Department of History
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

Searching for Survival: The Division of Dakota Bands and the Roots of the U.S.-Dakota War of 1862

By Spencer Kempf

History 489
Professor: Dr. Oscar Chamberlain
Cooperating Professor: Dr. Andrew Sturtevant

Abstract

In the latter months of 1862, tensions between the Dakota Sioux and settlers residing in Minnesota came to a head. Years of treaty making and living side by side with European Americans had not only greatly diminished Dakota lands, but threatened to take away the Dakota way of life. However, not all Dakota resisted this deculturalization and assimilation. In reality, the Dakota were divided between embracing and fighting assimilation into American culture. In both instances, Dakota bands sought the most viable path for their survival. Southern Dakota bands saw the Dakota way of life as viable, and perceived the American presence as a threat. Southern Dakota leaders, then, eventually made the decision to fight to maintain a traditionalist culture. Northern bands would remain loyal to the Americans that dominated the area. The result of the division, and eventual fighting, was the internment and removal of Dakota people regardless of their allegiance. It was threats to the standing culture, coupled with broken promises, that prompted the killing of five Euro-American settlers living in Action Township. Four Dakota men sparked a war that would only last four months, but would impact the lives of every Dakota band and every Dakota member for generations. Through the use of oral testimonies from the descendants of this event, narratives from Dakota people, and treaties, this capstone will demonstrate that the division of Dakota bands prior to the U.S.-Dakota War of 1862, was the result of Northern and Southern bands exercising agency in attempts to preserve Dakota life, culture, and traditions.

Introduction

Late in 1862, Fort Snelling became an internment camp for prisoners and innocent Dakota alike. Families of friendly Dakota and families of the Dakota men standing trial for their roles in the U.S.-Dakota War of 1862 would share the same land and poor conditions throughout the winter of 1862, and into early 1863. A Dakota man, Gabrielle Renville, described his experience of the transfer of Dakota into the camp in this way: "the prisoners, on their way to Fort Snelling, passed through Henderson, at which place the whites were very much angered and threw stones at the Indians, hitting some of them, and pulled the shawls and blankets off the women, and abused them much."[1] In victory, Minnesotans continued to punish the Dakota through the dehumanizing acts of throwing stones and imprisoning the innocent in a heavily guarded internment camp. Dakota men, women, and children were forcibly placed in close quarters and given limited necessities, including food and clothing. Conditions of this nature created an inhumane living environment claiming the lives of many who lived there. Renville writes of his experience in the camp: "We all moved into this inclosure, but we were so crowded and confined that an epidemic broke out among us and children were dying day and night."[2] This was an experience shared by many Dakota following the battles with United States. Although allegiances and ideology divided Dakota bands prior to the outbreak of the war, many experienced the same fate of internment and relocation.

Relations between the United States government and the Dakota Sioux nation began in the early nineteenth century as numerous treaties were signed by both parties between 1805 and 1858. The cumulative result of these treaties would be the dramatic reduction of Dakota lands, as well

[1] Gabriel Renville*, A Sioux Narrative of the Outbreak in 1862, and of Sibley's Expedition in 1863*, (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1905), 610.
[2] Renville, *A Sioux Narrative of the Outbreak in 1862, and of Sibley's Expedition in 1863*, 610.

as Dakota living side by side with incoming European American settlers. The close proximity shared between the Dakota and early settlers created strong kinship bonds. Dakota bands initially welcomed American presence, in the form of traders and trappers, onto their land and treated them as if they were Dakota themselves. Traders and early settlers began marrying and having children with Dakota women. Once full-time settlers began arriving in Minnesota, with the creation of Fort Snelling, there was already a large number of mixed-blood Dakota living in the area. This was the beginning of the divide between Dakota bands. Many of the mixed-blood Dakota welcomed the change from a traditional lifestyle to the newly presented American lifestyle.[3] Southern bands found the influx of Americans as threatening to the standing Dakota tradition. Originally comprised of thirteen tribes, the Dakota people became divided due to changing ideology. A majority of Dakota, and mixed-blood Dakota, accepted the changing culture around them, cutting their hair and adopting American practices. This was a way for them to remain on their homeland and maintain a limited cultural identity. The exception comes in the form of southern bands, and the leader of the resistance, Little Crow.[4] Dakota leaders of these southern bands made a decision to actively resist the influx of Americans to the region and would strive to maintain the traditional values of the Dakota culture.

Through treaties and land acquisition, the Federal and Minnesotan governments attempted to obtain as much land as possible in the west. The effect of these measures was the increased exposure of American culture to Dakota tribes. Many northern bands embraced the new culture and customs Minnesotans had to offer and blended them with their own traditions. However, what was embraced by some, was challenged by others. For Little Crow and southern bands, American

[3] Gary Clayton Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1997), xxvii.
[4] Hoover, Herbert T., "Review of Little Crow: Spokesman for the Sioux" (1988). Great Plains Quarterly. Paper 517. http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/greatplainsquarterly/517

culture was a threat to the longevity of the Dakota way of life. Permanent American settlements in Minnesota expedited the complete fracture of the Dakota community. Divided Dakota bands each struggled to preserve the Dakota life, culture, and traditions. Northern bands attempted to maintain kinship bonds and blend their lifestyle with American culture in order to remain in their homeland and progress their people. Bands in the south sought to eliminate what they saw as a threat to the standing, traditional Dakota way of life. Although influenced and sparked by American arrival in Minnesota, northern and southern bands each demonstrated agency in their methods for preserving Dakota homeland, life, culture, and traditions.

Treaties and an increasing American presence took its toll on Dakota traditionalists. On August 17, 1862, four Dakota men killed five American settlers living in Action Township. After debate among a select number of Dakota leaders, led by Little Crow, they agreed to send a war party to attack the Lower Sioux Agency, an administrative center for the Dakota reservation. Actions taken by Dakota warriors sparked a war lasting until December of 1862, with the final, sporadic, battles occurring in July of 1863.[5] As the preliminary battles, lasting from August to December, began to wane, the United States Army gathered Dakota men, women, and children and placed them at internment camps at Fort Snelling and in Mankato. These locations served as a placeholder for the Dakota until they could be properly placed on reservations, and in the case of active warriors, executed.

Historiography

Due to the complex nature of the topic, historians have approached the U.S.-Dakota war in a way that has placed blame on both parties involved. Others place the uprising, and its subsequent

[5] Gary Clayton Anderson*, Little Crow: Spokesman for the Sioux* (St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1985), 7-9.

events, within the framework of Civil War era federal Indian policy. Few books, journals, or articles have been written on the topic of the U.S.-Dakota War and the factions that arose upon the arrival of American settlers. In many respects, this division carries the most meaning to the state of Minnesota and the descendants of the active Dakota participants. Nationally, Native American conflicts such as Wounded Knee and the Sand Creek Massacre often overlook the events in eastern and southern Minnesota. Civil War battles and other related conflicts also dominate the narrative of the mid-nineteenth century. While these events dominate the master narrative, a few historians have written to keep the memory of the event alive. The war and its aftermath are often excluded from the master narrative of the American Indian wars.

One of the earliest histories of the U.S.-Dakota War, *A History of the Great Massacre by the Sioux Indians, in Minnesota*, was written just two years after the fighting in 1864. The authors Charles Bryant and Abel Murch give a history of White-Dakota relations dating back to French settlers in the 1680s. Overtly, this account documents the causes of the massacre favorably to the Dakota people, which is common among the present day historians. Bryant and Murch place the blame on "sums, amounting, in the aggregate, to $555,000, these Indians, to whom they were payable, claim have never been paid, except, perhaps a small portion."[6] This is a common argument explored by many researchers of this topic, and it is widely regarded as the spark to the Dakota uprising. However, despite the continuity the authors display with current historians concerning annuity payments, Bryant and Murch portray the Dakota as war hungry and murderers before the outbreak in 1862. Bryant and Murch disclose information regarding early Dakota

[6] Charles S. Bryant and Abel B. Murch, *A History of the Great Massacre by the Sioux Indians in Minnesota,* (Cincinnati: Ricky & Carroll Publishers, 1864*),* 34.

uprisings occurring in the late 1850s. Bryant and Murch make the arguement that the government is at fault for the uprising in 1862 because of a lack of action in 1857.

> We here leave the Inkpaduta massacre, remarking only that the Government paid the Indians their annuities, and made no further effort to bring to condign punishment…This was a greatest error on the part of our Government. The Indian construed it either as an evidence of weakness, or that the whites were afraid to pursue the matter further, lest it might terminate in still more disastrous results to the infant settlements of the State.[7]

It is the belief of this interpretation, that the United States government promoted an uprising by being lax on previous skirmishes and aggression from Native Americans. In this instance, the lenient nature of the government instilled the belief in other Dakota leaders that the United States was weak, and could be pushed out easily. Despite portraying the Dakota favorably early, as the authors approach the 1862 uprising in their timeline, they begin to paint the settlers and the United States as victims. When discussing the lives of the Annuity Dakota in the summer of 1862, just prior to the massacre, the authors state that the Dakota were thriving under allotment and making a better living than the settlers.[8] This statement demonstrates that the authors believe the Dakota had no basis for an uprising, instead they were living better than many settlers, disregarding the loss of Dakota culture and land.

Throughout the remained of the nineteenth-century, many historians carried similar beliefs as Bryant and Murch. That is, the belief that because the Dakota signed treaties and were given allotments, there was limited to no basis for an uprising. By the early twentieth-century, this notion began to shift in the form of the book *Speaking of Indians*, written by Ella Deloria. What set this book apart was the fact that it was written by a Dakota woman. Deloria has knowledge that the American public had never been subjected to. This book provided an intimate look into the

[7] Bryant and Murch, *A History of the Great Massacre by the Sioux Indians in Minnesota*, 45.
[8] Bryant and Murch, A History of the Great Massacre by the Sioux Indians in Minnesota, 73.

transition of the Dakota onto reservations, their experience with the allotment program, and the relationships with American settlers. *Speaking of Indians* created a look into the lives of the Dakota experience, giving the historiography of the U.S.-Dakota War a perspective that had yet to be explored.

Gary Clayton Anderson is the standard bearer on Dakota- White relations in Minnesota. His books *Little Crow: Spokesperson for the Sioux*, *Kinsmen of Another Kind* discuss the Dakota uprising, and in the case *of Little Crow: Spokesperson for the Sioux*, give a narrative of the Dakota perspective. *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, gives details into Dakota relationships, this includes the relationships between tribes and bands, as well as the relationships with incoming Europeans. Anderson also wrote, *Ethnic Cleansing and the Indian: The Crime That Should Haunt America*, providing a look at government policies for handling Native tribes and the attempts of assimilating the Dakota into European culture. His works demonstrate a split in Dakota society and attributes the actions of the American government as a means to eliminate the Dakota culture through ethnic cleansing. Anderson's works cover a range of Dakota topics including the prelude to war as well as the aftermath. In his 1984 book, *Kinsmen of Another Kind: Dakota-White Relations in the Upper Mississippi Valley, 1650-1862*, Anderson attributes the uprising and hostilities to "the breakdown of kinship relations with Whites."[9] This belief arises out of the strong relationship and enculturation the Dakota and European traders had developed prior to the settlement of the territory. Anderson believes that with the settlement of the territory, Americans faced strong pressure to abandon the relationships with the Dakota and give in "to the immensely strong urge to impose the cultural conformity that dominated the American frontier experience."[10] Anderson

[9] Tim E. Holzkamm, *Plains Anthropologist,* 31 (1986), Plains Anthropological Society: 333–34.
[10] Gary Clayton Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 280.

believes it was this abandonment and assimilation attempts, coupled with annuities that eventually gave the Dakota people no alternative but to seek aggression on the settlers. Writings by Anderson place the blame solely on settlers by expressing that the Dakota's only option for cultural survival was through violence.

Primary sources on the war are abundant. Newspapers of the time follow the war in detail, albeit in a manner that paints the Dakota as pure aggressors. Oral testimonies of Dakota and their decedents give way to details about how their families lived before and after the war, effectively outlining which families continued with Dakota traditions and which ones assimilated into European culture. While the testimony from decedents are not direct experiences, they do provide the closest oral history available as the stories have been passed down within the family.

The research presented in this paper argues that the arrival of American settlers into Minnesota accelerated the complete fracture of Dakota bands. Northern bands and mixed-blood Dakota felt the greatest chance for survival was to blend Dakota and American culture. Southern Dakota, further removed from American proximity, pursued measures that would see Dakota bands retain a traditional lifestyle. While Anderson maintains that there were divisions among Dakota, he writes as if the fracture occurred by force, rather than by decision. The research presented in this paper will show that the Dakota were divided in their attempts of preserving their people, land, and culture. Northern bands were willing to sacrifice traditional aspects of their lives to maintain their homeland, while bands in the South, however, sought to preserve all aspects of traditional Dakota life, in any manner necessary. Both sides of Dakota demonstrated agency in these events, and both played an equal role in the war that raged at the latter half of 1862.

Treaties and Land Cession

As Americans began expanding west, it became necessary for the United States to maintain their influence on those seeking settlement in the west. Accompanying the need of maintaining authority over settlers, the U.S. also saw land in the west as theirs to use how they pleased. "As early as 1811 it (Congress) authorized the president to set aside 6 million acres as military bounty lands."[11] Additionally, Congress set aside two million acres were set aside in Illinois, Louisiana, and Michigan. These two examples demonstrate how the United States made claims on lands they had no legal right to. The acreage set aside in Illinois, Louisiana, and Michigan was a case where the United States had yet to establish boundaries in these areas, and resulted in settlers squatting on the land. [12] To obtain legal rights to lands, the United States would create treaties with Native American tribes where land would be exchange for goods or annuities. Between 1805 and 1858, the Dakota signed four separate treaties with Americans. Treaties in 1805, 1837, 1851, and 1858 all ended with varying amounts of land ceded by the Dakota. The land cessions made by the Dakota allowed them to have greater access to European culture and influence.

Treaty of 1805

The initial treaty the Dakota signed with the United States occurred on September 23, 1805. It was a conference held between Lieutenant Zebulon Pike and seven Dakota leaders. The primary goal of this document, in the eyes of the Americans was to establish military posts in the region. This would ensure governance of the settlers in the area as well as their protection. In this treaty, the U.S. was able to establish their desired military posts along the Mississippi River and St.

[11] Gary Clayton Anderson, *Ethnic Cleansing and the Indian: The Crime that Should Haunt America*, (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2014), 133.
[12] Anderson, *Ethnic Cleansing and the Indian: The Crime that Should Haunt America*, 134.

Anthony Falls. The Dakota also granted "full sovereignty and power over said districts forever, without any let or hindrance whatsoever."[13] In return for the nine square miles offered to the United States, the Dakota were promised two thousand dollars, or goods equaling two thousand dollars. Additionally, the United States promised, "on their part to permit the Sioux to pass, repass, hunt or make other uses of the said districts, as they have formerly done, without any other exception, but those specified in article the first." [14] Through this treaty, the Dakota gained their first experience with the United States government. While the Dakota gave up valuable land along the Mississippi River, they were able to retain the majority of their land and rights in the area. Along with this came the introduction of American culture in their region. While exposure to Americans was limited, through the newly formed military forts and posts, the Dakota were experiencing a new way of life and presence in the area.

Treaty of 1837

The next major land treaty signed by the Dakota did not occur until September 29, 1837. Unlike the previous treaty, this document required the Dakota to "cede to the United States all their land, east of the Mississippi river, and all their islands in the said river."[15] In return for this larger portion of land, the Dakota were given 16,000 dollars in a combination of cash and goods and were then promised upwards of 40,000 dollars year to year. The money was meant to be divided and spent on provisions, medicines, tools, cattle, agricultural implements, a physician, farmers, and blacksmiths. [16] The 1837 treaty was one that drastically increased the presence of American culture in the Dakota world. Compensation for the Dakota land offered an American

[13] Treaty with the Sioux, 1805, United States-Sioux Nation of Indians, September 23, 1805.
[14] Treaty with the Sioux, 1805, United States-Sioux Nation of Indians, September 23, 1805.
[15] Treaty with the Sioux, 1837, United States-Sioux Nation of Indians, September 27, 1837.
[16] Treaty with the Sioux, 1837, United States-Sioux Nation of Indians, September 27, 1837.

lifestyle to the Dakota. European medicines, tools, provisions, and vocations were promised as payment for land. At this point, American culture was fully entrenched in Minnesota, and it was beginning to affect the Dakota way of life. While full blooded Dakota were present to sign this treaty, mixed-blood Dakota were also present to sign on behalf of the United States. This shows the close relationship between mixed-blood Dakota and the United States and how the Dakota had the ability to advocate for themselves in treaty making.

Treaties of 1851

While the initial treaty with the American government saw the Dakota lose small tracts of land, and the second saw the Dakota lose their land east of the Mississippi River, it was two treaties in 1851 that led the Dakota to lose its domination of Minnesota and Northern Iowa. In less than a month, two treaties were signed between four Dakota bands and the United States. Both treaties were virtually identical. The first bands to sign in were the Sisseton and Wahpeton bands, and they agreed to cede and "relinquish to the United States, all their lands in the State of Iowa; and, also all their lands in the Territory of Minnesota."[17] This stipulation was also agreed upon by Mdewakanton and Wahpakoota bands on August 5, 1851. In each agreement, the Dakota bands would be awarded over one-million dollars from the United States. However, the money was only guaranteed under certain circumstances. In each treaty, money was to be allotted for "the establishment of manual-labor schools; the erection of mills and blacksmith shops, opening farms, fencing and breaking land, and for such other beneficial objects as may be deemed most conducive to the prosperity and happiness."[18] Accompanying this allocated money was money to be used for improvement of agriculture, education, and to use in buying goods and provisions. The money

[17] Treaty with the Sioux–Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands, United States-Sisseton-Wahpeton, July 23, 1851.
[18] Treaty with the Sioux–Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands, United States-Sisseton-Wahpeton, July 23, 1851.

given to the four Dakota bands was done so in a way that promoted an American way of life. Mills, blacksmiths, manual-labor schools, and fences to separate private property are American institutions. The inclusion of conditions that dictate, to the Dakota, that the money will go towards the creation of American foundations, demonstrate the influence the United States now had over the Dakota people and the region. It was the Dakota, however, that chose to accept these conditions feeling that the Dakota would benefit from the support provided by the Federal Government. "The treaties of 1851 were tools of reform...Government officials expected to consolidate the Indians on the lands assigned to them, thus preventing clashes with whites, and to introduce a 'civilization' program."[19] Now, Dakota bands had agreed to sell their land and accompanying that was a blending of traditional and American cultures. With the influx of American settlers and the introduction of American practices, tensions would begin to grown within Dakota bands. Bands would now consider their way of life and be tasked with adapting to Americanization or with holding onto their traditional way of life.

Treaties of 1858

After ceding nearly all of their lands in the treaties of 1851, Dakota people were allowed access to the ceded lands, which were increasingly being developed by whites as productive farmland.[20] As the decade progressed, white settlers had begun calling for the "concentration of the Indians on the reservations."[21] Traditionalist bands continued hunting and fishing in close proximity to the growing U.S. population, disrupting American settlers. The creation of reservations for the Dakota was outlined in two treaties from 1858. Two treaties were signed on June 19, 1858 between four bands of Dakota. One treaty was signed by the Mendawakanton and

[19] Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 203.
[20] Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 203.
[21] Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 204.

the Wahpakoota bands while the second was signed by Sisseeton and Wahpaton bands. Both treaties allowed for the bands to remain on lands southwest of the Minnesota River. While these treaties overtly acknowledged the autonomy and culture of the Dakota, the fine print demonstrated strong attempts at Americanizing the Dakota bands. Traditionally, the Dakota lived on communal lands, but within this treaty, land was to be allotted to heads of families and single men twenty-one years of age and older.[22] Through this measure, the United States attempted to introduce to the Dakota the concept of private property. Privatization of property was not the only attempt the United States included in these treaties to culturally convert the Dakota bands. This attempted conversion came in the form of proximity to the American settlers and American way of life. In Article five of the treaty it is written that "The United States shall have the right to establish and maintain upon said reservation such military posts, agencies, schools, mills, shops, roads, and agricultural or mechanical improvements as may be deemed necessary."[23] As a result of this stipulation, the United States was able to maintain an active presence on the Dakota reservation. Added presence on the reservation meant that the United States was able to demonstrate European culture on lands that were initially meant to be a sanctuary for the Dakota and Dakota culture. Despite perceived autonomy and sovereignty, the United States maintained authority over the reservation by instituting measures, such as barring alcohol from the reservations, in order to assimilate the Dakota into a Christian and European culture.

Throughout the early nineteenth century, the United States and the Dakota agreed upon numerous treaties. Each treaty varied in the amount of land the Dakota were require to cede. Originally they agreed upon allowing the United States to create a military fort, and as time passed,

[22] Treaty with the Sioux, 1858, United States-Sisseton -Wahpeton, June 19, 1858.
[23] Treaty with the Sioux, 1858, United States-Sisseton-Wahpeton, June 19, 1858.

the land they sold grew until they were confined to reservations. While some Dakota were conscious in their efforts to maintain cultural autonomy, the influx of American settlers and American culture proved too much for many Dakota to resist. The passage of the four separate land treaties spanning the first half of the nineteenth century aided in the culture division of the Dakota people. As some bands resisted the American way of life, the proximity and daily interactions with settlers proved to many Dakota that their traditional way of life would soon be obsolete.

Northern Dakota Bands: Embracing of American Culture

The series of treaties signed between 1805 and 1858 impacted the traditional Dakota way of life. Coupled with the loss of land, the close proximity to the American culture led to many changes in the daily life of the average Dakota. From the beginning of interactions with Europeans, the way of life of the Dakota had begun to evolve. As trading and American presence increased in the region, the Dakota culture saw a shift from traditionalism to American Protestantism. Upon signing the treaties with the United States, the Dakota became the subject of paternalism under the U.S. government. With new, American, neighbors and being under the authority of the United States, the Dakota saw a shift in aspects of life. From hunting to European farming, and traditional spiritual beliefs to Christianity, Dakota people, like John Other Day, became fully immersed in the American way of life. The new way of life in the region created tensions. While many Dakota were embracing their new lives, quarrels and disputes over the new norms of the region were internally tearing the Dakota apart.

Up until the signing of the 1805 treaty, the relationships the Dakota had with Europeans were strictly held through traders and travelers. It was not until the creation of permanent forts in the region that the Dakota began creating meaningful relationships with the American people.

Early on in their relationship, the Dakota and settlers coexisted in the region with few problems. Dakota assimilation was in its infancy, and few bands were straying from their cultural heritage. After the initial treaty little had changed. "Although travelers could now more often see a corn or bean field on the periphery of their encampments, the Dakota people continued to rely heavily on hunting for subsistence." [24] Since the exposure to Americans at this time was limited to those living within the forts, many Dakota were not subjected to American norms and traditions. Interactions occurring early in the American settlement of Minnesota proved to be more balanced. Though the Dakota were beginning to assimilate into the military community of the American fort, "early Americans, both traders and government personnel, assimilated to various degrees key aspects of the Dakota world view."[25] Americans and Dakota alike living around Fort Snelling formed a "unique multiethnic society."[26] At this time, the Dakota and Americans lived peacefully and worked together to create a functioning society. The new found proximity to Americans meant the Dakota had increased accessibility with American goods, beliefs, and practices. No longer were French and English traders the Dakota's sole connection to European culture. Once Fort Snelling was completed, the northern Dakota bands surrounding the fort had daily interaction and commerce with European lifestyle. A growing desire for European goods gave way to Dakota people frequently bartering for supplies, food, and goods from residents of Fort Snelling. Bands increasingly moved away from hunting, their traditional form of sustenance. As northern bands moved away from hunting, they began practicing European farming techniques and bartering with the Americans at Fort Snelling. This was the beginning of the assimilation process for many Dakota. This was the first instance of prolonged exposure to European life, goods, foods, and

[24] Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 81.
[25] Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 101.
[26] Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 101.

supplies. While this was only the foundation of assimilation of the Dakota, it created a rift within bands as the "changing economic conditions had broken up the larger villages…and this affected tribal unity." [27]

What started as accommodation and kinship between the Dakota and Americans soon transformed into much more. As the Dakota surrendered more of their land and the American settlers began moving into the territory, "American 'civilization,' with its attendant acculturative mechanism, was slowly becoming entrenched."[28] Prolonged taste of American social, political, and economic institutions began swaying the Dakota approach to life. Additionally, Dakota reliance on Americans was increasing. Hunting and a self-sustaining lifestyle was being substituted by trade and dependence on American goods and labor. Reliance on American goods and practices were increased with the region's booming fur industry. Competition for control of the fur trade in the region created ecological problems, including the absence of suitable game for the Dakota. "A noticeable decline had occurred since 1817, as herd animals disappeared 'very rapidly' from Sioux country."[29] Lack of game and sustainable food sources was a driving factor for the reliance on American trade and agricultural practices. Shifting away from traditional hunting to farming and trading was the result of various factors. It was the ultimate combination of increasing contact with Americans and the absence of suitable game for hunting that drove Dakota bands closer to American way of life. However, these factors drew many Dakota towards American culture out of necessity for survival. Wabasha, a Dakota man, gave a statement describing his transformation to the American way of life:

> I told him that I had always been brought up as an Indian, had worn a blanket and feather, painted my face and carried a gun. I wished him now to write to the Great Father that I

[27] Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 82.
[28] Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 103.
[29] Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 107.

> had determined to leave off these things. I said write that I am determined to leave the war path, and to leave off drinking whisky, and give up plundering and thieving, and I want you to give me your ways. I know that your ways are good, and that your people obtain land and hold it, they plant corn and raise domestic animals. I wish you to give my people land where we may do the same.[30]

Wabasha sees no other way to ensure the survival of his people than to embrace American agriculture and domesticity. He is aware of the American presence and knows that to continue living traditionally he would only be making enemies with the Americans. Since American settlers had taken control of the region, and Dakota bands had been moved onto limited reservations, Wabasha saw it in the best interest of the Dakota to embrace the ideals of the settlers. He had the foresight to determine that the land cessions would continue as more settlers arrived. As a result, he saw giving into American ways to remain on the land of their ancestors. Wabasha continues by saying, "If we are left without a country, we will be obliged to go out on the plains."[31] For Wabasha, and other Dakota bands, the best chance at surviving and maintaining limited cultural independence relied on their willingness to embrace measures of American life.

John Otherday

Few Dakota embodied the notion of assimilation for survival like John Otherday. Much like Wabasha, Otherday, whose Dakota name was Ampatutokacha, was entrenched in the traditional Dakota life. His uncle was Big Culry Head, the leader of a Wahpeton band and later he grew up to become a successful warrior. In 1856, Otherday joined Hazelwood Republic. This was a band of Dakota who had begun farming and adapting the customs of white settlers. After

[30] *Papers Relating to Talks and Councils Held with the Indians in Dakota and Montana Territories in the Years 1866-1869* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1910), 90-91. As cited in: Gary Clayton Anderson and Alan R. Woolworth, *Through Dakota Eyes* (St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1988), 29.

[31] *Papers Relating to Talks and Councils Held with the Indians in Dakota and Montana Territories in the Years 1866-1869* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1910), 90-91. As cited in: Anderson and Woolworth, *Through Dakota Eyes*, 29.

demonstrating leadership in the rescue of a white woman, Abbie Gardner, after she was taken captive in Spirit Lake, Iowa, Otherday was sent to Washington D.C. to take part in treaty delegations. While in Washington D.C., Otherday further demonstrated his growing connectedness to American culture. Thomas A. Robertson, who accompanied his father, a Scottish translator, to Washington D.C. was close to Otherday during the treaty negotiations. Robertson stated that:

> John Otherday was a desperate character among his own people and was both feared and hated. On the trip to Washington in 1858 he brought back with him a white woman that he took out of a house of ill-fame whom he married after he got back on the reservation. Aside of whatever friendly feeling he might have towards the Whites, he was interested in getting his wife back to her own people, as well as getting himself away from his own people, some of whom were liable to shoot him at any time under cover of these troublous times…[32]

Looking at Robertson's account, Otherday, on the surface, looked as though he was attempting to distance himself completely from Dakota culture. Through farming, assisting the U.S. Army, and marrying a white woman, Robertson asserts that Otherday was abandoning Dakota life and attempting to appease whites by embracing their culture. Additionally, Robertson believes that these measures taken by Otherday made him an enemy to the Dakota traditionalists. Otherday, through his actions and dialog upon the attack at the Yellow Medicine Agency, speak to his belief that his blended American and Dakota lifestyle was the safest way to protect Dakota life. He spoke to Dakota from the Yankton, Sissiton living near the Yellow Medicine Agency and "He told them that they might easily enough kill a few whites – five, ten, or a hundred. But the consequence would be that their whole country would be filled with soldiers of the United States, and all of them killed or driven away."[33] Despite his remarks, and lengthy debates with other tribal leaders,

[32] Thomas A. Robertson, "Reminiscence of Thomas A. Robertson," *South Dakota Historical Collections* 20 (1940): 568-601. As cited in: Anderson and Woolworth, *Through Dakota Eyes*, 181.
[33] John Otherday, "Highly Interesting Narrative of the Outbreak of Indian Hostilities," *Saint Paul Press*, August 28, 1862, p. 2. As cited in: Anderson and Woolworth, *Through Dakota Eyes*, 121.

the attack on the Yellow Medicine Agency commenced as planned. However, regardless of the outcome, Otherday's search for peace demonstrated an attempt and desire to save the Dakota way of life. He verbally questioned the future of the Dakota if the attack continued. He outlined the fact that by being aggressors, the Dakota faced the dangers of occupation by the United States Army, and worse their removal from their homeland. Otherday used his knowledge of the American culture to give warning to the Dakota, foreshadowing that many Dakota would be killed and removed. The response his counterparts gave to these warnings was that killing and removal would occur if they did not act aggressively.

Otherday, like many Dakota, felt that the best way to protect traditional lands and maintain measures of Dakota culture was to evolve and adapt with the American culture. Otherday's procedure to preserve Dakota lands and identity took the form of implementing American culture into his everyday life. Otherday's combining of cultures made him a useful tool for the United States. As he successfully "led sixty-two refugees across the Minnesota and onto the prairie on the north side…Three days of dangerous travel under Other Day's skillful guidance brought the group to Cedar City in McLeod County."[34] From the outset of the hostilities between the Dakota and the American settlers, Otherday was an ally to Minnesotan cause. Due to his sympathetic relationship with white settlers, Otherday became a target for resisting Dakota bands. Dakota traditionalists sought to punish Otherday for his involvement in the conflict. "In revenge, the Indians burned his home and destroyed his carefully cultivated fields."[35] The destruction of Otherday's property and land was a symbolic destruction of American culture, however Otherday was rewarded for his efforts within the conflict. The government "awarded him $2,500 for his

[34] Kenneth Carley, *The Dakota War of 1862: Minnesota's Other Civil War*, (St. Paul, MN, Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1976), 19.
[35] Carley, *The Dakota War of 1862: Minnesota's Other Civil War*, 19.

bravery,"[36] and he used the money to purchase a farm. John Otherday's acceptance of American culture was a means to evolve the Dakota culture, and protect their future, his decision was rewarded with money and land in the area he had always called home.

Southern Dakota Bands: Traditionalists, Resistance, and Uprising

As members of the Dakota community, like Wabasha and John Otherday, were in the midst of salvaging Dakota culture by evolving with the American presence in the north, southern Dakota bands were actively resisting the changes they were witnessing. On the outset of the implementation of the 1858 treaty, the southern, or Lower Dakota were unsatisfied with their situation. Unlike their northern neighbors, the Dakota in the south were placed on a prairie reservation, far removed from the woodlands they were accustomed to. The resistance of the Lower Dakota to embrace American culture, and evolve was the result of, what they deemed, to be mistreatment following the influential treaties of the early to mid-nineteenth century. Southern Dakota, unsatisfied with their new situation, would refuse to accept the ways of the people they believed were acting unjustly towards them. For the Dakota traditionalists, there was no turning back from perceived mistreatment, missed annuities, and broken promises, and the result was the eventual uprising led by the influential resistor, Little Crow.

Resistance to American culture for the lower bands was the result of feeling slighted and cheated by the Federal Government, and feeling the bands to the north received a better deal for their land. "The Upper Sioux considered the land assigned them – from Lake Traverse to the Yellow Medicine River – acceptable as a reservation, since it included the sites of their old villages."[37] While the northern bands found a home on their reservation, the bands from the south

[36] Carley, *The Dakota War of 1862: Minnesota's Other Civil War*, 19.
[37] Carley, *The Dakota War of 1862: Minnesota's Other Civil War*, 3.

found themselves on a reservation outside of the traditional woodland areas, and on a prairie. Although the southern Dakota reluctantly made the move to their new reservation, they saw the land allotted to them as a means of Americanization. Previously, resisting Dakota would use woodland areas for cover as they hunted. It was their means of sustenance and survival, however a move to the prairie demonstrated a need to adapt. Dakota bands of this area believed the switch to have carried the intention of the United States to promote farming within the Dakota community, and the Dakota had reason to assume an ulterior motive to their reservation placement. In 1857, there was a strong push to implement a program of creating individual farms on Dakota reservations. By creating individual farms, the United States argued the Dakota would become less reliant on trading and could improve the economy on the reservation. Many early Dakota attempted to continue their traditional hunting and fishing lifestyle. Accomplishing this was not always easy. After the Dakota sold the land, "It caused us all to move to the south side of the river, where there was but very little game, and many of our people, under the treaty were induced to give up the old life and go to work like white men, which was very distasteful to many."[38] Those who embraced farming were resented by the old-order, and saw the shift as a means to divide Dakota bands. As northern Dakota bands, living around Fort Snelling, were embracing European customs, those in the south still had limited contact. As a result, they were slower in taking to the new culture. The reservation placement, then was seen by southern bands as a measure to accelerate their assimilation. By carrying this belief, these Dakota bands had little faith that the Federal Government and the settlers had their best interest in mind.

[38] Jerome Big Eagle, "A Sioux Story of the War," *Collections of the Minnesota Historical Society 6* (1894): 382-400. As cited in: Anderson and Woolworth, *Through Dakota Eyes*, 23.

Dakota mistrust in the Federal Government and white settlers would be solidified with treaty agreements and eventually, the treaties being unfulfilled. In the eyes of the Southern Dakota bands, treaty negotiations with the United States were lopsided, and unfairly agreed upon. Resisting Dakota claimed that "the whites had tricked them into signing a 'traders' paper' which had never been explained to them."[39] Additionally, nearly $400,000, thought to be allotted to the agreeing bands was instead given to traders and mixed bloods in the area. Although the Dakota felt used in the 1851 agreements with the United States, the idea of increased annuity payments were too much to pass on during the 1858 agreements. Again, the money thought to be marked for Dakota tribes was instead sent to traders in the area, leaving little money in the hands of the Dakota signees. This is because under the treaties, "the Indians had to pay a very large sum of money to the traders for old debts, some of which ran back fifteen years."[40] By including this measure, the United States was able to send money to their own citizens rather than paying out completely to the Dakota. Using these treaties also made the Dakota reliant on the United States. Dakota bands had no other option but to begin farming so they would be able to both pay out their debts and have food to survive. Coupling the perceived injustices of the treaty signing, was absent American annuity payments and promises broken.

Late and absent annuity payments were commonplace in the Dakota community. The Dakota rarely had the means to eat. Often, Dakota would travel to their reservation agency under promises of food, but promises would be broken. "When we came back [to the Redwood Agency] they didn't give us food as they promised – the agent did not give us food as he promised."[41] It

[39] Carley, *The Dakota War of 1862: Minnesota's Other Civil War*, 3.
[40] Jerome Big Eagle, "A Sioux Story of the War," *Collections of the Minnesota Historical Society 6* (1894): 382-400. As cited in: Anderson and Woolworth, *Through Dakota Eyes*, 24.
[41] Robert Hakewaste, "Evidence for the Defendants," *The Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Dakota or Sioux Indians v. the United States*, 1901-07, U.S. Court of Claims no. 222524, part 2, p. 358-59. As cited in: Anderson and Woolworth, *Through Dakota Eyes,* 32.

was commonplace for payments of money or goods to be late, but hostilities ran high when the United States altered their guidelines of who could receive government payments. Common belief among government circles was annuity funds should be reserved for Dakota demonstrating "civilization." As a result, they believed annuity payments should be an incentive for Dakota to convert to a European lifestyle. The shift, then, was annuity payments originally going to common Dakota property to reservation resources being used to effect change.[42] Dakota agent, Joseph R. Brown stated, "the idea that the agricultural and educational funds are the common property of all [Sioux Indians] should be discarded."[43] Despite the existing treaties agreement to pay annuity money for the common property, such as agriculture and education, Brown said "He obviously intended to assist with plowing and house building only those natives who were willing to adopt white customs."[44] This assertion demonstrates a willingness to provide limited assistance to the Dakota people, no longer did the entire band receive the benefits of annuities, only those who followed white customs.

After this change, it benefited the Dakota to change their lifestyles. This would have included owning property and using the land for agriculture. Many Dakota took to this lifestyle as a means to benefit from the payments given by the government. Resistance took hold among Southern Dakota leaders, including Little Crow. Changes enacted in the annuity payments were seen by Dakota leaders as acculturation and a threat to their authority. "It weakened tribal unity, limiting the power of civil chiefs; it encouraged the rejection of traditional religion, challenging the role of the shamans; and it demanded that men no longer take the warpath, weakening the

[42] Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 232.
[43] Brown to Cullen, 30 September 1858, SED no. 1, 35th Congress, 2d session, serial 974, 401-4; Brown to Cullen, 30 November 1859, NARG 75, LR, St. Peter's Agency; *Henderson Democrat* 1 October 1858. As cited in: Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 232.
[44] Ibid.

influence of war leaders."[45] Dakota leaders saw the changes as threatening to the standing order. If their people take to American life, they will be under the authority of the Federal Government, not tribal leaders. Additionally, the changes the treaty was advocating was a threat to Dakota culture. If all Dakota converted, their culture was at risk of extinction. Under the leadership of Little Crow, resisting Dakota bands sought to save their people through battle and eliminating the American presence.

Little Crow

Little Crow was the face of resistance in Minnesota during the Dakota uprising. He forever resisted any measure of conversion to an American life. His dedication to the cause could stem from many places. As a leader in the community, he felt a duty to protect his people as well as the traditions and customs they had accumulated within their history. Another possibility for his devotion could be due to the role he played in the treaty making and connection to the Federal Government. Despite efforts to remedy professed injustices in the treaty agreements, the result was ultimately the same, making Little Crow feel accountable for the potential extinction of his culture. To combat the influx of American culture, Little Crow was successful in preaching the injustices of the Federal Government and rally his bands against American culture through resistance and rhetoric. He became the figure head of a group that "would never abandon the old ways."[46]

Little Crow had tremendous mistrust in the United States and their citizens. He saw the measures taken by the United States as a way to split the Dakota bands and eventually fully assimilate them into "proper" American citizens. Accompanying the mistrust of the United States

[45] Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 236.
[46] Ibid.

was the belief that any American comment or institution was a means to eliminate the Dakota. Little Crow's mistrust in the Americans went so deep that during tribe councils he "would allow no Indians to attend it that had half-breed relatives"[47] Attempts were made to quell Little Crow's fears of change. William Cullen, the reservation Superintendent, assured Little Crow that, "Dakota men could continue in their old religious beliefs and still be husbandmen."[48] Little Crow did not receive this assurance well. To the Dakota, religion accompanied lifestyle, and if one is removed or changed, the other will be affected. Little Crow worked tirelessly to convince the Dakota to ignore the cultural changes around them. An example was education. He sought to have his people quit attending and teaching at missionary schools, "arguing that education was a component of white religion and farming."[49] Little Crow's refusal to compromise his traditions and religion empowered his Mdewakanton band. However, when news came of the killings at Action Township, Little Crow was hesitant to volunteer his leadership and warriors to battle.

Little Crow wanted to do what was necessary to protect his people and culture, but was worried about the ability of the Dakota to defeat the United States. When warriors in his band approached wishing to join in the resistance, Little Crow needed to subdue his warriors' emotions:

> Kill one – two – ten, and ten times ten will come to kill you. Count your fingers all day long and white men with guns in their hands will come faster than you can count. Yes; they fight among themselves – away off. Do you hear the thunder of big guns? No; it would take you two moons to run down to where they are fighting, and all the way your path would be among white soldiers as thick as tamaracks in the swamps of the Ojibways. Yes; they fight among themselves, but if you strike at them they will all turn on you and devour you and your women and little children.[50]

---

[47] Nancy McClure Huggan, "The Story of Nancy McClure," Minnesota Collections 6 (1894): 438-60; St. Paul Pioneer Press, June 3, 1894. As cited in: Anderson and Woolworth, *Through Dakota Eyes*, 139.
[48] Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 236.
[49] Ibid.
[50] H[anford] L. Gordon, The Feast of the Virgins and Other Poems (Chicago: Laird & Lee, 1891), 343-44, and Indian Legends and Other Poems (Salem, Mass.: Salem Press Co., 1910), 381-83. As cited in: Anderson and Woolworth, Through Dakota Eyes, 40-41.

While Little Crow refused to embrace American culture, he respected what they were capable of in terms of military power. He knew that the Dakota did not have enough man power to defeat the United States. However, since "the warriors perceived Little Crow to be the most-able, experienced, and committed to Dakota ways of the Mdewakanton leaders,"[51] he was put in a position to be in command of the Dakota warriors in their fight against the United States. Although reluctant to be the face and the leader of the active resistance, Little Crow, dedicated to the cause, assured his people that, "Ta-o-ya-te-du-ta is not a coward: he will die with you."[52]

Although hesitant, Little Crow wanted to protect Dakota traditions, and the best way he knew how was to eliminate the outside threat. Little Crow led the Dakota to the best of his ability. Eventually, a village formed around his home. This village became the command center for the Dakota resistance movement as it held "several thousand people, including more than three hundred mixed-blood and white captives."[53] In mid-August 1862, the resisting Dakota found success through small raids on the frontier, killing many and losing few. These raids were localized in small Minnesota settlements and many of the causalities were white settlers. Early raids also occurred at several Indian Agencies, including the Redwood Agency and the Yellow Medicine Agency. Many of the settlers displaced by the settlement raids, found themselves as refugees at Fort Ridgely. On August 19, 1862, the United States defended an attack from the resistors at Fort Ridgely. After their defeat at Fort Ridgely, Little Crow and the resisting Dakota looked to attack New Ulm, the largest settlement in the proximity of the Dakota reservation. In the two battles of New Ulm, the United States only lost thirty-four citizens while the number of

[51] Anderson and Woolworth, *Through Dakota Eyes*, 40.
[52] H[anford] L. Gordon, The Feast of the Virgins and Other Poems (Chicago: Laird & Lee, 1891), 343-44, and Indian Legends and Other Poems (Salem, Mass.: Salem Press Co., 1910), 381-83. As cited in: Anderson and Woolworth, *Through Dakota Eyes*, 40-41.
[53] Anderson and Woolworth, *Through Dakota Eyes*, 129.

Dakota killed is not known. This was a turning point of the war as the United States moved from a defensive mode to "an organized military effort to defeat and punish the Sioux."[54] However, following this shift in military effort by the United States, they experienced their heaviest military body count at the hands of the resisting Dakota. On September 2, 1862, the Dakota attacked a military camp at Birch Coulee wounding up to thirty soldiers in just the first thirty minutes of fighting. The siege on Birch Coulee lasted thirty-one hours and left seventeen Americans dead, and forty-seven wounded. "Big Eagle later reported that he had seen only two dead Indians."[55] This would be the last real measure of success Little Crow and the resisting force would experience however. Within the month, Little Crow would surrender at Camp Release all but ending the Dakota Uprising.

On September 24, 1862, after Colonel Henry Sibley and his troops had camped near Wood Lake near the Little Crow occupied Camp Release. Facing a force larger than his own, Little Crow was one of the final Dakota fighting in the field, but "Upon realizing the condition of things Little Crow and some two or three hundred of his followers hurriedly fled, 'folded their tents and stole quiet[l]y away.'"[56] After the Dakota surrender at Camp Release, Little Crow left Wood Lake to expand his influence by gaining support of other bands of Sioux as well as other tribes and British residing near present day Winnipeg at Fort Garry. Little Crow sought support from the Canadian tribes and government to obtain the release of Dakota prisoners in Minnesota. After failing in his mission to recruit sympathizers, Little Crow returned to Minnesota in the summer of 1863 with his son and seventeen other followers, sixteen of which were men. Upon returning, there were a series

[54] Carley, *The Dakota War of 1862: Minnesota's Other Civil War*, 40.
[55] Carley, *The Dakota War of 1862: Minnesota's Other Civil War*, 44.
[56] Samuel J. Brown, "In Captivity: the Experience, Privations and Dangers of Sam'l J.Brown, and Others, while Prisoners of the Hostile Sioux, during the Massacre and War of 1862," *Mankato Weekly Review*, April 6, 13 ,20, 27, May 4, 11, 1897. As cited in: Anderson and Woolworth, *Through Dakota Eyes*, 222.

of killings in the area of Little Crow and his followers. Although never directly linked to the killings, Little Crow was shot on July 3rd when "he was picking berries unarmed with his son or his grandson…He didn't shoot anybody or anything."[57] Little Crow demonstrates the fight of the resisting Dakota. He sought to save his culture and his people through war and the elimination of the American threat. To the resisting Dakota, the best way to protect Dakota culture was through violent uprising, demonstrating that they were going to have a say in the future of Minnesota and their culture.

Conclusion

Early uprisings by the Southern Dakota bands led to an all-out war between a limited amount of Dakota bands and the United States. Dakota warriors attacked the symbols of American culture. Agencies, forts, and farms were the target of Dakota attacks as they sought to destroy the American presence in their homeland. However, disrupted Dakota unity, and the strength of the United States military made it difficult for the Dakota to gain traction for a sustained attack on the United States. Since the Dakota were over matched, fighting did not last long, but the punishment made a statement about who was the new dominate authority in Minnesota.

"Death, indeed, is the least atonement which these savage miscreants can make for their dreadful crimes. But the greater the crime the greater the need that its punishment should carry with it the weight and sanction of public authority."[58] This was the call of Minnesota Govenor Alexander Ramsey, who believed in swift and heavy punishment. Minnesota and the Federal Government were prepared to inflict harsh punishments on the Dakota. In all, 392 Dakota prisoners were tried in Minnesota, and 307 of those cases resulted in a death sentence, while sixteen

[57] Melvin Littlecrow, interview by Deborah Locke, *U.S.-Dakota War of 1862 Oral History Project*, January 18, 2012.
[58] Alexander Ramsey, "A Proclamation to the People of Minnesota," *The Saint Paul Press*, December 11, 1862.

were given time in prison. The trial records were reviewed by the Federal Government, and President Lincoln approved thirty-nine of the potential death sentences. On December 26, 1862, thirty-eight of these men were hanged in Mankato in front of numerous citizens in what is called "America's greatest mass execution."[59] For many Minnesotans, the execution of these Dakota warriors was not satisfying, and they wanted measures to be taken to ensure no uprising would occur again.

Initially, the Dakota who had surrendered were sent to Fort Snelling. Here, 1,700 men, women, and children were imprisoned in a camp that lacked enough food, clothing, shelter, or room to comfortably hold all the Dakota. As a result, death ran rampant through the camp as they awaited their fate. For a great deal of whites, imprisonment was not enough to ensure their protection from a new uprising. They wished to see the Dakota roaming the prairies to "be pursued and punished and that all the captured Sioux be banished from the state"[60] It did not matter to whites the allegiances, as long as they were removed. This meant the 1,700 peaceful prisoners at Fort Snelling, mostly children and women, were included in the desired banishment. Whites were so set on removing the Dakota, peaceful or resisting, that they also made an "effort to remove the peaceful Winnebago Indians from their reservation."[61] Calls for removal were met with action. Groups of Dakota, and even Winnebago, were sent to reservations within the boundaries of South Dakota, North Dakota, and Nebraska. Additionally, prisoners were removed from the state and sent to Camp McClellan in Davenport, Iowa.

The introduction of the United States into Minnesota had drastic effects on the Dakota living in the region. Treaties had drastically reduced Dakota lands confining them to two small

[59] Carley, *The Dakota War of 1862: Minnesota's Other Civil War*, 75.
[60] Carley, *The Dakota War of 1862: Minnesota's Other Civil War*, 76.
[61] Ibid.

reservations. Both sides saw this as the end of traditional Dakota life, but their means of keeping Dakota culture alive differed greatly. Bands led by Wabasha and John Other Day, sought to combine their lifestyles with those introduced by their American neighbors. They believed the best way to maintain their homeland would be to demonstrate a willingness to live among and in the ways of the white settlers. Other bands, saw the United States as a usurping body. They saw the actions of the United States as a means to eliminate the Dakota and take away their land. Their response, led by Little Crow, was violence to try and forcibly remove the threat from their homeland. In the end, allegiance made little difference. Only those Dakota who worked closely with the United States were able to maintain their life in Minnesota. For the others, whether they supported the uprising or not, they found themselves removed from the land their people had called home for centuries. Although both sides had the goal of retaining Dakota lands and culture, it was their split that became their eventual downfall. Without unity, Dakota bands did not have enough of a peaceful presence to remain friendly with the United States or enough military power to effectively fight for the Dakota future.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Anderson, Gary Clayton, Alan R. Woolworth, eds. *Through Dakota Eyes: Narrative Accounts of the Minnesota Indian War of 1863.* St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1988.

- This book is an edited compilation of thirty-six narratives of Dakota experiences throughout the U.S.-Dakota War of 1862. A book like this provides a look at the war through the perspective of the non-dominant group. This book is available in print.

Alexander Ramsey, "A Proclamation to the People of Minnesota," *Saint Paul Press*, December 11, 1862.

- This article from the *Saint Paul Press* was written by Minnesota Governor Alexander Ramsey. In it, he urges Minnesota citizens to resist violence against the Dakota as he was looking to take extreme legal measures.

Bishop, Harriet E. *Dakota War Whoop, or, Indian Massacres and War in Minnesota.* Auburn, N.Y.: WM. J. Moses' Press, 1864.

- This book was written by a European American from Minnesota in the wake of the Sioux Massacre. It can provide a perspective of the beliefs the white settlers had about Dakota people during the time of war. Book is available in digitized form.

Bryant, Charles S. and Abel B. Murch. *A History of the Great Massacre by the Sioux Indians in Minnesota, Including the Personal Narratives of Many Who Escaped*. Cincinnati, OH: Rickey & Carroll Publishers, 1864.

- Written at the end of the U.S.-Dakota War, this book provides narrative accounts of settlers who experienced the Sioux Massacre. It also gives the perspective of settlers who came into contact with the Sioux. A digitized copy of the book is available.

R. *Letter to the editor of the St. Paul Pioneer ("The Indians and Half-Breeds from Fort Snelling) from R. [surname unknown], March 7, 1863.* Letter. From the Minnesota Historical Society, *Stephen R. Riggs and family papers, 1837-1988.*

- Letter written to the editor of the St. Paul Pioneer from an unidentified author, assumed to be Stephen R. Riggs. The letter outlines the role of "friendly" Sioux during the U.S.-Dakota War, the trials, and at the internment camp at Fort Snelling. Letter can be found at the Minnesota Historical Society Library.

Renville, Gabriel, *A Sioux Narrative of the Outbreak in 1862, and of Sibley's Expedition in 1863*, (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1905).

- This is a narrative written by Gabriel Renville, a Dakota man. It outlines his experiences during the U.S.-Dakota War of 1862. This includes military engagements, as well as the punishment of Dakota. A digitized copy of the book is available.

United States. Treaty with the Sioux, 1805. September 23, 1805. *Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties* vol. II (1805).

- The treaty signed by Dakota bands and the United States. This document outlines the conditions of the 1805 treaty, and declares what each side is to receive within the agreement.

United States. Treaty with the Sioux, 1837. September 27, 1837. *Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties* vol. II (1837).

- This document outlines the terms and conditions of the treaty between the Dakota and United States. It demonstrates what each side would be receiving in the agreement.

United States. Treaty with the Sioux—Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands. July 23, 1851. *Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties* vol. II (1851).

- This document outlines the terms and conditions of the 1851 treaty between the Sisseton and Wahpeton Dakota bands. It demonstrates what each side would be receiving in the agreement.

United States. Treaty with the Sioux, 1858. June 19, 1858. *Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties* vol. II (1858).

- This document outlines the terms and conditions of the 1858 treaty between the Dakota and the United States. It demonstrates what each side would be receiving in the agreement.

Various. *U.S.-Dakota War of 1862 Oral History Project.* Sound Recording. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society, 2011-2012.

- Fifty interviews with Dakota and European descendants of participants during the U.S.-Dakota War, including a direct relative to Little Crow. Uses the oral traditions of the Dakota culture to relay information throughout generations. Recordings are found at the Minnesota Historical Society Library.

Secondary Sources

Anderson, Gary Clayton. *Ethnic Cleansing and the Indian: The Crime that Should Haunt America*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2014.

- Uses the history of the United States Federal Indian Policy to argue that Indian policy was a way to rid the United States of Native Americans. The book covers wide range of topics including "Removal Policy" and boarding schools.

Anderson, Gary Clayton. *Kinsman of Another Kind: Dakota White Relations in Upper Mississippi Valley 1650-1862.* St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1997.

- An examination on how the Dakota's ethno-history caused the Sioux to resort to violence against white settlers. Anderson discusses themes such as a declining fur trade, increased white settlement, and Dakota economic dependence on European Americans.

Anderson, Gary Clayton. *Little Crow: Spokesman for the Sioux.* St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1985.

- This is a biography of the life of Little Crow. It outlines his beliefs and leadership in the resistance movement against the United States. This book is in print.

Carley, Kenneth. *The Dakota War of 1862: Minnesota's other Civil War*. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1976.

- An overview of the causes and events that led to the violence of the U.S.-Dakota War. The book also outlines the consequences for the Dakota people as a result of the fighting.

Deloria, Ella. *Speaking of Indians*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1944.

- Book written by a Dakota woman. This book outlines the life of the Dakota people while on reservations and while they were reliant on annuity payments from the United States government. This book also draws on the relationship between the Dakota and American settlers.

Faimon, Mary Beth. "Ties That Bind: Remembering, Mourning, and Healing Historical Trauma." *American Indian Quarterly* Vol. 28, No. ½ (Winter-Spring, 2004): 238-251.

- This article outlines the Fort Snelling Internment Camp. It argues that life in the camp has impacted the lives of future generations of Sioux people arguing that the camp rid the Sioux of culture and language.

Holzkamm, Tim E., "Review of Ethnic Cleansing and the Indian: The Crime that Should Haunt America," *Plains Anthropologist*, 31 (1986), Plains Anthropological Society.

- This is a review of the book Ethnic Cleansing and the Indian: The Crime that Should Haunt America. This provides a look into Anderson's work, and the historiography of the U.S.-Dakota War.

Hoover, Herbert T., "Review of Little Crow: Spokesman for the Sioux" (1988). Great Plains Quarterly. Paper 517. http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/greatplainsquarterly/517

- This is a review of the book written by Gary Clayton Anderson. This review provides a brief background of Little Crow, his life and his beliefs. Article is available online.

Meyer, Roy W. *History of the Santee Sioux: United States Indian Policy on Trial*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1993.

- A description of the effects of westward expansion on the Native American communities in Minnesota. Outlines of fur trading, treaties, and the uprising of 1862. Focuses primarily on the eastern Sioux including the: Mdewakatons, Wahpekutes, Wahpetons, and Sissetons.

Millikan, William. "The Great Treasure of the Fort Snelling Prison Camp." *Minnesota History* 56/4 (spring 2010): 4-17.

- An article that overviews the U.S.-Dakota War of 1862. The bulk of the article discusses the creation and implementation of the internment camp at Fort Snelling upon the completion of fighting.

Nichols, David A. *Lincoln and the Indians: Civil War Policy and Politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1978.

- Book details Federal Indian Policy under the Lincoln administration during the Civil War. The author argues that policy at this time aided and benefited the white settlers. Another argument is that the federal government held a relaxed and at times non-existent Federal Indian Policy.