

# **Tribal Decision-Making and Intercultural Relations: Crow Creek Agency, 1863-1885**

**Robert Galler**

## *Abstract*

Lower Yanktonai residents experienced great change during the first two decades at the Crow Creek agency in Dakota Territory. This essay traces the evolution of relations between tribal members, federal agents, and missionaries during these times of cultural confusion on the eastern side of the Missouri River. It shows how Yanktonai leaders helped their people negotiate complex intercultural relations through adaptation and resistance. Ethnohistorical analysis of agency reports and missionary accounts reveals that even when Crow Creek families acted in ways that seemed consistent with federal assimilation policy, their actions were often part of the larger Yanktonai agenda of cultural persistence.

In 1875, over a decade after leading his people to Crow Creek agency, Lower Yanktonai leader White Ghost told agent Dr. Henry F. Livingston and Episcopal missionary Edward Ashley what he thought of their plan to place a mission school in his camp south of the agency. "I do not like school houses or school teachers, I cannot eat them, and don't want the buildings erected," White Ghost asserted, "take them to the Agency for the children of the white men." White Ghost eventually called on Ashley to explain his critical response to the school established over his objections. Following recently learned cultural protocol;

---

Ashley filled a pipe with tobacco and smoked it with the Yanktonai leader. After a few puffs on the pipe, White Ghost stated, "my friend, you have a good house here." "My friend, *You* [emphasis Ashley] have a good house here," Ashley replied, "the school is not mine but yours; it is for your children, not for me." White Ghost responded, "Yes, that is the old story, the white man picks out a little piece of land on which to build a house. Then he puts a fence around it, and after a while he builds a larger fence around that, and then a larger fence around that, until he has a large lot of ground. That is the way the Indians have been treated all along." "My friend that may be true of some of the white men, but I do not think it is true in this case," Ashley replied, "However, you wait and see whether I build fence after fence and steal a big slice of your land."<sup>1</sup>

Conversations such as these reveal the complexity of intercultural relations and active Yanktonai leadership during the first two decades of Crow Creek agency. White Ghost was not among the Sioux leaders described by federal officials as "hostile" for taking up arms against American troops and most obviously resisting federal policy. He had led his people south of the agency where they made camp along Elm Creek. White Ghost did, however, retain an informed sense of his people's problematic history with Americans and a natural skepticism toward policies that federal officials claimed would help his people. He knew that Yanktonais had maintained peaceful relations with Americans since at least their 1825 treaty, but he had also experienced the attack of American troops at Whitestone Hill in 1863. Such violations of their trusting relations would not have prompted him to emulate Americans. Settling near the agency did not suggest an abandonment of cultural traditions or tribal acceptance of an emerging federal assimilation program. At Crow Creek, White Ghost and his people negotiated a complex relationship with an emerging American culture to secure their own Yanktonai future.<sup>2</sup>

General surveys of American history often present American Indians within a binary system of "peaceful" and "hostile" tribes and individuals. They neglect to explore the majority who fell between these simplistic extremes as well as the active agency of American Indians who settled early onto reservations. Consequently, readers of American history get the impression that resistance to American policy came only through military methods, and that those who did not fight quickly succumbed to federal dictates. Nineteenth-century Indian agents first presented "non-hostiles" as generally passive to show their assimilationist-minded leaders in Washington, D.C. of the potential of their Americanization plan. In 1870, for instance, Agent Livingston suggested Lower Yanktonai submission to agency policies. "The Lower Yanktonai band of Sioux Indians, located at the Crow Creek agency, show a peaceful and quiet disposition toward the whites," Livingston asserted, "On no occasion have they perpetuated, to my knowledge, any act in violation of their treaty during the time I have had charge of their affairs." White Ghost's defiant comments to Ashley in 1875 suggest anything but a passive recipient of American culture and its institutions.<sup>3</sup>

Ultimately, both Ashley and White Ghost made concessions to the others' cultural traditions, not due to liberal dispositions, but to further their ultimate goals. Ashley and other missionaries wanted to promote Christianity and American culture; White Ghost and his fellow Sioux leaders wished to act in the best long-term interest of their people. Accordingly, Ashley learned culturally appropriate ways to interact with leaders, adjusted his mission's location in order to attract Yanktonai interest, and developed some ability with the vernacular language. In a unilateral move with the help of agent Livingston, he planted the mission in White Ghost's camp—at least symbolically suggesting American influence in the community. Still, he learned, only with tribal support could he get children to attend with any regularity. Educational success rested evenly on the shoulders of teachers and community members.

Yanktonais similarly accepted certain elements of American culture within their communities while retaining their own beliefs and traditions that had served their people for many generations. White Ghost's Elm Creek camp of tipis and cottonwood log buildings in proximity to the agency symbolically reveals a blending of traditions. Yanktonai leaders knew that new environmental and political realities required adaptation. Interactions with Americans were just new stages in their dynamic history that they regularly met with one eye to adaptation and another to tradition. They opted for selective cultural alteration rather than general abandonment of traditions as called for by federal policy. Over time, White Ghost and other Yanktonais accepted land allotment, the arrival of missionaries, and the establishment of American schools, but often for more pragmatic reasons than to embrace American identities.

This essay will trace the evolution of relations between Lower Yanktonais at Crow Creek and federal agents and missionaries on the east bank of the Missouri River south of the Big Bend. It will also show how Yanktonai influenced missionaries, federal officials, and the specifics of their assimilation program. An exploration of developments at the agency will reveal the adaptation and cultural persistence of the Crow Creek Sioux in terms of agriculture, land organization, housing, dress, education, and relations with religious denominations. Ethnohistorical analysis of missionary accounts and government documents will indicate that when tribal leaders acted in ways that fit into American policy objectives it was often part of a Yanktonai agenda. Like in other Indian communities on the Great Plains, Yanktonai lived in *tiospayes*, extended families, not as a single entity. Thus, individual band leaders like White Ghost and Drifting Goose will stand prominent in this discussion of community decision-making and intercultural relations.

Anomadic lifestyle had led Yanktonais to the bend of the Missouri River for more than a century. Like their Sioux relations, Yanktonais migrated west from the Mille Lacs region beginning in the late seventeenth century, but likely had been familiar with the Dakota prairie for several generations before that time. Yanktonai bands traveled long distances between their Dakota kin along the

---

Minnesota River and their Lakota relatives who regularly traveled west of the Missouri River. Yanktonai focused their lives in the region between the Missouri and James Rivers of eastern Dakota Territory due to its rich and varied resource base. They often also served as liaisons that kept the Sioux confederation connected during the nineteenth century despite the great distances that separated them. Yanktonai and other Sioux recorded one of the more successful buffalo hunts near Fort Pierre on the eastern side of the Missouri River in 1830. Though the buffalo population would soon migrate from the region, this successful hunt shows a Yanktonai familiarity with the Crow Creek region for at least three decades before they arrived at the agency.<sup>4</sup>

The first Yanktonai to make a more permanent settlement near the Crow Creek tributary to the Missouri River came in the early 1860s. Yanktonais and Sioux relations were attacked by American forces led by General Alfred Sully and Colonel Henry Hastings Sibley near Whitestone Hill (in present-day southeastern North Dakota) following a successful buffalo hunt. U.S. troops killed several hundred people as the sun set on September 3, 1863. In addition to struggling with the death of their relatives, the survivors suffered from Sully's troops destruction of hundreds of thousands of pounds of dried buffalo meat—their planned sustenance for the upcoming winter.<sup>5</sup> Consequently, many people sought refuge and meager rations along the Missouri River available at Fort Pierre, Fort Sully, Fort Rice, and the Crow Creek agency. Ironically, the successful destruction of buffalo meat by Sully's forces, provided other federal officials with a more difficult task to feed large numbers of Sioux who migrated to the Missouri River. White Ghost's band were among the first Lower Yanktonai to arrive in the Crow Creek region.<sup>6</sup>

The Crow Creek agency was actually still inhabited by Minnesota Sioux (Santees) and Winnebagos (now known as Ho-Chunk) forcibly relocated to the newly-established agency following in the 1862 Minnesota Sioux uprising. These refugees struggled to adapt to the distinct environmental and climatic conditions. Federal officials hoped that with the right tools and effort that the Minnesota Indians would adjust to the new location. Drought, poor soil, grasshoppers, and insufficient federal support proved their demise. By early 1864, many people had left on their own accord and others heeded agency suggestions that they leave the agency in search of food. By 1866, the Santees moved to a new agency to their south where the Niobrara joins the Missouri River. During the previous year, Omahas granted the Winnebagos a portion of their land further south along the Missouri River. Ironically a few months after promoting these relocations, Dakota Territory Governor Newton Edmonds and other federal officials recommended that Lower Yanktonais, Two Kettles, and Lower Brules settle at Crow Creek.<sup>7</sup>

Sioux bands that gathered along the Missouri River during the 1860s sought food and other support from federal officials, but retained control over their lives and location. Agency reports reveal the regular mobility of Indian

populations and the frustration of agents who could not get Sioux bands to localize at distinct agencies. Bands seasonally divided and gathered together again as they had traditionally lived for generations. Crow Creek agents reported that bands from all the western Sioux tribes took rations from the agency at some point during the second half of the 1860s, particularly during the harsh winter of 1865-66. Two hundred and forty-nine lodges of Sioux congregated at Crow Creek in December of 1865, unable to leave due to the cold and depth of snow. Despite the efforts of Governor Edmunds and Crow Creek Agent J.M. Stone, the number of Indians arriving through early February continued to rise. Western Sioux bands sought assistance from their Santee kin (who would not move to their new agency until later in the spring) and other relations, who shared their lodges, meager rations, and meat from the few antelope and rabbits they could hunt in the immediate vicinity. Some Indians threatened to attack and destroy the post, if food was not distributed, suggesting that signing the 1865 treaty at Fort Sully entitled them to rations. Clearly, the situation was precarious at best, and Captain Smith's small force of thirty men held little control over the agency. As Stone stated in February of 1866, "a fight with them within a few days would not surprise me." By March, conditions improved enough to embolden agency staff. F.A.L. Day reported with a tone of confidence his interest in reducing population that had gathered at Crow Creek. "The snow is now fast going," he stated, "and I shall drive away these Indians in a few days." In reality, by the end of February, most had left the agency on their own accord in search of better provisions.<sup>8</sup>

Yanktonais proved particularly difficult to control as their varied bands sought resources in different locations. By 1865, 169 Lower Yanktonai families had separated themselves from the main body to settle on the Grand River, near the Standing Rock agency. Indian Department officials could not induce them back to the lower Missouri River agency. Buck led another band of Yanktonais east onto the prairies where they had food stored. Omahocta, described as a "chief of the Lower Yanktonais" camped along the James River at the "Dirt Lodges." By 1868, other Lower Yanktonais divided themselves between Crow Creek agency and Fort Rice to its north. Members of the Two Kettles band lived in equal numbers at Crow Creek and Fort Sully.<sup>9</sup>

Federal agents began to accelerate their efforts to promote assimilation of American Indians during the last years of the 1860s. Following the Minnesota Sioux War (1862), the Sand Creek Massacre (1864), and many other violent clashes with Indian communities, federal officials in the Ulysses S. Grant administration promoted the "Peace Policy." Liberals of the day, so-called "Friends of the Indians," demanded the end to the violence and federal accountants noted the great expense of military conflicts with western tribes. Assimilation of Indians into American society, they concluded, was a more humane and cost effective way to handle the "Indian problem." The Peace Policy rested on the goals of stabilizing communities on reservations, introducing

---

crop-based agriculture, promoting the English language and American culture, and encouraging the adoption of Christianity. Policy formulators intended religious denominations (originally, one per agency) to work with agents to promote these goals. Episcopalians were given jurisdiction over Crow Creek.<sup>10</sup>

Federal officials did not stray far from such goals, but recognized the need to adapt their approaches to the communities they attempted to serve. At Crow Creek, agents and missionaries learned the need to cooperate with Yanktonai leaders. In some cases, they actually reinforced tribal customs in their actions. Distributing rations and annuities directly to tribal leaders helped them retain their influence over their *tiospayes*. Missionaries and agents learned to work with leaders when they recognized that tribal members seeking allotments of land for their immediate families required the consent of their leaders. Community members learned that those who allied too strongly with Christian missionaries often risked the denial of rations on account of this support.

Yanktonais and Two-Kettles who remained at Crow Creek after the winter of 1865-66 began their first agrarian efforts there that spring. Still, the necessity of acquiring food for immediate consumption through regular hunting trips on the prairie limited their time to cultivate. In 1867 sufficient rain fell and grasshoppers were not a major problem, but few farming implements and limited time to spend cultivating produced a small crop.<sup>11</sup> Grasshoppers returned to destroy much of their efforts in 1868. Boss farmer Edwin Vinton assisted members of both groups to cultivate 200 acres of corn, but members of each tribe harvested only 500 bushels of corn that fall (worth an estimated \$2,000).<sup>12</sup> In comparison, increased tribal interest and improved environmental conditions in 1872 permitted nearly half of 1,200 Lower Yanktonais to harvest 5,000 bushels of corn and 100 tons of hay (\$8,800).<sup>13</sup>

Crow Creek records from 1875 show a more diverse economy for Lower Yanktonai and Lower Brule resident. Tribal members cultivated 300 acres as agency farmers prepared another 175 acres. They grew over three thousand bushels of corn, one thousand bushels of oats, 150 bushels of vegetables, and 400 tons of hay. Farmers recorded an above-average yield, though grasshoppers again took their toll on crops. Some farmers cut timber for housing while others hunted and sold animal furs. Crow Creek residents also raised 30 mules and nearly 100 head of cattle. While adding cattle to their constellation of animals, community members retained their interest in horses due to their ceremonial value, the status they reflected within their communities, and their practicality. Agents critiqued the amount of land and resources needed to support these animals, but by 1875 Crow Creek and Lower Brule claimed a total of over 3,000 horses.<sup>14</sup>

Agency statistics in the 1870s could give the impression of a successful assimilation program at Crow Creek. In 1874, for instance, Agent Livingstone reported that 1,300 residents of the combined Crow Creek and Lower Brule agency were "engaged in agriculture." Statistics comparing 1870 and 1874 show that the acreage cultivated by Indians at Crow Creek rose from 215 to 300 in that

time span. In that same time period, the number of bushels of corn produced also rose from 1,750 to 2,000.<sup>15</sup> These economic successes within an American capitalistic system led federal officials to predict grandiose results by the end of the first decade at Crow Creek. "The progress made by them in civilization during the past twelve months has been greater than that during any previous year," agent Livingston proclaimed in 1876.<sup>16</sup>

While both Yanktonais and federal officials could applaud successful crops, they did so for different reasons. Yanktonais did not farm to join the American economic system, but to support themselves and maintain their communities. As they had done for generations, they adapted to their environments and embraced economic strategies as needed. Federal officials, however, mistook cultural accommodation for abandonment of tribal identity. In fact, boss farmers were not the first to introduce agriculture to Yanktonai communities. Arikaras, Mandans, and Hidatsas taught them to farm along the Missouri River over a hundred years earlier.<sup>17</sup> The cultivation at Crow Creek was influenced by American strategies, but it retained a Yanktonai form. Despite agency efforts to promote individualism, Yanktonai practiced agriculture within a communal structure including one 20-acre plot near the lower camp that families cultivated through the 1870s. This method did not escape Acting Crow Creek agent William G. Dougherty. "Until this year this tribe has cultivated the soil in common under the control of the chiefs, and in small patches only," he complained in August of 1879, "the result has been practically nothing."<sup>18</sup> Tribal leaders kept control over this practice and generally refused to give their consent to individual land ownership until the early 1880s.

Other signs of resisting Americanization proved more noticeable, but did not always make their way into annual reports by agents. These documents today remain buried within the agency files of correspondences of agencies. In 1871, for instance, a council of Lower Yanktonai and Lower Brule from Crow Creek Sioux resisted the establishment of a telegraph line through their land by attempting to prevent workers of the Missouri River Telegraph Company from cutting timber for poles. Cedar was the most appropriate wood for telegraph poles. In that region of the Dakotas significant cedar stands only grew along the western side of the river on Lower Brule land. History taught tribal leaders that each American encroachment on their territory would bring another. Sioux leaders knew that each new grant of access to their territory would lead to a diminished size of their land and fewer resources with which to support their families. "They strongly refused to receive any price for the cedar as they opposed having the line built saying that it is sure to bring the railroad," Agent Livingston asserted in a letter to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Ely S. Parker, "they are desirous of my making you aware of their opposition to said telegraph." While the cedar grew on Lower Brule land, the Crow Creek Yanktonais proved particularly involved in convincing their neighbors not to sell, or if necessary, to ask a high price for the timber. R.J. Percy, superintendent of the company, figured poles to be worth ten cents each and Livingston suggested a price of 30 cents each.

Yanktonais boldly suggested the Lower Brules hold out for one dollar per pole. "The influence of the Yanktonais was used upon the Brules to prevent selling the timber," Percy noted, "they hoping thereby to prevent the building of the line to Fort Sully."<sup>19</sup>

Yanktonais continued participation in traditional ceremonies and maintained migratory lifestyles despite reported claims of successful assimilation. Even agent Livingston had to admit that some Crow Creek residents opted to slaughter stock given to them by the agent in order to provide food for traditional feasts and ceremonies.<sup>20</sup> In 1879 Acting Indian Agent William G. Dougherty noted the retention of a migratory lifestyle. Only 834 of 900 who belonged to the agency in 1879 drew supplies in July of that year. Among those absent, Dougherty reported that two dozen people attended the Sun Dance at Rosebud Agency. In addition, Drifting Goose's band that had been brought in to the agency the previous fall, was again "absent without leave" visiting their Sisseton relations at Devil's Lake.<sup>21</sup>

Drifting Goose's band provides an interesting window into the wide spectrum of cultural dynamics practiced by Yanktonai at Crow Creek during the early years of the agency. While in some ways they served as examples of American assimilation, Drifting Goose's band also revealed an independence that regularly resisted rules imposed on them by federal officials. A community of about 150 through much of the 1870s, they were basically self-sufficient and friendly to Americans, with some even serving as scouts when needed. They planted corn, squash, pumpkins, potatoes, and other vegetables as part of a mixed subsistence system along the James River, even after being designated to the agency. The camp, known as the "Dirt Lodge Village" or Armadale Island (located 25 miles north of present-day Redfield, South Dakota), consisted of 12 log cabins and twice as many tipis during the 1870s. Environmental conditions and practical dispositions prompted them to also hunt buffalo and other animals of the Dakota prairie to maintain a balanced subsistence system. As animal populations grew scarce in the region, the savvy Drifting Goose learned to add federal annuities available at Crow Creek and Devil's Lake (now Spirit Lake) to their varied economic strategies.

Drifting Goose's band increasingly confronted settlers, survey crews, and workers for the Union Pacific Railroad in this region during 1870s. These intrusions challenged their peaceful disposition and led to varied forms of resistance. Members of the band forced some crews to leave the region and humiliated others who persisted. After confronting Thomas Marshall's survey company in 1878, several of Drifting Goose's band tracked down the team's flag man, Zach Sutley, on his way home to Yankton. They threw him to the ground, cut off his clothing, and then set him free. In 1879 Drifting Goose learned that American settlers had confiscated their property and taken control of their land near the Dirt Lodge Village while his people were at the agency under orders of Captain Dougherty.



Drifting Goose took his case to Washington D.C. with the assistance of missionaries and other officials. He denied having “touched the pen” during the Fort Laramie Treaty meeting in 1868 that relinquished Sioux claims to eastern Dakota territory including his people’s land along the James River. President Rutherford B. Hayes responded on June 27, 1879 by signing an executive order creating the “Drifting Goose Reserve.” Under considerable pressure after finding out that white settlers had taken possession of the land in the mean time, Hayes signed another executive order July 13, 1880 that denied Drifting Goose’s claim and restored the land to public domain.<sup>22</sup>

Yanktonais began to leave three main camps near the river during these confusing times. Clearly, more conservative members opposed breaking up the camps, and the process extended through several seasons. Gradually, Lower Camp members relocated to individual homesteads along Crow Creek, about seven miles from the village. By the fall of 1878, nearly half of the upper camp left their village and either moved their homes or built new ones above the agency. They spaced themselves between a quarter of a mile and a mile apart. By the spring, most members of the upper camp moved out on the east-river prairie. In June of 1879, the remainder of the lower camp took their families and relocated along Crow Creek. By August in his annual report, Dougherty reported that 29 family heads grew corn, potatoes, melons, pumpkins, and/or other garden vegetables on between one and eight acres of land. Noticeably, he did not list White Ghost or Drifting Goose among this group in 1879. Both men apparently turned to farming in 1880, when the year’s report noted over 160 as having established their own family farms across the agency.<sup>23</sup>

By the spring of 1880, Crow Creek families requested the subdivision of the land and the allotment of it in severalty. Families could claim 320 acres and individuals were entitled to 80 acres. White Ghost, Drifting Goose, and other leaders stood among 173 tribal members claiming allotments along Crow Creek, Soldier Creek, Campbell Creek, and at the Big Bend. By 1884, the number of allotments distributed at Crow Creek had climbed to 239.<sup>24</sup>

Why did this interest in individualized agricultural pursuits and individual allotments take place so suddenly at this time? Federal officials had been promoting individualized farms and cultivation for over a decade at Crow Creek. Dougherty suggested that through consistent arguments and consultations he was able to convince family leaders to relocate from communal villages to individual farmlands. For Yanktonai, pragmatic concerns proved more significant than any philosophical argument an agent could make. Some Yanktonai leaders saw the need after many years in the same place to relocate to a new region for its resources. Decades of riverboat transportation and agency construction had taken their toll on timber and other resources near their Missouri River camps.<sup>25</sup> The context of Indian-white relations in the late 1870s suggests that growing American interest in land on the eastern side of the Missouri River made the most significant impact on Yanktonai decision-making. Inadvertently noting th

persistence of Yanktonai village social structure, Dougherty acknowledged that the realization of allotment at Crow Creek stemmed from decisions made by tribal leaders.<sup>26</sup>

Crow Creek families saw allotment of land as their best method to preserve for their communities as broad a base of land as possible. They witnessed the growth of American farms and settlements to their east and the construction of two railroad lines bordering their land.<sup>27</sup> Yanktonais needed a way to prevent this American expansion from enveloping their whole land base. The case of the Drifting Goose Reserve solidified the opinions of many that saw that federal officials had limited abilities to prevent encroachment on Indian lands. They learned that American courts would only honor federally recognized land claims. Crow Creek leaders also figured that cultivation of land and construction of permanent residences would reinforce their land claims. The retention of many Yanktonai traditions after this time indicates that tribal members did not exchange their culture for American identities.

As families took their places across the Crow Creek landscape, log homes could not hide the fact that Yanktonais also raised tipis on their land. The construction of distinct dwellings symbolized their concurrent participation in different cultural worlds. Many Lower Yanktonais began to build wooden houses prior to taking individual allotments. Between 1872 and 1875, the number of wooden houses at Crow Creek grew from ten to forty. White Ghost had even lived in a whitewashed, wood house by 1877. Federal promises to furnish floors and roofs remained unfulfilled. This unrealized offer led Crow Creek Agent John Gasmann to recognize many homes as “impossible to keep clean,” “very damp,” and “very unhealthy.” Many tribal members found that American-style log homes did not always meet their needs. Consequently, they constructed tipis beside their log houses as refuges from unhealthy summer conditions.<sup>28</sup> In 1878 Yanktonai artist John Saul was born in a tipi on the banks of Crow Creek, though the family later moved to a log cabin inside the old Fort Thompson stockade.<sup>29</sup>

Agreeing to allotment not only helped preserve Crow Creek land base, but it also earned tribal leaders respect with federal agents that influenced their status in the eyes of their own community. White Ghost, in particular, seemed to gain Agent Dougherty’s respect after appropriating certain American traditions. Prior to White Ghost’s 1879 acceptance of allotment, agent Dougherty recorded Wizi, a “cultivator of land,” as “chief” of the Lower Yanktonais. By 1881, White Ghost claimed a 320-acre allotment along Crow Creek as well as federal designation as “chief.” Crow Creek Census rolls maintain his continued tribal status by listing him as first resident through the early years of the next century.<sup>30</sup> White Ghost learned to work his relationship with federal and missionary leaders to his advantage. He negotiated this new system by selectively embracing certain traditions and rejecting others. Members of his band, Bowed Head and John Fluery, affiliated themselves with the Episcopal church, but White Ghost never joined.<sup>31</sup>

Many traditional elements of Yanktonai culture survived through these complex times of great cultural change. Tribalism endured within belief systems and ceremonial rituals. In the same annual report of 1881 that agent Dougherty reported the allotment of land, he noted the alteration but persistence of the “grass lodge” dance, as well as a revival in an “immoral dance,” presumably the Sun-Dance.<sup>32</sup> Yanktonai dress patterns also adapted to new styles while retaining preference for traditional garb. Environmental changes, limited availability of certain animal skins, and enlarged American trade networks led tribal members to increasingly wear “citizen dress.” Still, 1882 agency records show that only about a third of the population at Crow Creek wore “citizens’ dress.” Agent Gasmann reported in 1883 that individuals still frequently wore traditional dress and that it remained important for special occasions. Recorded as hindrances to their agricultural work ethic, Gasmann also noted the persistence of Yanktonai values of visiting sick relatives and gathering traditional foods in 1884.<sup>33</sup>

Federal agents turned to church leaders in the 1870s to help them promote Christianity, morals, and education in Indian communities. Grant’s earlier Peace Policy had initiated Episcopalian jurisdiction over the assimilation program at Crow Creek. Church leaders responded by nominating Henry Livingston as agent and sending missionaries to Crow Creek.<sup>34</sup> Missionary organizations often evaluated assimilation programs as unrealistically as federal agents. Board of Indian Commissioners Director William Welsh visited Crow Creek in 1870 and reported tribal interest in missionaries. “These Indians long for a minister, for schools, and for instruction in agricultural handicraft,” Welsh reported.<sup>35</sup>

Yanktonai worked with missionaries, as they did with federal agents, when their mutual interests merged—even when their overall agendas differed dramatically. For instance, missionaries and many Yanktonai eventually agreed of the need for English instruction. While missionaries saw this effort as leading to tribal incorporation into American society, tribal leaders often saw proficiency in English as a skill necessary to negotiate their own community interests. Over time, missionaries also assisted Yanktonai with land concerns and attempted to break the whiskey trade that threatened the health of the community. Some community members even turned to missionaries for new spiritual support during these chaotic times, though not necessarily with an interest in distancing themselves from their own cultural traditions.

In 1872 church leaders prevailed upon Hekalia Burt and Anna Pritchard to establish a more permanent Episcopalian presence at Crow Creek. Burt moved to Fort Thompson and held Sunday services there at an agency building that attracted members from the upper and lower camps. Pritchard established the first girls’ boarding school, which became a federal boarding school by the end of the decade.<sup>36</sup> Deacon Burt learned early of the need to work within the parameters of Yanktonai society. He evaluated the status of the upper and lower camps before deciding to establish his residence within the lower camp. He faced a difficult decision. He considered Upper Camp leader Wizi “the best chief here as regards our work” as well as the most solicitous of an Episcopalian

---

mission. Wizi reinforced his rhetorical support for missionaries by sending three girls from his band to the Sister Anna's agency boarding school. Episcopal leaders compensated Wizi for his allegiance by sending Burt a check for 100 dollars to purchase a wagon for the upper camp leader. A larger number of supporters in the lower camp, however, led the deacon to settle near White Ghost's village. Additional personnel expanded the Episcopalian involvement at Crow Creek, though its impact remained limited through the 1870s. By 1875, Edward Ashley and others joined Burt and Pritchard. Ashley began work at the lower camp in the fall of 1874, permitting Burt to turn his attention to the upper camp.<sup>37</sup>

Yanktonais attended services that related to them and withdrew their support from the church when Episcopalian standards were not consistent with community traditions. Fifty-seven attended the first service led by Burt, who learned the vernacular language. It even attracted the attention of Lower Brules who requested a missionary of their own. Ashley also attracted Yanktonais by holding two Sunday services per week in the Lakota language.<sup>38</sup> Limiting participation in the ritual of communion to those with sufficient religious instruction limited the appeal of the exclusive Episcopal Church to Yanktonais. Burt's questioning of the appropriateness of marrying Indians who had broken from church practices repelled tribal members. At times, miscommunication severed growing inter-religious dialogue. Burt concluded that cultural confusion over participation in Holy Communion turned Paul High Bear away from the Episcopalian fold.<sup>39</sup>

The transient nature of missionary personnel and an interest in employing community members who understood local traditions prompted church leaders to turn to Yanktonais to serve as catechists. Larger evangelical policy decisions led church officials to send Burt to start missions in other Sioux communities from 1875 to 1881, and Ashley to Divinity School in Minnesota and then a new placement at the Sisseton agency. During the first few decades at Crow Creek church leaders employed William Saul and David Tatiyopa at the lower camp, Dan Philip Firecloud at the agency, and Levi Trudell near the Big Bend. Episcopalian administrators could not support more personnel, and provided poor pay for those they did employ for short periods of time. Burt considered Dan Philip Firecloud his "right-hand man," but only paid him one dollar per month for leading services at the agency. By April of 1885, Firecloud left for Hampton Institute in Virginia.<sup>40</sup>

Yanktonai reacted differently to missionary messages and their neighbors' interests in them. Tribal members more easily accepted those who embraced American traditions than those who rejected tribal protocol. Breaking cultural rules earned rebukes and the loss of status within their community. Tewicaka (Truth Teller), for instance, lost influence within the lower camp, and notably with White Ghost, by giving the Grass Dance Society drum to Bishop William Hare. This act led tribal members to demand its immediate return. Recognizing that the drum belonged to the society and not the individual, Agent Dougherty

encouraged Episcopal Bishop William H. Hare to return the drum. Truth Teller stood by his action and joined the church though it cost him respect within the lower camp. White Ghost accepted the involvement of tribal members in Christian traditions, but drew the line at their denial of tribal rules. Following this incident, White Ghost no longer sought the counsel of Tewicaka.<sup>41</sup>

Initial community responses to education also varied within a wide spectrum. Some families, often with mixed blood heritage, sent their children to school as soon as one was established. White Ghost's response to the school placed in his camp over his opposition, as previously mentioned in the opening paragraph of this essay, shows the critical disposition of certain leaders and community members. In this case, White Ghost suggests that his opposition rested more on the issue of land than education. Other families supported Ashley's efforts to establish a school, though their reasons for doing so may have resulted from the material benefits gained by sending their children to school. To attract students during the first years of school operation at Crow Creek, the agent authorized additional quantities of beef to children that attended school. Agency staff issued one ticket daily to students who went to classes—attending ten days of school entitled them to ten pounds of beef. Though their motives prove difficult to assess, parents sent their children to school for economic, if not educational, reasons. Parents also learned that agents rarely enforced school attendance policies before granting rations.<sup>42</sup>

Tribal leaders retained great influence over community decisions regarding education. Depending on decisions of local leaders, communities might support or reject sending their children to school. By 1875, three schools instructed students at Crow Creek agency where the population stood at approximately 1200. The average attendance at the schools paled in comparison to potential student participation. The agency boarding school attracted an average attendance of eight, while the day schools in the camps above and below the agency averaged twenty and six students respectively.<sup>43</sup> In 1878 three of seven Lower Yanktonai chiefs still opposed American education. Some went so far as to send their soldiers to remove the children from classrooms. White Bear's band proved most "delinquent," according to Sister Anna in 1878.<sup>44</sup> Not until tribal leaders consented to send their children to school did enrollment in schools rise. Opposition declined in 1879 due to the shifting status of tribal leaders: one died, one lost his influence, and the third came to support the educational institutions. By 1879, three federally supported schools registered an average yearly attendance of 65 students during a ten-month academic year. Twenty of forty students who could read had learned during the past year.<sup>45</sup>

Still, limited school space, inconsistent staff, and lingering resistance of parents to send their children to schools kept the impact of American education to a minimum for many years. Staff turnover played a significant part in ineffective schools during the early years at Crow Creek. In fact, no schools operated at all in 1880 and classes met inconsistently in 1881. By 1883, only one school for 30 students operated at Crow Creek.<sup>46</sup> Even when the agency school expanded to

---

accommodate 85 students in 1885, Agent John G. Gasmann reported lack of parental support. "I find that every imaginable excuse is invented to keep their children at home, and it takes generally quite an effort on the part of the agent to fill his schools," the agent reported, "and constant vigilance to keep the children from running away after they have been entered."<sup>47</sup>

By 1882, Yanktonai felt new pressures to "open up" agency lands not yet allotted for non-Indians as available agricultural lands dwindled on the eastern Plains. Secretary of the Interior Henry Teller sent out commissioners to Crow Creek in 1882 to arrange for the cession of a portion of land in exchange for equivalent lands.<sup>48</sup> This caused much concern among tribal leaders. "The consolidation of this agency with a neighboring one on the west side of the Missouri River [Lower Brule]," Agent George H. Spencer reported, "has given rise to much uneasy speculation [that federal officials would be] removing them from their homes on the east side of the river to the west."<sup>49</sup> Using threat, misrepresentation, and guile during their negotiations, federal official convinced some Crow Creek leaders to cede a large portion of their reservation.<sup>50</sup> Upon learning of the impact of these negotiations, many tribal leaders tried to withdraw from the agreement and petitioned President Chester Arthur in April of 1882 for assistance.<sup>51</sup> Ultimately, Sioux Commissioner Newton Edmunds reported to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Price that Crow Creek Indians ceded in February of 1883 "all the interests in the Great Sioux Reservation and about three-sevenths of the Crow Creek Reservation."<sup>52</sup> Unsympathetic to Yanktonai appeals, President Chester Arthur's executive order opened up the Crow Creek and Old Winnebago Reservation to white settlement on February 27, 1885. Upwards of 2,000 non-Indians rushed onto agency lands to build shanties by March of 1885. Of the 635,000 acres of reservation land only 135,000 remained under tribal control, with much of that land of limited agricultural value.<sup>53</sup> American interlopers not only claimed land but also interfered with the agency cattle herd and stole from tribal members.

White Ghost responded by seeking support from the Indian Rights Association (IRA) leaders, who helped him argued the illegality of the executive order. According to the Fort Laramie Treaty (1868), future land cessions required the consent of three-quarters of tribal men, which were not received during the 1882 negotiations. With the help of IRA leaders and Agent Gasmann, White Ghost began a speaking tour to Boston, New York, Springfield and other eastern cities in March to seek redress. His eloquent appeals stressed the historic peaceful nature of relations between his people and Americans.<sup>54</sup> Ultimately, newly inaugurated President Grover Cleveland's Executive Order of April 17, 1885 rescinded Arthur's decree to order the removal of white settlers within 60 days. Many white settlers ignored Cleveland's executive order and remained on their "improved" lands, but Yanktonai fears of being relocated west of the river subsided.

In response to regular threats to control over Crow Creek land and a growing need to understand the American legal system, Drifting Goose similarly sought

missionary allies. Interest by certain tribal leaders in a permanent Catholic mission attracted maverick Father Francis M. Craft to Crow Creek for two months during the spring of 1884 and Father William A. Kennealy in March of 1885.<sup>55</sup> Tragic stories of student deaths at federal off-reservation boarding schools led Crow Creek leaders to call for a Catholic mission school close to home during the early 1880s. Drifting Goose drew on historic relations between Sioux kinsmen and Catholic emissaries to seek out Dakota bishop and Benedictine priest Martin Marty—the disciple of legendary Jesuit missionary Pierre De Smet. Tribal leaders contacted Marty during his summer of 1883 visit to Standing Rock, repeating their interest to meet the Catholic Bishop in Pierre, South Dakota in October of 1884. Sioux leaders Iron Nation, Two Lance, White Hawk, Bone Necklace, and Drifting Goose renewed this message in Huron, South Dakota on July 4, 1885.<sup>56</sup>

Contact between Crow Creek leaders and Catholic priests grew before the year ended. In October of 1885, Drifting Goose and Bull Ghost attended a Huron, South Dakota fair, where they reportedly received assistance from Catholic leaders. In November, tribal leaders invited Reverend William Mahoney to surreptitiously visit Crow Creek to meet a contingent of tribal members led by Drifting Goose, Bull Ghost and Crow Man. Mahoney employed a controversial, unlicensed trader as a scribe and encouraged tribal members to sign a petition requesting a Roman Catholic mission. On January 28, 1886, tribal leaders sent the Office of Indian Affairs a petition signed by 200 tribal members for a Catholic Mission school.<sup>57</sup>

Federal interest in accommodating a larger number of Sioux children to American schools prevailed over their preference for Episcopalian missionaries. Officials realized that the enlargement of the government's agency school could not accommodate all potential Crow Creek students.<sup>58</sup> In 1886 federal officials responded to the request for a Catholic mission at Crow Creek by granting use of 160 acres of land in the northeast corner of the reservation along the West Fork of Elm Creek to the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions. Over twenty years later, Drifting Goose's family buried him in the cemetery behind the Catholic Mission he helped to establish. Now administered by the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, this school continues to educate students to prepare them to operate within American society.<sup>59</sup>

Lower Yanktonais experienced great changes during their first two decades at Crow Creek agency. They maintained a dynamic culture in the face of great pressures by federal officials and missionaries to abandon their traditions as well as American businesses and settlers to confiscate their land. Rather than passively accepting assimilation programs, Yanktonai leaders actively negotiated the complex intercultural world in which they found themselves in the late nineteenth century. Tribal leaders learned to work with federal officials and missionaries to promote their own interests. Through these two decades, tribal leaders encouraged cultural change for Yanktonai reasons not as a part of the federal program to eliminate their traditions and incorporate families into American society.

## Notes

1. Edward Ashley, "Crow Creek," G-2, Edward Ashley Papers, Episcopal Diocese of South Dakota Archives, Center for Western Studies, Augustana College, Sioux Falls, South Dakota. Anthropologists recognize the Yanktonai as one of the seven original tribes of the Oceti Sakowin or Sioux federation. The other six tribes include the Mdewakantonwan, Wahpekute, Sisseton, Wahpeton, Yankton, and Teton, according to James H. Howard, "Introduction," *The Dakota or Sioux Indians: A Study in Human Ecology*, (Vermillion, SD: Dakota Museum, 1966), 1-3. According to James Owen Dorsey, "Siouan Sociology," in *Fifteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1893-94*, (Washington: GPO, 1897), 213-222, the Ihanktowana, or Yanktonai, may be divided into the "Upper" and "Lower" divisions, the later also known as Hunkapatina. Yanktonai proper means "Little End Village" and *Hunkpatina* means "Campers at the Horn or End of Camping Circle." A history of the Yanktonai Sioux may be found in Clair Jacobson, "A History of the Yanktonai and Hunkpatina Sioux," *North Dakota History*, Vol. 47, No. 1 (1980), 4-24.
2. Charles J. Kappler, ed., *Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties*, II (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1903), 227-29. For a discussion of the Battle of Whitestone Hill, see Clair Jacobson, "The Battle of Whitestone Hill," *North Dakota History*, Vol. 44, No. 3, (Summer 1977), 4-14
3. First Lieutenant United States Army, Indian Agent William H. French, Jr. to Governor and ex-officio Superintendent Indian Affairs John A. Burbank, September 1, 1870, *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs*, (ARCIA), 1870, 682.
4. Edward Thompson Denig, *Five Indian Tribes of the Upper Missouri: Sioux, Arikaras, Assiniboines, Crees, and Crows*, ed. By John C. Ewers (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1961), 34-36.
5. Jacobson, "The Battle of Whitestone Hill, 4-24.
6. Martin Brokenleg and Herbert T. Hoover, eds., *Yanktonai Sioux Water Colors: Cultural Remembrances of John Saul* (Sioux Falls: The Center for Western Studies, 1993), 8.
7. Commissioner of Indian Affairs D.N. Cooley to Secretary of the Interior O.H. Browning, October 22, 1866, *ARCIA*, 1866, 36.
8. Crow Creek Agent J.M. Stone to Governor and ex-official Superintendent of Indian Affairs Newton Edmunds, February 5, 1866; F.A.L. Day to Newton Edmunds, March 5, 1866, *ARCIA*, 1866, 162-64.
9. Acting Indian Agent William G. Dougherty to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, August 18, 1879, *ARCIA*, 1879, 130; Day to Edmunds, March 5, 1866, *ARCIA*, 1866, 164-65; United States Indian Agent Upper Missouri Sioux J.R. Hanson to Governor and ex-officio Superintendent of Indian Affairs A.J. Faulk, September 16, 1868, *ARCIA*, 1868, 649-650.
10. Virginia Driving Hawk Sneve, *That They May Have Life: The Episcopal Church in South Dakota, 1859-1976* (New York: Seabury Press, 1977), 5.
11. Dakota Territory Governor A.J. Faulk to Commissioner of Indian Affairs N.G. Taylor, September 9, 1867, *ARCIA*, 1867, 226.
12. Hanson to Faulk, September 16, 1868, *ARCIA*, 1868, 649-51, 820.
13. Crow Creek Agent Henry F. Livingston to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Francis A. Walker, September 1, 1872, *ARCIA*, 1872, 647, 790-91.
14. Livingston to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Edward P. Smith, August 31, 1875, *ARCIA*, 1875, 740, 747.
15. French to Burbank, September 1, 1870, *ARCIA*, 1870, 804; *ARCIA*, 1874, 116.
16. Livingston to Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Q. Smith, August 24, 1876, *ARCIA*, 1876, 24.
17. James H. Howard, "the Wiciyela or Middle Dakota," *The Dakota or Sioux Indians: A Study in Human Ecology* (Vermillion: Dakota Museum, 1966), 1-4.



18. Dougherty to Hayt, August 18, 1879, *ARCIA*, 1879, 25.
19. Livingston to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Ely S. Parker, June 16, 1871; R.J. Percy to Parker, May 29, 1871, Record Group 75, National Archives.
20. Livingston to Smith, August 24, 1876, *ARCIA*, 1876, 24.
21. Dougherty to Hayt, August 18, 1879, *ARCIA*, 1879, 24.
22. *South Dakota Historical Collections*, III, 105; V, 366-68; Edward Ashley, "Drifting Goose Story," Edward Ashley Papers, Episcopal Diocese of South Dakota Archives, Center for Western Studies, Augustana College; Dougherty to Hayt, August 18, 1879, *ARCIA*, 1879, 24-25, 215.
23. Dougherty to Hayt, August 18, 1879, *ARCIA*, 1879, 25.
24. "Crow Creek," Ashley Papers; Livingston to Smith, August 31, 1875, *ARCIA*, 1875, 740; Dougherty to Hayt, August 18, 1879, *ARCIA*, 1879, 24-25; Dougherty to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Hiram Price, August 21, 1881, *ARCIA*, 30, 85-88; Crow Creek Agent John G. Gasmann to Commissioner of Indian Affairs John D.C. Atkins, August 17, 1885, *ARCIA*, 1885, 21.
25. Dougherty to Hayt, August 18, 1879, *ARCIA*, 1879, 130.
26. Dougherty to Price, August 21, 1881, *ARCIA*, 1881, 26.
27. The Chicago and Northwestern Railroad bordered Crow Creek on the north, and the Chicago, Milwaukee, and Saint Paul bordered the agency on the south, according to Agent George H. Spencer to Price, September 1, 1882, *ARCIA*, 1882, 26.
28. Gasmann to Price, August 20, 1883, *ARCIA*, 1883, 85.
29. Artist John Saul was known for promoting tribal oral and artistic traditions. He also became the teacher of noted Sioux artist Oscar Howe, according to Brokenleg and Hoover, 8.
30. Dougherty to Hayt, August 18, 1879, *ARCIA*, 1879, 132; Dougherty to Price, August 21, 1881, *ARCIA*, 1881, 85; *Indian Census Rolls, 1885-1940*, Crow Creek (Lower Yanktonai and Lower Brule Sioux Indians), National Archives.
31. Olive M. Roberts to Bishop William H. Hare, June 21-July 12, 1877, Hare Papers, Box 1.
32. Dougherty to Price, August 21, 1881, *ARCIA*, 1881, 87.
33. Dougherty to Hayt, August 18, 1879, *ARCIA*, 1879, 336; Dougherty to Price, August 21, 1881, *ARCIA*, 1881, 87; Gasmann to Price, August 20, 1883, *ARCIA*, 1883, 86.
34. Congress enacted Grant's Peace Policy on April 10, 1869 that stipulated that tribes should relocate to reservations as soon as possible to learn Christian and "civilization" practices. The President would punish those who refused to relocate to reservations, fair business practices should operate in regard to supplying reservations with needed goods, religious leaders should serve as Indian agents, and religious organizations should establish schools and churches for the benefit of tribal members, according to Sneve, 5.
35. Sneve, 41.
36. Livingston to Walker, September 1, 1872, *ARCIA*, 1872, 645, 647. Sneve, 7, 41-43.
37. "Crow Creek," Ashley Papers. Wizi, the cousin of White Ghost, joined the Episcopal Church and was buried at the Episcopalian cemetery in Fort Thompson. White Ghost never joined the Episcopal church, according to Jan M Dykshorn, "William Fuller's Crow Creek And Lower Brule Paintings," *South Dakota History*, Vol. 6, No. 4 (Fall 1976), 417-18
38. Hekalia Burt to Hare, November 17, 1873-January 12, 1874, Hare Papers, Box 1; Sneve, 41. Missionary reference to Indigenous languages can prove complex. I use linguistic terms used by missionaries in this work, though it is uncertain if their use of Lakota, Dakota, or Sioux represents distinct dialects or their term for the broader language system.
39. Burt to Hare, March 20 - October 28, 1885, Hare Papers, Box 2.
40. Samuel J. Brown to Hare, October 27, 1879, Hare Papers, Box 1; Burt to Hare, February 9-April 1885, Hare Papers, Box 2; Sneve, 168.

- 
41. "Crow Creek," Ashley Papers; Brown to Hare, June 2, 1879, Hare Papers, Box 1.
  42. "Crow Creek," Ashley Papers; Anna Pritchard to Hare, May 31, 1878, Hare Papers, Box 1.
  43. Livingston to Smith, August 31, 1875, *ARCIA*, 1875, 740.
  44. Pritchard to Hare, May 31, 1878, Hare Papers, Box 1.
  45. Dougherty to Hayt, August 18, 1879, *ARCIA*, 1879, 133, 337. Brown to Hare, June 2, 1879, Hare Papers, Box 1.
  46. Dougherty to Hayt, August 18, 1879, *ARCIA*, 1879, 133, 337; Dougherty to Price, August 21, 1881, *ARCIA*, 1881, 88; Gasmann to Price, August 20, 1883, *ARCIA*, 1883, 87; Gasmann to Hare, March 25, 1885, Hare Papers.
  47. Gasmann to Atkins, August 17, 1885, *ARCIA*, 1885, 21.
  48. Indian Rights Association, *Crow Creek Reservation, Dakota: Action of the Indian Rights Association, and Opinions of the Press, West and East, Regarding Its Recent Occupation By White Settlers* (Philadelphia: Office of the Indian Rights Association, 1885), 10.
  49. Spencer to Price, September 1, 1882, *ARCIA*, 1882, 26.
  50. Henry Spackman Pancoast, "Facts Regarding the Recent Opening to White Settlement of Crow Creek Reservation in Dakota" (Philadelphia: Indian Rights Association, circa 1885), 2; Gasmann to Price, August 20, 1883, *ARCIA*, 1883, 31.
  51. Burt to Hare, April 1882, Hare Papers; Gasmann to Price, August 20, 1883, *ARCIA*, 1883, 31.
  52. Newton Edmunds to Price, February 27, 1883, Senate Report, No. 283, 365, in Indian Rights Association, 11.
  53. "Protest Against Robbing the Indians of Their Lands," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, March 26, 1885, in Indian Rights Association, 17.
  54. Elaine Goodale, "Mr. Arthur's Grave Mistake in His Last Executive Order Concerning an Indian Reservation," March, 18, 1885, letter to the *Springfield Republican*, in Indian Rights Association, 15.
  55. Duratschek, *Crusading Along Sioux Trails: A History of Catholic Indian Missions Among the South Dakota Sioux, 1839-1945* (Yankton: A Grail Publication, 1947), 93-98, 162-63.
  56. "Stephan Planning Centennial: History of Stephan," *Lakota Times*, March 26, 1986. The dates on this event conflict on whether this Fourth of July Celebration in Huron took place in 1884 or 1885.
  57. Letter from St. Matthew's Church, Washington, D.C. unsigned and unaddressed, Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions (BCIM), General Correspondence Series 1, Dakota Territory (1877-84), Marquette University Archives, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Duratschek, 163-64; "The Immaculate Conception Mission School, Stephan, South Dakota," *Indian Sentinel*, (1906), 8, reported the two hundred signatures on the school petition. According to petition dated November 27, 1885, Crow Creek Agency, and unsigned letter of December 11, 1885, BCIM, Series 1, 112 signatures registered in support of Catholic school and mission. According to Episcopal minister Burt, a November Crow Creek petition for a Catholic mission included twenty names. Varied archival research also reveals that while Catholic sources suggest involvement of the reservation agent, Episcopal sources deny this and maintain more clandestine actions.
  58. Burt to Hare, May 19, 1886, Hare Papers, Box 2.
  59. Federal officials granted "the right of temporary occupancy" to "Catholic Church authorities of the territory of Dakota" according to Lucius Q.C. Lamar, Secretary of the Interior to John D.C. Atkins, January 26, 1886, BCIM, Series 1, Roll 13. Rev. Justin Snyder, O.S.B., "Golden Jubilee of Father Pius Boehm, O.S.B.," *The Indian Sentinel* III, no. Vol., No. 4 (October 1923), 154-55.