and Charlotte's Harbor, some miles west of the latter."²¹ The island community was a haven for some survivors of the Negro Fort incident on the Apalachicola River, and it existed up to the war for Seminole removal.²² The residents cut timber and fished, shipping their goods to Havana where they were traded for rum and firearms. The Seminoles also traded with Cuban fishermen, and Indian agent Gad Humphreys reported that runaway slaves were shuttled to Havana this way, sometimes for freedom and sometimes for sale.²³

The legal mechanisms for settling slave disputes between whites and Indians failed. DuVal proposed that the government buy Seminole slaves, as individual whites were prohibited from slave trading with Indians, but he was told by Superintendent of Indian Affairs Thomas L. McKenney that agents should not involve themselves in slave trade with their charges. When

-
20. Marsh to McKenney, May 17, 1826, and John N. McIntosh to Calhoun, January 16, 1825, OIA-LR, roll 800. See also, John M. Goggin, "The Seminole Negroes of Andros Island, Bahamas," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 24 (January 1946), 201-06; Kenneth W. Porter, "Notes on the Seminole Negroes in the Bahamas," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 24 (July 1945), 56-60; and Harry A. Kersey, Jr., "The Seminole Negroes of Andros Island Revisited: Some New Pieces to an Old Puzzle," *Florida Anthropologist* 34 (December 1981), 169-76.
 21. Statement of John Winslett, sworn to by Augustus Steele, Jr., December 21, 1833, OIA-LR, roll 290.
 22. James Forbes and James Innerarity searched for slaves known to have been at the Negro Fort. They reached Tampa Bay where they learned that the runaways were in the Charlotte Harbor area. William Coker and Thomas Watson, *Indian Traders of the Southeastern Spanish Borderlands* (Pensacola, 1986), 309.
 23. DuVal to Calhoun, September 23, 1823, *Territorial Papers*, XXII, 744; Gad Humphreys to Calhoun, January 31, 1826, *Territorial Papers*, XXIII; 203; James W. Covington, "Life at Fort Brooke, 1824-1836," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 36 (April 1958), 325-26.

whites took Indian slaves, Florida agents were instructed to use due process to get the slaves back. When Indians held slaves claimed by whites, the burden of proof was on the white. In accordance with the Moultrie Creek treaty, the Seminoles did return some runaway slaves, and in other cases, Humphreys explained to the representative of a Georgia slaveowner, they welcomed investigation "by a competent tribunal."²⁴ For the most part, however, the Seminoles refused to surrender the slaves in question before the trial. "Their own negroes that have been taken from them are held by white people who refuse to dilliver [sic] them up," DuVal told the superintendent of Indian Affairs, "I have felt asshamed [sic] while urgeing [sic] the Indians to surrender the property they hold, that I had not power to obtain for them their own rights and property held by our citizens. . . . To tell one of these people that he must go to law for his property in our courts with a white man is only adding insult to injury."²⁵

Indians resisted surrendering slaves to public (white) custody as a precondition for resolving disputes because they knew they had no rights in court. "The Indian, conscious of his rights, and knowing that he paid the money, though incapable of showing the papers executed under forms of law, as he had received none, and relying upon the honesty of the white man, protested most earnestly against these demands, and resolutely expressed a determination to resist all attempts thus to wrest from him his rightfully acquired property," explained John T. Sprague in his history of the Second Seminole War. "Deprived as they were of a voice in the halls of justice, the surrender of the negro at one dispossessed them, without the least prospect of ever getting him returned." The commander of the army post at Tampa Bay, Colonel George M. Brooke, observed in 1828 that "so many claims are now made on them, that they begin to believe that it is the determination of the United States to take them all. This idea is strengthened by the conversations of many of the whites, and which they have heard."²⁶

24. Humphreys to Horatio Lowe, September 17, 1828, OIA-LR, roll 800.

25. DuVal to McKenney, March 20, 1826, *Territorial Papers*, XXIII, 483; McKenney to DuVal, May 8, 1826, *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, II, 698; Mark F. Boyd, *Florida Aflame* (Tallahassee, 1951), 36.

26. John T. Sprague, *Origin, Progress, and Conclusion of the Florida War* (New York, 1848; facsimile ed., Gainesville, 1964), 34, 43, 52-53.

Whites, however, saw it differently. Samuel Cook, Abraham Bellamy, and other planters complained that "whilst the Law furnishes to the Indians ample means of redress for the aggressions of Whitemen, we are Constrained to look with patience, whilst they possess and enjoy the property most justly and rightfully Ours." They also objected to being prevented from taking from Indian country "even those negroes that are unclaimed and unpossessed by the Indians."²⁷ Cook also voiced another frontier slaveowner's complaint, that slaves purchased from the Seminoles often slipped back to Indian country. DuVal reported to Superintendent Thomas McKenney that "the persons who have been most clamorous about their claims on the Indians and their property are those who have cheated them, under false reports, of their slaves, who have since gone back to the Indians."²⁸ Alfred Beckley, an army lieutenant stationed in Florida in 1825, noted that planters sought any opportunity to use force against the Seminoles "so that the whites might possess themselves of many valuable negroes."²⁹

DuVal favored withholding treaty annuities until the Indians returned runaway slaves, and the Indian Office did so in 1828, but later reversed the policy and forbade it in the future. Since some white claims were indisputable, DuVal said, the slave in question ought to be given by the Indians to the agent, or the owner "ought to receive the full value of him from the nation."³⁰ Local slaveowners, however, advocated "adequate military force" to "recover pilfered property" from the Seminoles.³¹

If, in the critical role of the agents as mediators between Indians and frontier whites, "the success of the work depended upon the character of the man," then the agents assigned to the Seminoles exacerbated rather than allayed conflict.³² Ample evidence shows that, contrary to orders, Gad Humphreys engaged

27. *Territorial Papers*, XXII, 763.

28. *Ibid.*, XXIII, 473, 483.

29. Cecil D. Eby, Jr., ed., "Memoir of a West Pointer in Florida," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 41 (October 1962), 163.

30. *Territorial Papers*, XXIV, 452; Boyd, *Florida Aflame*, 42; DuVal to Cass, May 26, 1832, OIA-LR, roll 288.

31. "Memorial to the President by Inhabitants of St. Johns County," March 6, 1826, *Territorial Papers*, XXIII 462-63. Three members of the Fatio family signed the memorial.

32. Francis Paul Prucha, *American Indian Policy in the Formative Years* (Cambridge, 1962), 56.

in slave trade with his charges, and planters accused him of dragging his feet on their complaints about runaways. In one case, a woman in St. Marys, Georgia, claimed that a slave and the slave's children were living with the Seminoles. A man dispatched to retrieve them found it "next to an impossibility" to get them back due to the Seminoles' "natural reluctance to give it up and the wish of their agent to speculate."³³ "The negroes this man is after are ours, and the white people know it is so," said the subchief Jumper to Humphreys.³⁴ When Humphreys reported the Seminoles' determination not to allow the contested slaves out of their possession, interested parties petitioned Washington for an investigation, charging Humphreys with colluding with a local planter to prevent transfer of the slaves so that the claim would be abandoned with the passage of time and as expenses mounted.³⁵

McKenney also received accusations that Humphreys had worked fugitive slaves on his own land for several months before returning them to their owners. Secretary of War Peter B. Porter informed President John Quincy Adams of allegations that Humphreys had "connived with the Indians in the concealment of runaway slaves, and in that way affected purchases of them himself, at reduced prices."³⁶

Humphreys explained to Alex Adair, the investigator of the allegations, that he bought slaves from Indians so that claimants could prove ownership in court, an impossibility as long as the slaves were in Indian possession.³⁷ Adair concluded that while Humphreys probably did bill the government for sugar kettles installed on his land, the other charges were difficult to prove since "those who had been most clamorous appeared most disposed to evade the inquiry." Humphreys apparently had made reasonable settlements with his accusers when he learned that he was to be investigated. Zephaniah Kingsley, who claimed that Humphreys had held one of his slaves for over a year, "stated

33. James Dean to Archibald Clark, September 20, 1828, OIA-LR, roll 800.

34. Sprague, *Origin, Progress, and Conclusion*, 51. The Indians maintained, and white witnesses later confirmed, that the slave woman in question had been sold to an Indian by the claimant's father twenty years earlier.

35. Clark to McKenney, October 20, 1828, OIA-LR, roll 800.

36. McKenney to Peter Porter, November 1, 1828, *Territorial Papers*, XXIV, 95-97; Porter to John Quincy Adams, December 6, 1828, OIA-LR, roll 800.

37. Humphreys to Alex Adair, April 27, 1829, OIA-LR, roll 800.

he had settled his business with the Agent in his own way. . . . [H]is property had been surrendered to him some months back and he cared no more about it."³⁸

An Alachua County resident reported to Governor DuVal that Humphreys possessed blacks belonging to Indians, and that he bought Indian cattle with IOUs he later refused to honor. Humphreys was a liability, McKenney noted, because those opposing him in Florida "make his services in that quarter of but little, if any, use to the Government, whilst his dealing in slaves is in direct violation of an express order forbidding it." Both Governor DuVal and the territory's Congressional delegate Joseph White wanted Humphreys replaced, and he was dismissed in March 1830.³⁹

Humphreys's slave problems continued. DuVal received complaints from Indians that Humphreys held their slaves. Humphreys's replacement, John Phagan, attempted to return the slaves, but Humphreys refused to release them unless Phagan was willing to purchase them.⁴⁰ In another case, stemming from his role as Indian agent, Humphreys sought government assistance in recovering two black men claimed by an Indian woman named Culekeechowa. She had inherited from her mother a slave named Caty, who later bore four children. Horatio Dexter, a trader, persuaded Culekeechowa's brother and Caty's husband to trade Caty and her two daughters and two sons in exchange for whiskey. Humphreys, as agent, agreed to help the Indian woman, so he went to St Augustine where Dexter was offering the slaves for sale. Humphreys maintained that he had to buy them to prevent their sale to a Charleston buyer. But then, instead of returning them to Culekeechowa, he kept the slaves for himself. When the boys grew older and became aware of what had happened, they left for Seminole country in 1835.⁴¹

38. Adair to John Eaton, April 24, 1829, *ibid.*

39. Marsh to DuVal, May 29, 1829, *Territorial Papers*, XXIV, 234; McKenney to Porter, November 1, 1828, *ibid.* 95-97.

40. DuVal to Phagan, October 9, 1830, OIA-LR, roll 800; Phagan to Cass, February 6, 1832, *ibid.* The blacks in this case were claimed by an Indian woman named Nelly Factor and by two whites named Floyd and Garey. DuVal told Phagan to seize the slaves and deliver them to Floyd and Garey. DuVal to Phagan, February 7, 1832, *ibid.*

41. Wiley Thompson to Cass, July 19, 1836, *American State Papers: Military Affairs*, VI, 460. A copy of the bill of sale is in the Florida Negro Collection,

Slave disputes between Seminoles and whites frequently went unresolved because the interpreters in these negotiations sometimes were former slaves themselves. DuVal observed that Seminole blacks were “much more hostile to the white people than their masters,” and were “constantly counteracting” advice to the Indians. In several instances, he said, chiefs had agreed to a white demand in council but later were talked out of compliance by their black advisors.⁴² The problem, as Humphreys saw it in 1827, was that “the negroes of the Seminole Indians are wholly independent, or at least regardless of the authority of their masters; and are Slaves but in name.” Indians considered blacks “rather as fellow Sufferers and companions in misery than as inferiors,” Humphreys wrote, and the “great influence of the Slaves possess over their masters” enabled them to “artfully represent” whites as hostile to people of color.⁴³ The first step in moving the Seminoles out of Florida, DuVal told the commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1834, “must be *the breaking up of the runaway slaves and outlaw Indians.*”⁴⁴

When Andrew Jackson was elected president, public opinion in the South was demanding stricter control over Indians. Whites wanted land, of course, but they also saw Indians as possible allies of foreign powers (as in the War of 1812), and the presence of fugitive slaves among them was viewed as a threat to internal security. Jackson urged Indian removal legislation in his December 1829 annual message to Congress, and he tried to soothe opposition by assuring that removal would be voluntary and peaceful. In May 1830, Congress appropriated \$500,000 for the negotiation of removal treaties. The territory

Florida Historical Society Archives, University of South Florida Library, Tampa. Later, Caty and one of her daughters also ran away, as Humphreys listed them (and the sons) as slaves “taken” by the Indians in the war. Caty, one son, and one daughter are listed in 1838 muster rolls of captured blacks en route to Indian Territory.

42. If the Seminoles were to be removed from Florida and transported west, DuVal recommended, “the Government ought not to admit negroes [sic] to go with them. . . . I am convinced the sooner they dispose of them the better.” DuVal to McKenney, January 12, 1826, *Territorial Papers*, XXIII, 414; DuVal to McKenney, March 2, 1826, *ibid.*, 454.
43. Humphreys to Acting Governor William McCarty, September 6, 1827, *ibid.*, 911.
44. DuVal to Elbert Herring, January 26, 1834, House Exec. Doc. 271, 24th Cong., 1st Sess., 18. (Emphasis in original.)

BLACKS AND THE SEMINOLE REMOVAL DEBATE 67

north of Texas and west of Arkansas that was designated for resettlement was considered at the time the only available location where the Indians would not be in the way of white expansion.⁴⁵

Floridians had been voicing removal sentiment since early in the territorial period.⁴⁶ As indicated in a message to Congress, the main reason for ousting the Seminoles from Florida never changed through the years. "A most weighty objection" to the presence of Indians in the territory was "that absconding slaves find ready security among the Indians and such aid is amply sufficient to enable them successfully to elude the best efforts by their masters to recover them."⁴⁷

Territorial government wholeheartedly supported the white slave interests. The Legislative Council requested removal in July 1827, and Acting Governor James Westcott asked the council to strengthen the militia because "we have amongst us two classes who may possibly at some future period, be incited to hostility, and . . . it behooves us always to be prepared." He believed the only humane solution was to move the Indians away from whites and without their slaves.⁴⁸

An 1826 Florida law to regulate Indian trade imposed the death penalty on anyone who "shall inveigle, steal, or carry away" any slave or "hire, aid, or counsel" anyone to do so. That this section— which does not mention Indians— appears in a bill relating to Indian trade shows slaveowners' concern over the black-Indian connection. In 1832, the territory prohibited "Indian negroes, bond or free," from traveling outside the Indian boundaries. Also, in light of the Gad Humphreys episodes, the council set limits to the amount of the reward Indian agents could collect for capturing runaway slaves, established account-

45. Ronald N. Satz, *American Indian Policy in the Jacksonian Era* (Lincoln, 1975), 3-11; Prucha, *Formative Years*, 225-38.

46. Joseph Hernandez to Thomas Metcalfe (chairman, House Committee on Indian Affairs), February 19, 1823, *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, II, 410. Hernandez, like many many Florida slaveowning petitioners to the government, was a naturalized American citizen who had been living in Florida since the Spanish period.

47. Memorial to Congress by Inhabitants of the Territory, March 26, 1832, *Territorial Papers*, XXIV, 679.

48. *Territorial Papers*, XXIII, 897; St. Augustine *Florida Herald*, January 26, 1832.

ing requirements in slave cases, and required agents to advertise fugitive slaves in their custody.⁴⁹

In January 1832, Secretary of War Lewis Cass instructed James Gadsden, Florida planter and Jackson supporter, to arrange a treaty with the Seminoles agreeing to their removal west to the new Creek country, with all annuities in the West to be paid through the Creeks.⁵⁰

Gadsden met with the Seminole leaders at Paynes Landing on the Ocklawaha River. Among the first orders of business was selection of interpreters satisfactory to the Seminoles. Gadsden brought along Stephen Richards for that purpose, while the Seminoles chose Abraham, “a faithful domestic of Micanope, the Head Chief. In addition the interpreter of the agent, Cudjo, was present.”⁵¹ As advisors and interpreters in Indian-white negotiations, these two men were perhaps the most influential blacks in Florida at the time.

Abraham was regarded as more than an interpreter; he was frequently called a “chief Negro” in official dispatches, and army surgeon Jacob Rhett Motte described him as “a perfect Tallyrand of the savage court.”⁵² How he arrived among the Seminoles is speculative, but judging by his manners and knowledge of English, he may have been an Englishman’s house servant prior to the United States’ acquisition of Florida. His wife was Bowleg’s half-black widow, by whom he fathered three or four children.⁵³ Abraham’s influence is usually described in comparison to his “master” or patron, Micanopy, “a large, fat man, rather obtuse in intellect, but kind to his people and his slaves.”⁵⁴ Micanopy was described by General George McCall as “rather too indolent to rule harshly”; he tended to leave official business to what he called his “sense-bearers,” one of whom was Abraham.⁵⁵ Despite the prevailing opinion of Micanopy, no one

49. *Acts of the Legislative Council*, 5th Sess. (1827), 79-81; *ibid.*, 6th Sess. (1828), 104-07; *St Augustine Florida Herald* July 1, 1830, February 2, 1832.

50. *American State Papers: Military Affairs*, VI, 472.

51. James Gadsden to Cass, November 1, 1834, OIA-LR, roll 806.

52. Woodbourne Potter, *The War in Florida* (Baltimore, 1836; facsimile ed., Ann Arbor, 1966), 9; Motte, *Journey into the Wilderness*, 210.

53. Porter, *Negro on the Frontier*, 296-305.

54. John Lee Williams, *Territory of Florida* (New York, 1837; facsimile ed., Gainesville, 1962), 214.

55. George A. McCall, *Letters from the Frontiers* (Philadelphia, 1868; facsimile ed., Gainesville, 1974), 146.

BLACKS AND THE SEMINOLE REMOVAL DEBATE 69

underestimated Abraham. John Lee Williams, one of the first Florida historians and a figure in territorial politics, said Abraham had “as much influence in the nation as any other man. With an appearance of great modesty, he is ambitious, avaricious, and withal very intelligent.”⁵⁶ Thin and over six feet tall with a broad, square face and a thin moustache, Abraham was “plausible, pliant, and deceitful,” according to Mayer Cohen, who also noted, “and, under an exterior of profound meekness, [he] cloaks deep, dark, and bloody purposes. He has at once the crouch and the spring of the panther.”⁵⁷ Captain John C. Casey, who spent much time with Abraham during the war and knew him better than most whites, described him as having “a slight inclination forward like a Frenchman of the old school. His countenance is one of great cunning and penetration. He always smiles, and his words flow like oil. His conversation is soft and low, but very distinct, with a most genteel emphasis.”⁵⁸

Cudjo was described as a “regular interpreter at the Seminole agency,” although it is not known when his relationship with the government began. As late as 1822 he was “one of the principal characters” of a black Seminole town in the Big Swamp area, according to William Simmons who spent a night in his house.⁵⁹ One Indian agent complained of his “very imperfect knowledge of the English language,” and John Bemrose, a soldier in Florida in the 1830s, described his speech as “the common negro jargon of the plantation.” Bemrose mentioned that partial paralysis afflicted Cudjo.⁶⁰ Another contemporary caustically remarked of the “little, limping figure of *Cudjoe* . . . with his cunning, squinting eyes; and his hands folded across his lap, in seemingly meek attention to the scene around him.”⁶¹

56. Williams, *Territory of Florida*, 214.

57. Myer M. Cohen, *Notices of Florida and the Campaign* (Charleston, 1836; facsimile ed., Gainesville, 1964), 239.

58. Casey quoted in Charles H. Coe, *Red Patriots* (Cincinnati, 1898; facsimile ed., Gainesville, 1974), 46.

59. William Simmons, *Notices of East Florida* (Charleston, 1822; facsimile ed., Gainesville, 1973), 41.

60. Thompson to Herring, October 28, 1834, House Exec. Doc. 271, 24th Cong., 1st Sess., 154; Lt. Joseph W. Harris to Cass, October 12, 1835, *ibid.*, 217; John Bemrose, *Reminiscences of the Second Seminole War*, John K. Mahon, ed., (Gainesville, 1966), 17.

61. Quoted in Kenneth W. Porter, “Negro Guides and Interpreters in the Early Stages of the Seminole War,” *Journal of Negro History* 35 (April 1950), 175.

Of all the blacks to figure prominently in Seminole removal and the ensuing war, Cudjo was the first to side with the government. Kenneth Porter, in his account of black interpreters who served before the Second Seminole War, attributes this to "his physical deficiency of partial paralyais [that] predisposed him toward association with those who could give him the medical attention and comforts which his condition called for and which would have been inaccessible among the hostile Indians and Negroes."⁶² By the time of the meeting at Paynes Landing, Cudjo was drawing a salary and rations from the Indian agency at Fort King, and probably living there as well.

Gadsden's main obstacles to a successful conclusion of the treaty negotiations were slave claims and the idea that the Seminoles should combine with the Creeks. He told the assemblage that as bad as emigration sounded to them, their situation would only be worse under local jurisdiction, which would be their fate if they refused to sell their land. He offered to include an article earmarking \$7,000, over and above the main payment for relinquishing their land, for the government to settle property claims against them. The sum "will probably cover all demands which can be satisfactorily proved," Gadsden said "Many claims are for negroes. . . . The Indians allege that the depredations were mutual, that they suffered in the same degree, and that most of the property claimed was taken as reprisal for property of equal value lost by them."⁶³ Finally, Gadsden conferred privately with Abraham and Cudjo and added \$400 to the Seminole payment specifically for the two black men. It was "intended to be a bribe," recalled one disgusted army captain; Gadsden "could not have got the treaty through if he had not bribed the negro interpreter."⁶⁴

The Seminoles believed they had forestalled giving up their land. All they had agreed to, they thought, was to send a delegation to the Indian territory to examine the proposed new land. The group would report back to the larger body of Seminoles,

62. *Ibid.*, 177.

63. Quoted in Potter, *War in Florida*, 31-32.

64. W. A. Croffut, ed., *Fifty Years in Camp and Field: Diary of Major-General Ethan Allen Hitchcock* (New York and London, 1909), 79; John K. Mahon, "Two Seminole Treaties: Paynes Landing, 1832, and Fort Gibson, 1833," *Florida Historical Quarterly* 41 (July 1962), 1-11; Paynes Landing treaty printed in Kappler, *Indian Affairs*, II, 394-95.

BLACKS AND THE SEMINOLE REMOVAL DEBATE 71

and then the final decision would be made. This interpretation was also held at the highest levels of the federal government. The secretary of war, in his annual report to the president, said the treaty was “not obligatory on [the Indians’] part” until a group examined the land “and until the tribe, upon their report, shall have signified their desire” to move. “When they return, the determination of the tribe will be made known to the government.”⁶⁵

Seven Seminoles, Abraham, and agent John Phagan went to the proposed new Seminole land during the winter of 1832-1833. At Fort Gibson on the Arkansas River, Phagan and three other federal agents prepared a document for the group’s signatures. It stated that the group was satisfied with the country to be assigned to the Seminoles, that they would live within the Creek nation but have a separate designated area, and that they would become “a constituent part of the Creek nation.”⁶⁶ The Seminoles balked. They had no authority to sign anything, and it is reasonable to assume that Oklahoma in the winter was not very appealing to natives of Florida. According to one version, Phagan threatened to refuse to guide them home until they signed. Jumper, Holata Emathla, and Coi Hadjo later claimed never to have signed, but they probably said that to protect themselves from Seminoles violently opposed to removal. Abraham’s part at Fort Gibson went unrecorded and is unclear, but obviously a combination of trickery and duress was employed to hasten emigration. Ethan Allen Hitchcock, who later had to fight in the resulting war, called the Seminole treaty process “a fraud on the Indians.”⁶⁷

When the group returned and reported to the Seminole council what they had seen, Micanopy informed agent Wiley Thompson that the Seminoles decided to decline the offer. Thompson told him that the delegation had signed away Florida and to prepare his people for emigration. Abraham brought the chief’s answer the next day. “The old man says today the same he said yesterday, ‘the nation decided in council to decline the offer.’” Captain McCall, with several years’ service in

65. *Niles’ Weekly Register* 43 (January 26, 1833), 367.

66. Fort Gibson treaty printed in Kappler, *Indian Affairs*, II, 394-95.

67. Mahon, “Two Treaties,” 11-21; Croffut, *Fifty Years*, 80, 122; Grant Foreman, *Indian Removal* (Norman, 1932), 322.

Florida, knew the interpreter to be "crafty and artful in the extreme" and thus did not doubt that he had "as usual, much to do in keeping the chief, who was of a vacillating character, steady in his purpose."⁶⁸ Abraham, however, was not the only influence on Micanopy; "not an Indian would have consented to the relinquishment of their country" had the Paynes Landing agreement worked the way they thought it would, according to John Sprague. The Seminoles who signed at Fort Gibson were, in fact, "ridiculed and upbraded by all classes, male and female, for being circumvented by the whites." Resistance sentiment was so strong that the Fort Gibson signatories feared for their lives.⁶⁹

Aside from the overt fraudulence of the recent treaties, the two major obstacles to Seminole removal remained living with the Creeks and the designs of others on their slaves. The first problem was destined to continue as a part of the removal treaties; the second was supposedly settled in the stipulation that the United States settle property claims against the Seminoles. Nevertheless, plans were still afoot to keep the blacks in Florida as the Indians were moved out.

The Seminoles gradually separated themselves from the Creek Confederacy, a process virtually complete by the Red Stick War, but the Creeks, however, often included the Seminoles in their treaties even though no Seminoles were signatories.⁷⁰ The Seminoles, in fact, adamantly denied the Creeks' right to do so. These treaties usually had articles indemnifying American citizens out of the Creek annuity for slaves taken by Indians; thus the Creeks claimed black Seminoles as their own, and these demands for the "return" of slaves further complicated Indian removal. Though the Seminoles recognized a political separation between themselves and the Creeks, clan ties still bridged the two groups.⁷¹

68. McCall, *Letters*, 301-02.

69. Sprague, *Origin, Progress, and Conclusion*, 79.

70. The treaty the Creeks made in New York in 1790 and the Indian Springs treaty of 1821 are two examples.

71. Gadsden warned Gad Humphreys that "disaffected" Creeks were prone to move to the Seminoles "whenever their irregularities earned them to chastizement." Gadsden to Humphreys, November 11, 1827, OIA-LR, roll 806. Creeks unwilling to move west, he said, will seek refuge in Florida. The letters of the Office of Indian Affairs during the war and the diary of Major General Thomas Jesup (Florida State Archives, Tallahassee) show that many did indeed seek their escape in Florida. Cases also exist, such as

BLACKS AND THE SEMINOLE REMOVAL DEBATE 73

Even Seminoles who favored emigration objected to uniting with the Creeks. The Creeks wanted, according to Lieutenant Woodbourne Potter, to bring the Seminoles into their nation "evidently with a view to dispossess the Seminoles, in the easiest manner, of their large negro property, to which the former had unsuccessfully urged a claim."⁷² Colonel Duncan Clinch, leader of the United States forces in the 1816 Negro Fort battle and now owner of 3,000 acres in Alachua County, explained that the Seminoles feared for their property because the Creeks were much more numerous than they were. They also believed they would have no justice in the West without a separate agent to attend to their interests. However, the authorities in Washington did not heed the advice of those at the scene and continued to plan combining the Creeks and Seminoles on the same land under one agency.⁷³ The Seminoles argued that the slave claims made by the Creeks were covered by the sixth article of the Paynes Landing treaty in which the United States agreed to pay for such claims. "As it would be difficult, not to say impossible, to prove that the negroes claimed by the Creeks, now in the possession of the Seminole Indians, are the identical negroes, or their descendants. . . . I cannot conceive that the Creeks can be supposed to have a fair claim to them," said agent Thompson.⁷⁴

The Creeks were but one group asserting the right to enslave black Seminoles. After President Jackson agreed with his Florida supporters that it might be a good idea for the government to permit the selling of the black Seminoles to whites, Thompson expressed his fear to the acting secretary of war that such a policy would "bring into the nation a crowd of 'speculators,' some of whom might resort to the use of improper means to effect their object, and thereby greatly embarrass our operations."⁷⁵

Chief Neamathla, of Florida Indians moving to Creek country in Alabama to forestall removal.

72. Potter, *War in Florida*, 43.

73. Boyd, *Florida Aflame*, 52; Duncan Clinch to Cass, August 24, 1835, House Exec. Doc. 271, 24th Cong., 1st Sess., 104; Acting Secretary of War C. A. Harris to Thompson, May 20, 1835, OIA-LR, roll 806; Remhert W. Patrick, *Aristocrat in Uniform: General Duncan L. Clinch* (Gainesville, 1963), 61.

74. Potter, *War in Florida*, 41; Thompson to DuVal, January 1, 1834, *American State Papers: Military Affairs*, VI, 154.

75. Thompson to Harris, June 17, 1835, *American State Papers: Military Affairs*, VI, 471.

Governor Richard Keith Call, who had served under Jackson in the Florida campaign of 1818, initiated the plan to sell the blacks. "The negroes have a great influence over the Indians; they are better agriculturalists and inferior huntsmen to the Indians, and are violently opposed to leaving the country," he explained to Jackson. "If the Indians are permitted to convert them into specie, one great obstacle in the way of removal may be overcome." Carey A. Harris, head of the Office of Indian Affairs, explained to Thompson that such a move would rid the Seminoles of one certain point of conflict in the West "which . . . would excite the cupidity of the Creeks." Harris believed, furthermore, that it would not be an inhumane act as "it is not to be presumed the condition of these slaves would be worse than that of others in the same section of the country."⁷⁶ To Thompson, a policy of allowing Seminole slave sales was one more problem blocking peaceful removal. He had to counteract rumors spread by "malcontent Indians" that he had his own designs on the blacks, "and the moment I am called upon to meet this new difficulty, a party of whites arrives at the agency with what they consider a permission from the War Department to purchase slaves from the Indians." Should this continue, he warned, "it is reasonable to suppose that the negroes would en masse unite with the malcontent Indians." Instead, he proposed using the blacks "to exert their known influence" to work for removal by assuring the security of their existing relations with the Indians and not "classing them with skins and furs." In the end, Thompson was permitted to deny entry to Seminole country of any trader without a license from him, and he could issue licenses at his own discretion.⁷⁷

Army officers in Florida agreed with Thompson that black opposition to being sold to whites would bring energy to the Seminole resistance, as blacks did not see themselves benefiting by coming under white control. The commander of American troops in Florida, Lieutenant Colonel A. C. W. Fanning, worried that "the cupidity of our own citizens" might ruin removal plans because the blacks, "who are bold, active, and armed will sac-

76. Call quoted in Potter, *War in Florida*, 46-49; Harris to Thompson, May 22, 1835, OIA-LR, roll 806.

77. Thompson to Cass, April 27, 1835, House Exec. Doc. 271, 24th Cong., 1st Sess., 183-84; Harris to Thompson, July 11, 1835, OIA-LR, roll 806.

BLACKS AND THE SEMINOLE REMOVAL DEBATE 75

rifice some of them to their rage."⁷⁸ When Thompson asked chiefs friendly to removal to conduct a pre-removal census of their people, including slaves, blacks became alarmed that the compilation of their names and numbers was the first step in the effort to put them under white control. At the same time, Thompson said, whites came to the agency with the War Department's affirmative response to Call's inquiry about Seminole slaves.⁷⁹

The majority of Indians opposed emigration, regardless of the agreement made by a handful of chiefs. As General Thomas S. Jesup explained in the midst of the war, "even when a large portion of the heads of families should assent to a measure, those who dissented did not consider themselves bound to submit to or adopt it." Some headmen, including Jumper, Coi Hadjo, Charley Emathla, and Holata Emathla, knew American power made resistance futile and thus privately favored emigration, but their people so opposed it that they threatened the lives of any Indians complying with the removal plan. Osceola emerged as a leader of the militant resistance and, though not a hereditary Seminole leader, collected followers who agreed with what he said. His ascent to leadership also owed as much to action as talk; Thompson jailed him briefly for threatening him with a knife, and a month before the onset of the Second Seminole War he killed Charley Emathla for preparing for removal regardless of the sentiment of the people.⁸⁰

Thompson tried to explain to the Seminoles how much worse their condition would be if they remained in Florida without federal protection. He also offered assurances that the government would protect their property from the Creeks. Micanopy held firm on the twenty-year term of the Moultrie Creek treaty which did not expire for nine more years. Other Indian speakers complained that the Paynes Landing treaty had not been explained to them correctly, that they only meant to look at the western land, and that the western land was no good.

78. Alexander C. W. Fanning to Adjutant General, April 29, 1835, *Territorial Papers*, XXV, 133.

79. Potter, *War in Florida*, 45-46; Thompson to Harris, June 17, 1835, OIA-LR, roll 800.

80. Boyd, *Florida Aflame*, 47-56; Williams, *Territory of Florida*, 216; Thomas S. Jesup to Joel Poinsett, October 17, 1837, *American State Papers: Military Affairs*, VII, 886.

Nothing was resolved at this October 1834 meeting, and Thompson noticed that the Indians, "after they had received their annuity, purchased an unusually large quantity of powder and lead."⁸¹

Duncan Clinch met with the Seminoles in April 1835 and got no further than had Thompson. Jumper proceeded to make a lively two-hour speech, and Bemrose recorded "Cudjo's short and abrupt elucidation of doubtless a noble harangue. . . . 'When he look upon the White man's warriors, he sorry to injure them, but he cannot fear them, he had fought them before, he will do so again, if his people say fight.' . . . When asked to elucidate more fully the speaker's meaning, it tended only to his imperfect grunt of 'he say he no go, dat all he say.'" Clinch, exasperated, finally told the council if they did not emigrate voluntarily it would be done by force. A number of chiefs agreed, but not Micanopy or Jumper.⁸²

Abraham, who had interpreted the removal treaties, was now counseling resistance, and Thompson believed the cause lay in the actions of his predecessor at the Seminole agency, John Phagan.⁸³ Abraham fumed that he had never been paid. As Thompson explained, "He has (in my possession) Major Phagan's certificate that he is entitled for his service to \$280 for which Major Phagan, on the presentation of Abraham's receipt at the Department received credit. Abraham says he never gave a receipt; that he has been imposed upon; and he is consequently more indifferent upon the subject of emigration than I think he would otherwise have been. I have little doubt that a few hundred dollars would make him zealous and active." The money, Thompson said, should not be given "but on the production of the effect desired."⁸⁴

81. Thompson to Herring, October 28, 1834, House Exec. Doc. 271, 24th Cong., 1st Sess., 54-65.

82. Bemrose, *Reminiscences*, 17-24; *American State Papers: Military Affairs*, VI, 75.

83. Phagan had been fired in 1833 when a treasury department comptroller found in Phagan's accounts twelve invoices that had been altered \$397.50 over the true amount, with Phagan paying the contractor the true amount and the agent pocketing the remainder. J. B. Thornton to Cass, August 29, 1833, OIA-LR, roll 800. The year before, Phagan was in trouble for openly campaigning against Joseph White in the delegate election, conducting card games in the office, and hiring his own slave in the agency smithery at government expense. Phagan to Cass, February 6, 1832, *ibid.*

84. Thompson to George Gibson (commissary general of subsistence), September 21, 1835, House Exec. Doc. 271, 24th Cong., 1st Sess., 214.

BLACKS AND THE SEMINOLE REMOVAL DEBATE 77

Secretary of War Cass declined this opportunity to influence a useful ally. "Major Phagan having filed here the proper receipt for Abraham for his pay as interpreter, and received credit for the amount, it would be unsafe and inconsistent with the rules of the Department to set aside the receipt, and pay the claim now presented," he told Thompson.⁸⁵

With the blacks, especially the influential ones, siding with the resistance, the murder of Charley Emathla by Osceola as an example for those Indians inclined to cooperate with removal, and the sudden abandonment of the Seminole communities, Clinch and Thompson perceived that trouble was imminent. The Florida frontier could be destroyed, Clinch told the adjutant general of the army, "by a combination of the Indians, Indian Negroes and the Negroes on the plantations." Reinforcements arrived in December, and a plan was made to move by force on the Seminole country after New Year's Day to round up the Indians for emigration.⁸⁶

The eruption of hostilities in the last week of 1835 owed much to the alliance of blacks with the Seminoles. Luis Pacheco, the former slave of the Fatio family who had subsequently lived in Indian country, was the guide for Major Francis L. Dade's fateful encounter with the Seminole warriors who were determined to resist removal. Whether or not he colluded with the attackers, as he denied to his death, other blacks assisted the warriors who ambushed Dade's troops. Major F. S. Belton published in *Niles' Weekly Register* his account of the battle in which he stated that "a negro . . . named Harry, controls the Pea Creek band of about a hundred warriors, forty miles southeast of [Fort Brooke] . . . who kept his post constantly observed, and communicate with the Mickasukians [sic] at Wythlacochee [sic]."⁸⁷

85. Cass to Thompson, October 28, 1835, *ibid.*, 227. The Paynes Landing treaty stated that Abraham and Cudjo were "to be paid on their arrival in the country they consent to remove to"; thus Phagan had no business invoicing the government for Abraham's payment while the Seminoles were still in Florida. Cudjo also had been victimized by Phagan, as the agent sent to Washington a bill for \$480 (although Cudjo was due only \$180) from which the interpreter received nothing. Cudjo complained that in three years with Phagan he had received only \$175. Thompson to Her-ring, March 3, 1835, OIA-LR, roll 800.

86. *American State Papers: Military Affairs*, VI, 61; Patrick, *Aristocrat in Uniform*, 71.

87. *Niles' Weekly Register* 49 (January 30, 1836), 367.

At the same time Dade's force was wiped out, blacks and Indians assaulted plantations near St. Augustine, and approximately 300 slaves joined them. One leader of the raids, John Caesar, was a black Seminole with family connections on one plantation. Another was John Philip who lived with King Philip and had a wife on Benjamin Heriot's sugar plantation.⁸⁸

Thus began the longest and most expensive Indian war the United States government was to wage. Ultimately the war for removal could not be resolved without a guarantee by Major General Thomas Jesup that blacks would be permitted to go to the West with the Seminoles rather than sold into slavery. Obviously, the events leading up to the war were distinctly influenced by blacks sympathetic to Seminole resistance.

88. Motte, *Journey into the Wilderness*, 118.