Land and Relationships

How removal changed relationships among Native nations

OKH.C.2.2.C "Examine the consequences of Indian Removal on intertribal relationships among Tribal groups historically residing in Indian Territory and those relocated there."

NAME _____ DATE _____

1 READ AND MARK

Read it twice

YOUR JOB Underline two federal land decisions in the passage, then number each decision and the effect it had on relationships among Native nations with matching numbers.

Who Could Live on the Land?

1 Indian Territory was not empty land waiting for newcomers. Osage and Wichita peoples had long lived in or used parts of the region that became Oklahoma. During the 1830s, the United States forced many Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Muscogee (Creek), and Seminole people from their southeastern homelands to Indian Territory. Federal officials assigned land to the relocated nations, but those decisions did not erase the claims, travel routes, or hunting grounds of peoples already connected to the region. Removal therefore reshaped relationships among Native nations, not just relationships between Native nations and the United States.

2 The Osage and Cherokee case shows why these relationships were complicated. Some Cherokee people had moved west before the forced removals of the 1830s, and conflict with Osage people already existed. In 1825, Osage leaders signed a treaty ceding a large area to the United States. Federal officials later assigned part of that area to Cherokee people. Osage families still had ties to places they had used, while Cherokee families needed secure land for homes and farms. Competing claims could sharpen mistrust. Removal increased pressure on a relationship that had a longer history; it did not create that history.

3 Other relationships developed through federal land agreements. In 1855, the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations leased a western part of their assigned territory to the United States for the settlement of other Native peoples. Wichita people, whose homelands included parts of present-day Oklahoma, settled in that area in 1859 after leaving Texas amid violence. The arrangement connected nations relocated by removal to a people with older ties to the region, but federal officials controlled much of the process. Unlike the Osage-Cherokee dispute over competing claims, this example involved an agreement about where another group could live. Neither case fits a simple story of constant warfare or effortless cooperation.

2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE

Use the passage

1. How did the federal land assignment described in paragraph 2 affect the relationship between Osage and Cherokee people?

2. Why would it be inaccurate to say that forced removal started the Osage-Cherokee conflict?

3. How did the 1855 lease shape the relationship between the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations and Wichita people?

4. What do both examples show about the United States government's role in relationships among Native nations?

3 YOUR TURN

Your own words

A museum caption says, "Removal made every Native nation in Indian Territory an enemy of the others." Write a replacement caption of 70 to 95 words. Use both cases from the passage to explain why relationships were more complicated than that.

ANSWER KEY

Land and Relationships

HIGH SCHOOL · OKH.C.2.2.C

PART 1 · READ AND MARK

Underline two federal land decisions in the passage, then number each decision and the effect it had on relationships among Native nations with matching numbers. Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

PART 2 · ANSWERS

#	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	How did the federal land assignment described in paragraph 2 affect the relationship between Osage and Cherokee people?	**It assigned Cherokee people land ceded by the Osage, whose families still had ties to it. Their competing claims could increase mistrust.**
2	Why would it be inaccurate to say that forced removal started the Osage-Cherokee conflict?	**Some Cherokee people had moved west before the forced removals of the 1830s, and conflict with Osage people already existed.**
3	How did the 1855 lease shape the relationship between the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations and Wichita people?	**The Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations leased part of their assigned territory to the United States, and Wichita people later settled there. Federal officials controlled much of the arrangement.**
4	What do both examples show about the United States government's role in relationships among Native nations?	**Federal land decisions linked nations with different ties to Indian Territory. An assignment increased pressure over competing claims, while a lease provided a place for another group to settle.**

PART 3 · YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)

Removal changed relationships among Native nations, but it did not make every nation an enemy. Osage and Cherokee people had a history of conflict before the forced removals of the 1830s. Later, a federal land assignment increased pressure over places Osage families still knew and Cherokee families needed. Another land decision worked differently: the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations leased territory to the United States, and Wichita people settled there. These cases show how federal decisions could intensify competing claims or create new arrangements for settlement.

Accept responses that distinguish conflict predating mass removal from pressure increased by later land assignments. For the lease, look for recognition that it connected relocated nations and Wichita people through a federally managed settlement arrangement.