WOLFGANG HOCHBRUCK

"I Ask for Justice": Native American Fourth of July Orations

Originalbeitrag erschienen in:
Paul Goetsch u.a. (Hrsg.): The Fourth of July : political oratory and literary reactions.
Tübingen: Narr, 1992, S. [155] - 165

Wolfgang Hochbruck

'I ASK FOR JUSTICE': NATIVE AMERICAN FOURTH OF JULY ORATIONS

Native Americans and the Fourth of July

For citizens of the early republic, the Fourth of July represented an expression of political sovereignty and an opportunity to celebrate their success in the War of Independence. For the indigenous population, however, an affirmative essay titled "Why the Indian Should Celebrate"[1] would have warranted a question mark during those years. The *Declaration of Independence* mentioned the aboriginal population only as "savage Indians" and as part of the biological weaponry of the British King. Furthermore, the classification of the Indians as 'savages' who constituted a permanent menace to the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness of the peaceful American settler became a topical element in Fourth of July orations.[2] In true Puritan tradition the 'savages' were considered little (if at all) better than one of the biblical plagues which the now independent United States, like the early settlers, were manifestly destined to overcome due to their moral (and military) superiority.

That Indian oratory in the *Noble Savage* tradition was often praised in contemporary American letters does only at first appear as a contradiction. The Noble Savage was made to serve the same purpose as his ignoble counterpart: while Puritan readers had relished the Indian speaker in the form of the Christian proselyte, U.S. citizens loved the dying chief--in Freneau's poems, in the famous 'Logan'-oration, in Cooper's *Mohicans* and Stone's *Metamora*. Whereas contemporary Indians were objects of wrath and contempt, Indians of the past were accepted as geographical ancestors because they proved that the United States had a cultural history of its own, different from Britain. In the role of the dying noble savage, the Indian could also be

---

[1]Joseph Henry Broker (Chippewa), in a special issue of the Carlisle Indian School newsletter *Carlisle Arrow*, 4th July, 1912.

[2]Klaus Lubbers, "The Status of the Native American in Fourth of July Orations, 1777-1876," in Renate von Bardeleben, ed., *Wege amerikanischer Kultur* (Frankfurt, New York, Bern, 1989), 97-110, pp. 98ff.

used to denounce nobility in general.[3] Only one white speaker of the period strayed far from the accepted formulae and dared to criticise his compatriots for their treatment of Native land rights.

> . . . let it be remembered, that even in this early period of our existence, we exhibited some specimens of that fraud and injustice which has been too conspicuous ever since.--I mean in forcibly or fraudulently depriving the natives of their possessions.[4]

As Klaus Lubbers remarks, "His *faux pas* created quite a stir."[5]

The opportunity for a Native American to voice his own opinion first occurred when the Fourth of July oration began to lose its attractiveness as a purely commemorative address and its self-congratulatory rhetoric became stale.[6] After the War of 1812 the rhetoric of the Fourth became subject to change as speakers started to point out that many of the promises and principles of the *Declaration of Independence* were not only as yet unfulfilled but that some had even been perverted through abuse and corruption of authority. In this changed atmosphere, speakers increasingly commented on problems of the day like the question of abolition. On a few occasions, speakers also mentioned the plight of the aboriginal population.[7] Later, the Jackson administration's Indian relocation policy brought the first Indian politicians--most of them Cherokee--as eloquent spokespeople of their nations to the cities of the North.[8]

In the 1850s the debate over the abolition issue grew increasingly intense, whereas there were few conflicts involving Indians. Indian and pro-Indian speakers sensed their opportunity: educated orators of Native American descent travelling the lecture circuit like the Ojibwe George Copway were

---

[3]David Murray, *Forked Tongues: Speech, Writing, and Representation in North American Indian Texts* (London, 1991), p. 36.

[4]David Daggett, a New Haven lawyer, 1787, quoted in Lubbers, "The Status of Native Americans," p. 102.

[5]*Ibid.*, p. 101.

[6]For criticism of the Fourth of July oration, cf. Howard H. Martin, *Orations on the Anniversary of American Independence, 1776 - 1876* (Evanston, 1955), pp. 317f.

[7]Cf. the parts of Joseph L. Tillinghast's oration (Providence, 1814) on behalf of the subdued Creeks, quoted in Lubbers, "The Status of the Native American," p. 106.

[8]Murray, *Forked Tongues*, p. 42; see also Bernd Peyer, ed., *The Elders Wrote* (Berlin, 1982), pp. 34-43 (Elias Boudinot, "Address to the Whites") and pp. 51-55 (John Ross, "To the Senate and House of Representatives").

celebrated as the epitome of their race--however questionable their right to represent their tribes may have been in some cases.[9]

The Speech of John Quinney/Wannuaucon (The Dish), Muh-he-con-new (Stockbridge Mahican), 1854

The first recorded Fourth of July oration delivered by an American Indian was given in 1854 upon request of the citizens of Reidsville, N.Y., by John W. Quinney, a Muh-he-con-new.[10] Quinney was grand sachem of the Stockbridge band of Indians, a group made up of different tribes, mostly Muh-he-con-news who had been relocated several times since the 18th century.[11] Their original homes had been in New York State. Quinney and the band he represented were christianized and educated; in 1837 Quinney himself had drafted a constitution for his people.[12]

As a Native American speaker in 1854, Quinney faced a complicated task. The pre-existing ethnic barrier that separated him from his audience was increased by the fact that his audience wanted to celebrate and enjoy themselves while Quinney's interest lay in addressing a problem serious to his tribe. Both factors made the use of nationalistic formulae and appeals to patriotic sentiment impossible. Furthermore, to the general audience the 'Fourth' was connected with the birth of a nation; 'Indian speech' signified decline and death. Quinney also faced a problem of rhetorical form. The well-meaning editors who saw his speech as "strongly marked by the peculiarities of Indian eloquence" (p. 313) had fallen victim to the public perception of the

---

[9]Donald B. Smith, "The Life of George Copway or Kah-ge-ga-ga-bowh (1818-1869) - and a Review of his Writings," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 23 (1988), 5-38, p. 29: "At the time he published his books he was neither a Canadian Methodist preacher nor an Indian chief, as he presented himself in his autobiography."

[10]See Appendix, pp. 282-286. Quotations from this speech are hereafter cited with bracketed page numbers in the text. I am grateful to Prof. Joseph Wiesenfarth (Madison) for his assistance in acquiring this text. Thanks also to Prof. Daniel F. Littlefield (Little Rock) who contributed valuable information, and especially to Beth Satre who proofread the manuscript.

[11]Cf. T. J. Brasser, "Mahican," in Bruce G. Trigger, ed., *Northeast. Handbook of North American Indians* (Washington, 1978), 15, 198-212, p. 209. Quinney uses the terms "Muh-he-con-new" (315 and 320) and "Mohegan" (316-317) alternately for his tribe. The Indians of Stockbridge are usually called *Mahicans* today, and are believed to be a tribal group different from the Mohegans, even though Quinney's statement would point to the contrary. Within this article, the term "Muh-he-con-new" shall be used.

[12]Brasser, "Mahican," p. 210.

'Indian orator' as less an individual than a set of images and preconceptions.[13] A long line of European and American writers, including missionaries as well as politicians and authors like Irving and Cooper, had helped to firmly root this stereotype in American public opinion. One particularly influential source was the speech of Logan, a Mingo chief,[14] to Lord Dunmore. Thomas Jefferson publicized this text, claiming that it not only equalled the orations of Cicero and Demosthenes but was "by an American in any case."[15] Reprints in American schoolbooks of the nineteenth century contributed to its distribution.[16] An article that appeared in the *Knickerbocker* in 1837 provides a summary of the contemporary stereotypes concerning American Indian rhetoric, that is, oratory in Indian languages. They were generally seen as limited in linguistic capacity and intellectual range and therefore prone to use flowery metaphors derived from observable nature.[17] The opening sentence of the article combines 'Indian' metaphor with the belief that Indian languages and oratorical mode would disappear with their speakers to form a statement of rare imbecility: "A few suns [!] more, and the Indian will live only in history."[18] Quinney's speech must be interpreted against this background.

Fourth of July orators as a rule started by using opening formulae which conveyed a sense of unity of speaker and audience. Deviating from this pattern, Quinney starts by pointing out his distance from the audience.

---

[13]Cf. Charles Camp, "American Indian Oratory in the White Image," *Journal of American Culture*, 1 (1978), 811-817, p. 811: "... much of what has been recorded and passed down as 'native' or 'typical' Indian speechmaking may constitute only a very specific application of certain speechmaking skills and traditions to wholly 'non-native' circumstances–chiefly negotiations between tribal leaders and federal bureaucrats."

[14]Printed first as "The Speech of Logan, a Shawanese (Mingo) Chief, to Lord Dunmore," in *The Pennsylvania Journal; and Weekly Advertiser* (Philadelphia, Feb. 1, 1775). In Jefferson's *Notes on the State of Virginia* (1782) it was reprinted not in the section on *Aborigines* but as part of an argument against the alleged inferiority of the Americans; Murray, *Forked Tongues*, p. 40. For different versions, cf. James H. O'Donnell, "Logan's Oration: A Case Study in Ethnographic Authentication," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 65 (1979), 150-156.

[15]R. H. Sandefur, "Logan's Oration–How Authentic?," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 46 (1960), 289-296, p. 291.

[16]In the 19th century in *McGuffey's Fourth and Fifth Reader*; cf. Robert Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian. Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York, 1978), p. 88.

[17]Anon., "Indian Eloquence," *The Knickerbocker*, 7 (1835), 385-390.

[18]*Ibid.*, p. 385.

> It may appear to those whom I have the honor to address, a singular taste, for me, an Indian, to take an interest in the triumphal days of a people, who occupy by conquest, or have usurped the possession of the territories of my fathers... (p. 314)

Identifying himself not by his particular tribe but as "an Indian," Quinney assumes a comprehensive position from which to develop his argument. Explicitly stating his training in the American school system, he undercuts the possibility of being rejected by the audience as an ignorant person unfit for speaking on such an occasion. Within the first paragraph he also mentions both the "triumphal" aspects of the day and the justified "rejoicings" commemorating "the free birth of this giant nation." Thus far, Quinney follows the traditional pattern of Fourth of July oratory closely, but the second half of the sentence contradicts the first, pointing out that to the aboriginal population the outcome of the War of Independence meant only the "transfer of the... dependence of my race from one great power to another" (p. 314). He then stifles possible alarm among his listeners by addressing them as "my friends" and humbling himself. A personal remark "I am getting old" is linked with the general observation that a "steady consuming decline" affects his tribe so "that their extinction is inevitable" (p. 315). Quinney effectively ascertains in his audience the stereotype of the 'Vanishing Indian.' He even goes so far as to use the conventional literary image of the "happy hunting-grounds." In a similar way, the famous Sconondoa had started his equally famous speech by referring to himself as "an old hemlock." This traditional rhetoric of humility was thereafter used by the Whites as evidence of the Indians' acceptance of their own decline.[19] Quinney was obviously familiar with traditional rhetoric and with the stereotype of the vanishing 'Noble Savage.' Cooper's novels *The Last of the Mohicans* and *The Pioneers* had greatly reinforced this stereotype: the Mohican tribe disappears with the deaths of Uncas and Chingachgook. According to Cooper's novels, Quinney didn't exist![20]

---

[19]W. Tracy, "Indian Eloquence," *Appleton's Journal of Literature, Science and Art*, 6 (November 1871), 543-545, p. 545.

[20]As a sort of bitter irony, Quinney was of very ill health at the time he gave the oration and died within a year; cf. A Stockbridge Indian [author], "Death of John W. Quinney," in Lyman C. Draper, ed., *Collections of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin* (Madison, 1859; repr. 1906), 4, 309-311. Another article commemorative of Quinney in the same volume proves that Cooper's novels were known by the tribe: Levi Konkapot, "The Last of the Mohicans," *ibid.*, 303-307.

Rather than confronting Cooper's texts directly, however, Quinney makes skillful use of his knowledge of stereotypical images and of literary texts. In a satirical twist he calls the 'happy hunting-grounds' an area "which the Great Father"--instead of the conventional 'Spirit'--"has prepared for all his red children." (p. 315) 'The Great Father' (in Washington) was the stereotypical phrase from Indian Treaties denoting the U.S. President. He also employs the term 'pale-face,' a term introduced by Cooper and later used by Copway. The creation myth in which the Great Spirit makes the Indian from red clay (p. 317) had been put into literary form by Washington Irving before.[21] The "covenant of friendship" (p. 317) was a common phrase from many treaties with the Iroquois Confederacy (but *not* with the Muh-he-con-new). Quinney also knew the Bible. When he says of the Whites that "They were strangers, and we took them in--naked, and we clothed them," he quotes Matthew 25, 35-36, a passage that appears in similar form in Logan's address. Quinney probably wanted his listeners to recognize familiar images and topoi which might ease the way for the political demands that were to follow.

The emphasis he placed on his education at the outset of his speech aids Quinney when he mildly rebukes his audience for their belief in written documents. Quinney makes clear that he favours the oral tradition (p. 315) and gives his version of the history of the Muh-he-con-new land-title to the region. The rebuke rests on two arguments; first, oral memory is tribally supervised and as a result more accurate and trustworthy than written documents that may be--and, according to Quinney, frequently were--falsified and made to serve individual gains and interests; and second, the tribe almost lost its oral history when it was entrusted to a white printer.[22]

The story Quinney relates is in keeping with Cooper's version of the Algonquian migration myth told by Chingachgook in *The Last of the Mohicans.*[23] However, Quinney also shapes it to resemble the myth of the colonists. In the tale, a great people migrate across the sea, overcome hardships in the new country and finally settle peacefully. Their governmental system is demo-

---

[21]Washington Irving, "The Seminoles," *The Knickerbocker*, 16 (1840), repr., *Wolfert's Roost, The Complete Works of Washington Irving*, ed. R. Rosenberg (Boston, 1979), 27, 182-191, p. 185.

[22]One of the texts of "the traditions reduced to writing, by two of our young men" (315) may have been Hendrick Aupaumut's "History of the Muh-he-con-nuk Indians," originally printed in Electa F. Jones, *Stockbridge Past and Present* (Springfield, Mass., 1854), 14-23, from an incomplete manuscript written around 1790 (acc. to Peyer, *The Elders Wrote*, p. 25). Repr. *ibid.*, 25-33.

[23]James Fenimore Cooper, *The Last of the Mohicans* (New York, 1980, orig. 1826), p. 34.

cratic: delegates decide political measures by consensus. This storyline observes the conventional myth extolled in so many Fourth of July orations; Quinney depicts his people's migration myth in a way that parallels and, at the same time, satirizes the myth of American colonial settlement. By defaulting on their obligations and responsibilities towards the Indian nation, the Americans destroyed a system much like their own. Symbolically, Quinney implies, they turned against themselves.

When Quinney mentions the coming of the whites to America his mode changes. An anacoluthon underscores the shift from satire to a series of complaints about "the terrible story of recompense for kindness" which befalls the "simple, trusting, guileless Muh-he-con-new." (p. 318) The rhetorical form parallels the increasingly encompassing maltreatment of the Indian: "I have seen much [of this terrible story] myself--have been connected with more, and, I tell you, I know all" (p. 318).

The interlocked "I tell you" is programmatic for the following paragraphs in which Quinney accuses the colonists of having intentionally broken promises, unlawfully usurped tribal lands, and instigated intertribal feuds. The audience, repeatedly addressed as "my friends," now comes under immediate attack for present events as well as for those that happened more than two centuries ago. White misdemeanour and ill-treatment of the Indians are frequently spoken of in the passive form, a device which enhances the impression of suffering. The elegiac 'ubi sunt' in Quinney's lament for the 25,000 of his tribe alive in 1604 has the same effect. Quinney's initial friendliness and humility now help to make his accusations the more upsetting for his audience. This strategy is in turn reinforced when Quinney switches from past to present tense and begins to formulate accusations as questions, or, rather, as challenges: "Will you look steadily at the intrigues, bargains, corruption and log-rolling of your present Legislatures, and see any trace of the divinity of justice?" (p. 319). Finally, combining a friendly manner with an accusatory content, he directly confronts his audience, subverting their belief in their legal ownership of the very land they are assembled on.

> Let it not surprise you, my friends, when I say, that the spot on which we stand, has never been purchased or rightly obtained; and that by justice, human and divine, it is the property now of the remnant of that great people from whom I am descended. (p. 319)

Having corrected the historical record and having voiced past grief and present complaints and involved his present audience, Quinney can finish his

speech with an appeal for justice: "For myself and for my tribe, I ask for justice--I believe it will sooner or later occur--and may the Great and Good Spirit[24] enable me to die in hope" (p. 320). Though Quinney again summons the image of the dying noble savage here, the reference is only personal. It does *not* extend to his tribe, which remains waiting for justice to be done.

The expectation of divine intervention is based on the sermon as one aspect of the rhetorical heritage of Quinney's oration. From this point of view, the tribal migration myth attains the quality of a piece of Scripture. The ensuing complaints could then be seen as a harangue on the sinfulness of the congregation's acts. Quinney's final warning that according to the Bible offences will be punished also resembles an aspect of the sermon. Not yet content with this warning to individuals, Quinney adds that according to "the annals of the earth . . . national wrongs are avenged, and national crimes atoned for in this world" (p. 320). This juxtaposition of a religious threat and a rather spectacular worldly assumption based on unspecified historical data could only work on an audience conscious of their guilt; a condition Quinney successfully fostered by using elements from the sermon.

The second tradition at work in Quinney's speech also has biblical roots. Notwithstanding his 'Indian' rhetoric, Quinney argues along the same lines as Fourth of July orators have done for decades before him. Presenting himself as a figure like Hiob, he models his speech along the form of the biblical Jeremiad.[25] As in the classical American Jeremiad, he criticizes past and present conditions, ending with a plea for improvements in the near future, including reparations to balance the injustices his people had suffered at the hands of the whites. Speeches of contemporary abolitionists worked according to the same principle.

After the War: Assimilation and the Struggle for a Landbase

Native Americans who delivered Fourth of July Orations after the Civil War found themselves in the same predicament as Quinney. The Indians were still without the rights of citizenship. Surprisingly, this was seen as an asset. Under the protection of their nationhood with its traditional system of landownership, the Cherokee, Muskogee, Choctaw, and others managed to

---

[24]Cf. above; obs. that here he speaks of *Spirit* rather than *Father*!

[25]Cf. Sacvan Bercovitch, *The American Jeremiad* (Madison, 1978).

maintain their lands. Consequently, Allen Wright, Governor of the independent Choctaw Nation, and the Muskogee-Creek orator G. W. Grayson expressed[26] in their speeches the fear that once tribal lands were distributed under an American system, large portions would be sold to enterprising whites.[27]

> Within the past few years the humane and philanthropic congressmen sought to extend a territorial government over us, thinking that will confer on us a lasting good. But they do not understand our situation, hence their sympathy proves abortive. Whenever they pass a territorial form of government over us, they will cause us to lose a large portion of our common domain . . .[28]

Wright's laudation of the "philanthropic congressmen" continues the tradition of satire incipient in Quinney's speech. His oration also rang a warning, even though Wright--quite in keeping with the conventional form--finished on a joyful note, including the promise of a brighter future: "Let the strain of music swell. It is neither the time nor place of sorrow. Let us look forward to a happy future--great, happy day for us all--of which this day is but a shadow."[29] The effects of the Dawes Act of 1888 proved Wright's warnings to be only too justified.

The most interesting aspect of these speeches, however, is that while Wright (like Quinney before him) had been invited to speak at Fort Smith, Arkansas, Grayson was guest speaker at a Fourth of July celebration held *within* the boundaries of the independent Cherokee Nation. The Cherokees voluntarily celebrated the national holiday of the same people who would succeed within a matter of years in destroying their Nation's functioning economic, political, and educational systems for a second time.[30] At the time of Grayson's oration, however, they had something to celebrate. The U.S. court

---

[26]Allen Wright, "Speech of Gov. Wright at the Fort Scott Celebration on July the Fourth," *Atoka Independent* (July 12, 1878), p. 1; G. W. Grayson, [Speech reproduced in an article by] White Horse, "Vinita, C.[herokee] N.[ation], July 4th, 1881," *Cherokee Advocate* (July 20, 1881), p. 1. Grayson's tribal affiliation is given as 'Muskogee' in the article, but cf. G. W. Grayson, *A Creek Warrior for the Confederacy: The Autobiography of Chief G.W. Grayson*, ed. W. David Baird (Norman, 1988).

[27]An act of Congress granting citizenship and individual landholdings to the Stockbridge tribe was repealed in 1846 upon request by John Quinney who had noticed early that too much tribal land was lost to white purchasing.

[28]Wright, "Speech," p. 1.

[29]Grayson, "Vinita," p. 1.

[30]Cf. Vine Deloria Jr., *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties. An Indian Declaration of Independence* (New York, 1974), pp. 9-11.

at Fort Smith had outlawed attempts by white agitators to provoke the Cherokee and to elicit enough antagonism to justify military action against them. This court decision was celebrated; however, Grayson found it necessary to repeat his observation that the Indian nations were celebrating not quite the same thing as the rest of the United States.

> A novel feature of our meeting to-day, however, is, that we have recent and peculiar reasons for joy which in no way relate to the declaration of American Independence. While they in no way relate to this great event, yet this being a day of general rejoicing in the land, it has been decided that we, too, may take part in the general feeling.[31]

About the same time, the unconditional surrender of the last 'wild' tribes in the West reinforced the belief that the military defeat and unconditional surrender of the indigenous peoples would necessarily be followed by their equally unconditional cultural assimilation. Government boarding schools and missions were established, Native rituals outlawed. Anthropologists subsequently noted that some tribes used the Fourth as an ersatz holiday to fill the gap left by the ban on traditional ceremonies: "This is the only time the traditional camp circle is now used. This affair comes near the time of the former Sun Dance and arouses much talk of 'old times'."[32] The Fourth was incorporated into Lakota life as "Ahn-páy-too wah-káhn táhn-ka, the Great Holy Day."[33] This combination of national holiday and Indian celebration sometimes led to ironic effects bordering on the cynical, like "a sham battle commemorating the Custer Massacre"[34] in a Fourth of July celebration in 1900 on the Rosebud Reservation. The reenactment of a defeat of U.S. troops clearly runs counter to the original meaning of the holiday, and not only that: originally, the destruction of Custer's command on the 25th of June 1876 had cast a shadow over the centennial celebrations. Apparently, the Sioux had formally adopted the Fourth and culturally restructured it according to their needs, a common practice in indigenous societies under colonial rule.

In boarding schools that served to educate Indian youths, the Fourth was part of the curriculum. At Hampton Institute in 1887, students (who had recently been granted citizenship) lauded the Fourth and the Declaration of

---

[31]Grayson, "Vinita," p. 1.

[32]Scudder Mekeel, "A Discussion of Culture Change as Illustrated by Material from a Teton-Dakota Community," *American Anthropologist*, 34 (1932), 274-285, p. 281.

[33]Albert H. Kneale, *Indian Agent* (Caldwell, Ida., 1950), p. 63.

[34]*Ibid.*, p. 63.

Independence. The oration of Henry Lyman, a Sioux student, nonetheless contains some passages reminiscent of Quinney's criticism of colonial society.

> Then, at the height of this glorious success, a great wrong was done by the American people; this wrong was done to our race . . . In the eyes of the law and the eyes of the people whose blood and their blood [sic] was shed for the cause of independence, our race had no protection under the laws of the country. Unprotected they were at the mercy of the great rush of foreigners who came to avail themselves of the riches of this country. . . . The white man is the Indian's foe.[35]

This criticism was (of course) ineffectual, but not because Lyman was not a skilled orator and politician like Quinney, Grayson, or Wright. After the issue of abolition had been settled, the Fourth once again became an occasion for ceremonial rhetoric rather than political zeal. As a result, Lyman--like Quinney--could only rest his hope on God. "And it is through God that our wrongs are righted and atoned for. We ought to be thankful that we are living in a country and an age when such wrongs cannot be tolerated."[36] Lyman's hopes were to no avail. His and his fellow students' speeches[37] were modelled on outdated and conventionalized forms at a time when the general populace considered the Fourth as hardly more than an opportunity to set off fireworks, dress up for burlesque parades, and to get drunk.

---

[35]Henry Lyman, "Speech of Henry Lyman: Our Fourth of July," *Southern Workman* (August 16, 1887), p. 89.

[36]*Ibid.*, p. 89.

[37]Charles Doxson, "Speech of Charles Doxson," *Southern Workman* (August 16, 1887), p. 89; Susan La Flesche Picotte, "Fourth of July," *Talks and Thoughts of the Hampton Indian Students*, 2 (1887), 2-3.