

# UCLA

## American Indian Culture and Research Journal

### Title

"As They Were Faithful": Chief Hendrick Aupaumut and the Struggle for Stockbridge Survival, 1757-1830

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/79z428jk>

### Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 3(3)

### ISSN

0161-6463

### Authors

Ronda, Jeanne  
Ronda, James P.

### Publication Date

1979-06-01

### DOI

10.17953

### Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

## **"As They Were Faithful": Chief Hendrick Aupaumut and the Struggle for Stockbridge Survival, 1757-1830**

**JEANNE RONDA**

**JAMES P. RONDA**

In a moving speech delivered a few years before his death in 1813, the great Shawnee warrior Tecumseh recalled the tragic events that had claimed the lives of so many Indian people. "Where today are the Pequot?" he lamented. "Where [are] the Narraganset, the Mohican, the Pokanoket and many other once powerful tribes of our people? They have vanished before the avarice and oppression of the white man, as snow before a summer sun."<sup>1</sup> By his bitter words Tecumseh hoped to inspire a grand Indian resistance movement that would halt the deadly process. But the ultimate failure of Tecumseh's plan meant that the decimation of Indian tribes would continue. In a few short years the Mingo, Miami, and Wea were added to the list of nearly-shattered tribes. Tecumseh's own people, the Shawnee, were scattered beyond the Mississippi, thoroughly dispossessed and demoralized. But one significant Eastern tribe emerged from this turbulent period with its identity and dignity intact. "Where today" are the Stockbridge? Despite severe hardships, the Stockbridge Indians of Tecumseh's time could answer readily. This small but influential tribe

---

Jeanne Ronda is a writer specializing in American Indian history. She has previously published in the *American Indian Quarterly*. James Ronda is Associate Professor of Early American History at Youngstown State University and is the co-author of *American Indian Missions: A Critical Bibliography*.

managed to hold together—from those years into the present—in the face of tremendous social and political change.

The survival of the Stockbridge is in large part a testimony to the efforts of one Indian leader, a man who opposed Tecumseh's message and tactics at every turn. Captain Hendrick Aupaumut, Stockbridge chief, U. S. war veteran, Indian agent, missionary, and diplomat, was that extraordinary man. "Captain Hendrick", as he was so often called, deserves a larger place in our history than scholars have customarily allowed. A charismatic leader whose desires and talents were not unlike Tecumseh's, Aupaumut embodied the other alternative. He urged his kinsmen to adopt, not revile, Christianity and European civilization. He convinced his own people, and a number of other tribes as well, that emulation of white ways—not resistance to them—offered the surest path to survival. While militant Indians demanded defiance, Aupaumut argued that only accommodation could insure Native Americans a future in an increasingly white-run world.

Hendrick Aupaumut was born in May, 1757, in the Indian mission village of Stockbridge, Massachusetts. In all likelihood he was welcomed into the world by Christian parents. Seven years before his birth his grandfather Hendrick and ninety other Muhheakunnuk (Mahican) Indian pilgrims had come to Stockbridge to avail themselves of Reverend John Sergeant's thriving mission project. The newcomers joined over two hundred other Muhheakunnuk Indians and members of other tribes to form a successful Indian community. By the time Aupaumut was born, most prominent Muhheakunnuk families residing at Stockbridge had been won over to Christianity; all successive chiefs thereafter were church leaders as well as political functionaries.<sup>2</sup>

Young Hendrick grew up in an environment that successfully combined Indian and European ways of life. The Muhheakunnuk Indians were now called the Stockbridge, but they continued to go on long, roving hunting expeditions and tend old garden plots at their former residences. Within the village, families farmed individual land allotments using English farming techniques. They raised beans, corn, and squash as they had always done, but found that the use of modern implements increased their corn yield three-fold. With the missionaries' help and supervision the Stockbridge formed an English-style church committee and town council. Their chiefs sought the guidance of their white mentors in matters of faith and conduct, but retained their traditional roles as intertribal arbiters and statesmen. A third-generation Christian and heir to a powerful political dynasty, Hendrick Aupaumut was able to establish an identity—and a serviceable ideology—early in his life. His rigorous mission school experiences further prepared him for the future by providing

him with proficiency in reading and writing English. Church, school, and family nurtured him well. When Hendrick reached maturity he was well-equipped to lead his people through the minefield of events that historians so colorlessly label "American Indian policy" or "Indian-white relations."

One of Hendrick's strengths was his manifest appreciation of his Indian past. As grateful as he was to the "good" missionary whites who brought him his faith, education, and job skills, Aupaumut remained spiritually connected to his Muhheakunnuk ancestors. A fascinating tribal history he wrote in 1791 indicates that he considered them more virtuous than most worldly whites. Even before these Indians "ever enjoyed the gospel revelation" they revered one supreme being and conducted daily devotional services. If Aupaumut's *History* is to be believed, the lives of his forebears were graced by most of the so-called "Christian" virtues: love, charity, industry, frugality, and obedience. Only after the coming of the white man did disease, scarcity, and violence seriously disrupt Muhheakunnuk life.<sup>3</sup> Why then did Hendrick profess such fervent belief in the white man's god? Why did he insist that only "civilization" could save and elevate his people?

Aupaumut's convictions reflected his daily experiences in Stockbridge's nearly-unique mission community. Young Hendrick found it much easier to believe in Christianity and "civilization" than did most eighteenth-century Indians because his village demonstrated that Christian doctrines and "civilized" habits could work for Native Americans. The very first Stockbridge residents had joined the experiment because they had concluded that respect for English culture and cooperation with its messengers was vital to their survival and prosperity. Realizing that their pre-contact world was gone forever, they called upon the missionaries to help them build a new one. Hendrick inherited their philosophy and pondered its further application as he prepared for his expected roles as sachem and chief. He viewed Christianity as the fulfillment of earlier Muhheakunnuk religion and observed that the new gospel helped hold his people together. Since he had experienced its benefits from birth, Aupaumut believed that all the things missionaries meant by "civilization" also made sense. Sedentary agriculture provided a steady food supply, hard manual labor taught discipline, and reading and writing courses prepared children for participation in the white colonial world. Private property and monogamous marriage reinforced the social ideals he deemed necessary to orderly post-contact village life.

In a memorable series of speeches made in 1803, Aupaumut tried to convince some skeptical Delaware Indians that these dreary practices were indeed desirable. That was no easy task, for Delaware tradition

dictated very different customs. The warriors laughed at the idea of cultivating the earth themselves; that was women's work. Only those men who grew too old or feeble for hunting ever stayed home to tend the crops, and the young men recoiled at the idea of such premature retirement. As they saw it, Aupaumut's plans would fill their lives with boredom and expose them to the scorn and ridicule of other warriors. Most agreed with the sentiments of a plain-speaking Oneida man who observed that "squaws and hedgehogs are made to scratch the ground." The Delaware recognized that in recommending "civilization", Aupaumut was asking for a virtual revolution in sex roles. By urging Indians to become like whites, he was also challenging another sacred assumption. Tradition held that the Great Spirit had ordained the vocations of the two races. He had given "the white man a plough, and the red man a bow and arrow, and sent them into the world by different paths." Each was directed "to get his living in his own way."<sup>4</sup>

Aupaumut contended that the red man could no longer depend upon the proverbial "bow and arrow." To make a living he would have to leave the traditional path. Hendrick insisted that accommodation offered "the best way" for Indians to cope with their rapidly changing world. He pointed out the "many advantages" the Stockbridge hoped to gain by following this route. "Our white brothers cannot so easily cheat us now with regard to our land affairs," he argued. Although Aupaumut emphasized the common sense aspects of his plan for the Delaware, he assured them that his commitment to it was based on far more than expediency or convenience. His stand was firmly rooted in social theories that fit his theological view of history. For Aupaumut, there could be no turning back along the trail first trod by his grandfather. It was abundantly clear to both Hendricks that "civilization" and Christianity constituted the "plain path" to communal salvation. Other paths would surely lead to destruction. "All the [Indian] nations who thus rejected Civilization and Christian religion, and embraced the wicked practices of the white people, were poor, and finally became extinct from the earth," Aupaumut observed. "But on the other hand, all the Indians who accepted the offer of the good white people were blessed. So far as they were faithful, they prospered, and the remnants of them remain to this day." Aupaumut told the Delaware they would "be able to hold [their] lands to the latest generation" if they followed the example of their "grandchildren" the Stockbridge. He predicted disaster if they did not. "Your villages will be deserted or possessed by a people who will cultivate your lands," he warned, "and finally you will be extinct from the earth."<sup>5</sup> Over and over again in his dealings with the Western tribes Aupaumut expounded upon this simple equation. It is not too much to say that it functioned as the

guiding principle of his life. Certainly it molded his world-view and imbued his life with an urgent sense of mission. It was in the tradition of his power-broker forebears that Aupaumut felt compelled to play the role of mediator, but he played it with a difference. He added a new evangelistic element to the old diplomacy, believing that the Stockbridge were "the front door, by and through which" Christian missionaries and federal officials could go to win over resisting tribes.<sup>6</sup>

Few men have lived out their philosophies as consistently as did Hendrick Aupaumut. A survey of his peripatetic career reveals him to be a decisive man of action. Because he understood the relationship between ideology and politics, he did not hesitate to cast his lot with the American revolutionaries in 1775. In June of that year, eighteen year old Hendrick enlisted in the first company organized in his area in Massachusetts. He and many other Stockbridge warriors served "with great propriety and fidelity" throughout the war. Thirty Stockbridge soldiers died fighting the British at White Plains, New York in 1778. Shortly thereafter General George Washington promoted Aupaumut to the Captaincy of his company, citing "the good opinion I have of your bravery and attachment to the U. S. of A." Hendrick and his men participated in Sullivan's campaign, an extensive military exercise of destruction and terror that succeeded in laying waste nearly all enemy Iroquois villages. After the war, Army Headquarters issued a laudatory certificate of discharge to its hardy Stockbridge contingent. "The Muhheakunnuk Indians have fought and bled by our side," it declared. The United States would henceforth "consider them as our friends, brothers, and subjects."<sup>7</sup>

A few years later the United States government realized it had an especially valuable friend in Hendrick Aupaumut. In the wake of General Arthur St. Clair's stunning defeat in 1791 by Indian tribes of the Ohio Valley, frontier policy was a shambles, and the government assuredly needed all the Indian friends it could get. Secretary of War Henry Knox summoned Aupaumut to Philadelphia in 1792 to secure his services as envoy to the resistant tribes. The thirty-five year old chief was instructed to "convince them of the moderation, justice, and desire of the United States for peace."<sup>8</sup> It was a difficult, dangerous, arguably impossible mission, for even those tribes which preferred to take a neutral or pro-government stand could see little evidence of moderation or justice in recent federal behavior.

When Aupaumut returned from the western council, he presented Knox with a remarkable fifty-six page document. While the council enterprise itself was neither decisive nor unique, Hendrick's report deserves close examination. It provides us with a window into a turbulent, distressing time. The Indians who attended the council realized the agonizing

choices they were being forced to make. A few had even made up their minds. "The Shawnee are very high for war," Aupaumut noted.<sup>9</sup> Almost every day debates raged between the "war party" and the "party for peace." When labelled a coward, one pro-peace delegate faulted his accuser for a dismally short memory. "You do not remember," he retorted, "how you almost [ate] your own dung this summer for reason of war." A pro-war Wyandot faction boycotted the proceedings but sent an equally pointed message through a courier. Peace is easy for *you* to talk about, relayed the messenger. "Why—because you live in a safe place—yonder. Now let us exchange our seats, let me live or set yonder, and you set here [and] see whether you would rejoice to hear the offer of peace."<sup>10</sup>

Faithful to his instructions, Aupaumut told the delegates that the United States was genuinely interested in peace; it wanted no lands but those obtained by fair treaty. "The United Sachems will not speak wrong," he assured them. "Whatever they promise to Indians they will perform."<sup>11</sup> Via a messenger, influential Iroquois warrior Joseph Brant told the conference a very different story. He claimed to have seen President Washington and heard him vow to take over a huge portion of Indian land between the Miami and Wabash rivers. "And he did take up dust," Brant said, "and did declare that he would not restore so much dust to the Indians."<sup>12</sup> Aupaumut contended that the pro-British Brant was lying about the intentions of the American President. Hendrick admitted that injustices had been done in the past, but insisted that the Revolution had changed all that; now honesty and humanitarianism would surely come to characterize the government's treaty-making. Aupaumut was certain that the continuing misdeeds of the Big Knives were the acts of renegades, not the fruits of deliberate United States policy.<sup>13</sup>

Subsequent events proved Aupaumut's optimism—and lofty view of his government—unfounded. The peace talks of 1793 failed, the federal government launched another military expedition, and in 1794 General Anthony Wayne avenged St. Clair's defeat by trouncing the Indians at the Battle of Fallen Timbers. As a result the United States acquired two-thirds of Ohio and a large strip of Indiana—the very territory that Brant's warning had described. In the light of this, it is possible to argue that Aupaumut was less than honest with his kinsmen at the 1792 conference. After all, he appeared there as a paid emissary, accepting \$500 upon his return. Joseph Brant, by contrast, had turned down an offer of one thousand guineas to be the government's representative at the same council. If one accepts the notion that Aupaumut knew more than he was admitting to the delegates, the diplomat looks rather shabby indeed. He could be viewed as a traitor, or even a spy, as Brant charged. But Aupaumut's report indicates that the Captain was more honorable, and considerably

more complex, than that. He knew all too well the conniving nature of many land companies, state governments, and individuals, but honestly believed better of the new federal establishment. Some federal officials seemed anxious to frame a more benign Indian policy, one that would not sully the ideals of the new republic. It was this sentiment that was communicated to Aupaumut before his departure. He probably did not know that most high-level government planners fully expected the mission to fail. Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson later admitted that the negotiations had been little more than window-dressing. The peace effort's principal function had been to buy time to better prepare for the next military advance.

Although seeming to trust the Indian policy of the new government, Aupaumut did entertain some troubled thoughts about the partisan role he was asked to play in the drama. For white eyes only, Aupaumut penned these memorable words in his narrative.

*In all my arguments with these Indians, I have as it were obliged to say nothing with regard of the conduct of the Yorkers, how they cheat my father, how they [have] taken our lands unjustly, and how my fathers were groaning as it were to their graves, in losing their lands for nothing, although they were faithful friends to the whites. . . I say had I mention these things to the Indians, it would aggravate their prejudices against all white people.<sup>14</sup>*

Whatever Aupaumut's motives in 1792, it is certain that in subsequent years his loyalties remained firmly on the side of his adopted country. Whenever certain western tribes elected to halt the ever-extending American empire, either by force or refusal to negotiate, Aupaumut was to be found in the government's ranks. Captain Hendrick was with General Wayne at Fallen Timbers, and he served as mediator between the warring sides until the fateful Treaty of Greenville in 1795. He helped negotiate the 1803 and 1809 Treaties of Fort Wayne which whittled away at more native lands and enraged many already disaffected Indians. There is no evidence to indicate that Aupaumut ever regretted his involvement in such transactions. Like so many missionaries and government bureaucrats, he believed that the vanquished Indians deserved their fate. Having rejected "civilization" and Christianity, they had thereby forfeited the right to retain their lands. Men like Aupaumut held that dispossession, as regrettable as it might be, could be a blessing in disguise for some Indians, for it would force the foolhardy souls to reconsider. Deprived of suitable hunting territory, the landless Indians would be compelled to attempt the "civilized," sedentary life.

Thus American frontiersmen continued their relentless advance into Indian homelands. Bit by bit, treaty by treaty, Aupaumut did his best to mediate when the inevitable conflicts arose. His military activities, as well as his "civilizing" ones, put him on a direct collision course with the other key Indian leader of the age, Tecumseh. At the very time Aupaumut was conducting his trouble-shooting missions throughout the Old Northwest, Tecumseh was preaching the gospel of Pan-Indian armed resistance. While Aupaumut labored to instill the notion of private property in the minds of his Indian pupils, Tecumseh rallied his followers around the ideal of common ownership—a concept designed to halt land sales by individual chiefs. Aupaumut told Indians to embrace Christianity and "civilized" habits in order to survive; Tecumseh insisted that survival depended on the determination of Indians to resist white values and ideas.

The battle lines could not have been much more precisely drawn. Aupaumut believed fervently that Tecumseh's crusade was the very work of the Devil. He was convinced that the Shawnee's plans were suicidal for Indian peoples and contrary to God's will for them. He reserved his greatest measure of contempt for Tecumseh's brother the Prophet, whom he called "the emissary of Satan."<sup>15</sup> For a time the Prophet functioned as the spiritual head of the resistance movement and used his considerable influence to inspire a ruthless anti-Christian purge within the western tribes. Against Tecumseh's wishes the Prophet's followers massacred several hundred Indian converts, many of them Delaware. Hearing of such atrocities must have filled Aupaumut with righteous anger and new resolve. Captain Hendrick spent several years fighting against Tecumseh under the supervision of General William Henry Harrison. Historians have noted that Harrison's conduct towards Indians was none too noble, but Aupaumut gave the General his unswerving loyalty. Clearly, he believed the campaign was a lofty endeavor despite the more secular motives of his superior. In a letter to his mission mentor John Sergeant, Jr., Aupaumut referred to "a true, humane feeling toward our fellow creatures, white, red, and black" that prompted him and like-minded chiefs to do their utmost in the struggle.<sup>16</sup>

Even Aupaumut's allegiance to Harrison was born of a genuine desire to secure a worthwhile future for Indian people. It must be noted that Aupaumut did, on occasion, play the Indians' advocate against the government. Always, though, it was the "civilized" Indians he assisted. In 1808 Aupaumut left Harrison's employ to travel to Washington on behalf of the Tuscarora, who were seeking compensation for lands lost to them after the Revolution. We do not know the outcome of Hendrick's trip, but it is a measure of his confidence in the United States that he under-

took such a mission. It is also a measure of his extraordinary patience. As a Stockbridge, Aupaumut already knew that the government dispensed justice slowly, if at all; Stockbridge warriors waited years, decades sometimes, to be paid for their wartime services.

The strife on the frontier intensified and ultimately blended into the international conflict we call the War of 1812. Aupaumut and Tecumseh threw themselves wholeheartedly into the struggle. Tecumseh's alliance with the British gave him a final moment of glory in the conquest of Detroit, but the next year brought disaster. In 1813, the fiery warrior perished in battle against his old adversary, William Henry Harrison. Aupaumut undoubtedly rejoiced at the news of Tecumseh's defeat, and prayed anew for the "civilizing" of his western brethren.

Aupaumut's devotion to the United States throughout so many trying episodes appears all the more remarkable when we consider that the Captain was concurrently occupied with his own tribe's survival and maintenance. More remarkable still is the fact that Aupaumut remained set upon the path of civility and patriotism despite the many bitter experiences that confounded the Stockbridge on that journey. To appreciate the singlemindedness and tenacity of Aupaumut we must step back a bit to outline the history of the Stockbridge from the Revolution until his death. Only then can we come to understand the role this very busy man played in the life of his tribe.

The confident predictions of security and prosperity that characterized Aupaumut's early rhetoric stood in stark contrast to reality. Everywhere they went, the Stockbridge encountered land-hungry whites who bought, swindled, or legislated their way on to Indian-owned lands. The seemingly insatiable land-seekers drove the tribe from Stockbridge, Massachusetts in the 1780s. To make a fresh start, Aupaumut purchased land in Madison County, New York in 1783 and established New Stockbridge. The new village adjoined another Christian Indian community, the Oneida's Brothertown settlement. Here the ever-consistent Aupaumut practiced what he preached regarding agricultural labor. Visiting missionaries recalled that they had seen his "good field of wheat, Indian corn and grass," and had "had the pleasure of meeting him in the road driving his ox team."<sup>17</sup> A passage from Hendrick's 1791 *History* describes the values that made such successful farming possible. "My children, you must be very industrious," wrote Aupaumut. "You must always get up early in the morning, put on your clothes, and moccasins, and tie your belt around you, that you may do something that is useful and proper for you to do." Hendrick claimed that Muhheakunnuk families practiced such diligence long before white contact, but many exhortations in his *History* sound remarkably like missionary rhetoric. "But if you will be lazy, you will be poor. Your

eyes will be on those who are industrious, of whom you will be obliged with shame to beg, or starve; and none will give you anything to eat without grudging it."<sup>18</sup> Few Europeans have written more convincingly in praise of individualism and free enterprise.

For all its promise, New Stockbridge was not destined to last long. Aupaumut knew that land companies would clamor for the removal of all New York Indians and eventually win their desire from the state legislature and the Congress. As early as 1791 he began to explore the idea of another western move. In 1808 Aupaumut secured land from the Miami and Potawatomi at White River, Indiana, for the tribe's next home. Hendrick was enthusiastic about this removal, for it meant that the Stockbridge could soon bid farewell to their worldlier New York neighbors. The Oneida had been disappointing neighbors and at times a real hindrance; some Oneidas had even ridiculed Stockbridge men for their willingness to farm. Aupaumut also had personal reasons for being optimistic about a White River settlement. His appointment as federal Indian agent to the Delaware in Indiana came through in December, 1808. The Captain was eager to believe that now both Stockbridge and Delaware peoples might find a common future in the Indiana Territory. Most important, Hendrick felt secure in this venture. President Jefferson himself had given the project his blessing and approval. In a letter dated December 21, 1808, he promised to give Aupaumut a paper declaring the right of the Stockbridge, Delaware, and Munsee to hold the White River lands along with the Miami and Potawatomi. He warned Hendrick that nothing could prevent the Indians from selling their territory if both old and new occupants agreed to, but urged the tribes to hold on to the land, farm it, and "dwell on it all your days."<sup>19</sup>

Aupaumut's anti-Tecumseh activities and military service in the War of 1812 delayed the White River removal for almost a decade. Two families left for Indiana in 1817. The next year about eighty Stockbridge followed. Shortly after their arrival in the Promised Land they learned the distressing truth: the United States claimed all the lands in question and was preparing to open them to white settlers. The Miami and Potawatomi had been "persuaded" to sell and they had sold out completely. The federal government had obtained a treaty that totally ignored the Stockbridge pilgrims and Jefferson's 1808 note. The Indians were given three years to relocate once again. Aupaumut was now in his sixties, so he sent his capable son, Solomon Hendrick, to Washington to protest. The trip must have been a disheartening experience. President James Monroe and his deputies felt no moral obligation to the uprooted Indians and displayed very little interest in the outdated sentiments of President Jefferson. Solomon returned empty-handed, knowing that the wearing

search for a homeland would have to begin all over again. But like his father, the young chief persevered. In 1821 Solomon led a Stockbridge delegation to Wisconsin and succeeded in purchasing 6,000 acres from the Menominee Indians. In 1822 the White River pilgrims reached the new site and proceeded to build what they hoped would be a permanent settlement. They constructed log houses, laid out small farms, erected a sawmill, and established a church and school just as they had done at New Stockbridge, New York. Over the next ten years the White River Stockbridge were joined by many of those who had remained in New York. Aupaumut himself arrived in Grand Kaukaulin, Wisconsin in 1829. The aged chief, now seventy-one years old, at last witnessed the reunion of his people. There were land squabbles, factional disputes, and further removals ahead for some of the Stockbridge, but 1829 was still a year of triumph for the tribe. Aupaumut must have been gratified to see his dream realized at last. Especially pleasing to him was the fact that his son Solomon had proven himself an able leader and a worthy heir.

But long life proved a mixed blessing for Aupaumut. In his final years Captain Hendrick stumbled along "the plain path." He fell into alcoholism and lost his ability to lead. Missionaries reported that "intemperance and disease laid him aside."<sup>20</sup> It is tempting to speculate on the causes of Aupaumut's apostasy. The patriarch had spent a lifetime exhorting his brethren to shun the "evil spirits" in the white man's drink. He knew that its influence had doomed many a "civilizing" experiment and destroyed countless Indian lives and families. Why then did he turn to it at last, to the horror of his pious family? Did he finally begin to doubt the truth of the axioms he had lived by all his life? So long as he was active, Aupaumut had never lost sight of his mission. He had lived out every day—each war, journey, or negotiating session—believing that the Christianized Indians would ultimately be rewarded by a just government and a merciful God. The fact that the Stockbridge were so often rewarded with empty promises, deceitful legal practices, and outright land fraud may have finally overwhelmed the old chief. We will never know how Aupaumut viewed his career at this point in his life. We know only that before his death in 1830 he "spoke of his intemperate habits with deep regret, and lamented that he had so long neglected the concerns of his soul."<sup>21</sup>

In the final analysis, Hendrick Aupaumut need not have been displeased with the choices he made for the Stockbridge. He was correct in believing that accommodation offered the best—perhaps the only—chance for Muhheakunnuk survival. He was able to draw upon his social theories and religious convictions to construct a strategy that worked as well as could have been expected. Admittedly, that strategy fell far short of

being the grand land insurance policy that Aupaumut had described to the Delaware. Like so many other Christian tribes, the Stockbridge found that they could never entirely escape the consequences of being Indian in a hostile white world. They were cheated, and cheated repeatedly, despite their loyalty to God and Country. But Aupaumut had realized that accommodation would at least give the Stockbridge an edge, a thin margin of advantage, in the struggle. That margin meant the difference between tribal survival and cultural extinction on numerous occasions. While accommodation did not prevent the dispossession of the Stockbridge, it did enable the tribe to avoid its worst effects. Aupaumut's people escaped the fates of so many other uprooted tribes: dispersal, impoverishment, and despair. When the Stockbridge were forced to move, they always found the spiritual and material resources to rebuild, guided by the blueprint of accommodation. Aupaumut's sensible strategy kept the tribe together and gave Muhheakunnuk culture a longer lease on life. The eighteenth and nineteenth-century Stockbridge managed to keep a measure of native pride alive while functioning successfully in a thoroughly white world. Many of them continued to wear clothing that was identifiably Indian. The Muhheakunnuk language lasted until the 1870s—two generations after Aupaumut's death and nearly one hundred and fifty years after acceptance of the Christian gospel. The twentieth-century Stockbridge also evinced the beneficial effects of Aupaumut's leadership. Anthropologists observing them in the 1960s noted that the Stockbridge still perceived themselves to be assimilated, educated, Christian Indians with a distinctly Indian value system. Like their mission-trained forebears, they continued to prize schooling and their children seldom left school early. A modern tribal council president, a descendant of Hendrick's in-laws, revived the ancient intertribal arbiter role by assuming leadership positions in several Pan-Indian organizations; Aupaumut would certainly have approved. Today there are but 160 persons on the Stockbridge-Munsee reservation, down from 380 in 1966. Inter-marriage has inevitably reduced the ranks of the tribe. But there are nearly 3,000 Delaware-Stockbridge in the United States today who may justly identify themselves as heirs to the legacy of Hendrick Aupaumut.

"As they were faithful, they prospered," Aupaumut had said. "And the remnants of them remain to this day."<sup>22</sup> The Stockbridge experience proved the Captain at least half right. His people never found prosperity in proportion to their faith, but they did survive into present times. That was the monument Hendrick Aupaumut most intensely desired.

NOTES

1. Alvin M. Josephy, Jr., *The Patriot Chiefs* (New York, 1958), p. 159.
2. Ted J. Brassler, *Riding on the Frontier's Crest: Mahican Indian Culture and Culture Change* (Ottawa, 1974), pp. 34-36; Marion J. Mochon, "Stockbridge-Munsee Cultural Adaptations: 'Assimilated Indians,'" *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 112 (1968): 191-94.
3. Hendrick Aupaumut, "History of the Muhheakunnuk Indians," in Jedidiah Morse, ed., *First Annual Report of the American Society for Promoting the Civilization and General Improvement of the Indian Tribes in the United States* (New Haven, 1824), pp. 42-45. There is a slightly different version of the Aupaumut "History" in Electa F. Jones, *Stockbridge, Past and Present* (Springfield, MA, 1854).
4. Jeremy Belknap and Jedidiah Morse, eds., "Report on the Oneida, Stockbridge, and Brotherton Indians, 1796," *Indian Notes and Monographs* 54 (1955): 17.
5. Hendrick Aupaumut, "Speeches to the Delaware, as recorded in the Journal of Rev. John Sergeant, Jr., 1803," *Missionary Herald* 1 (November 1805): 270-72.
6. Aupaumut, "Speeches," *Missionary Herald* 1 (March 1806): 465.
7. Washington to the President of Congress, 13 September 1780, in John C. Fitzpatrick, ed., *Writings of George Washington*, 39 vols. (Washington, 1931-1944), XX: 44-45; Washington to Hendricks, 4 July 1779, Fitzpatrick, ed., *Writings*, XV: 368; Certificate to the Muhheakunnuk Indians, 8 July 1783, Fitzpatrick, ed., *Writings*, XXVII: 53.
8. Knox to Aupaumut, 8 May 1792, *American State Papers: Class 2: Indian Affairs*, 2 vols. (Washington, 1832-1834), 1: 233. The best general study for the events of which Aupaumut was so much a part is Reginald Horsman, *Expansion and American Indian Policy, 1783-1812* (East Lansing, 1967).
9. Hendrick Aupaumut, "A Narrative of an Embassy to the Western Indians," *Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania* 2 (1827): 106.
10. Aupaumut, "Narrative," pp. 111, 113.
11. Aupaumut, "Narrative," p. 127.
12. Aupaumut, "Narrative," pp. 127-28.
13. Aupaumut, "Narrative," pp. 127-28.
14. Aupaumut, "Narrative," p. 128.
15. Aupaumut to Rev. John Sergeant, Jr., 27 March 1808, *Missionary Herald* 4 (February, 1809): 426.
16. Aupaumut to Sergeant, p. 426.
17. Belknap and Morse, eds., "Report," p. 22.
18. Aupaumut, "History," p. 44.
19. Jefferson to Hendrick, 21 December 1808, in A. E. Bergh, ed., *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, 20 vols. (Washington, 1903), XVI: 450-54.
20. Rev. Cutting Marsh to the Editors, 9 September 1830, *Missionary Herald* 26 (December 1830): 386. Marsh, long-time missionary among the Wisconsin Stockbridge, gives some valuable observations on life in the new settlement in letters collected by R. G. Thwaites, ed., "Documents Relating to the Stockbridge Mission, 1825-1848," *Collections of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin* 15 (1900): 39-204.
21. Marsh to the Editors, 9 September 1830, *Missionary Herald* 26 (December 1830): 386.
22. Aupaumut, "Speeches to the Delaware, 1803," *Missionary Herald* 1 (November 1805): 271.