

2019

Indigenous People and the New England Town Meeting: Stockbridge, Massachusetts, 1730-1775

Daniel R. Mandell

Truman State University, dmandell@truman.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd>



Part of the [Indigenous Studies Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mandell, Daniel R. (2019) "Indigenous People and the New England Town Meeting: Stockbridge, Massachusetts, 1730-1775," *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 15 : Iss. 2 , Article 5.
Available at: <https://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol15/iss2/art5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Public Deliberation. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Public Deliberation by an authorized editor of Public Deliberation.

Indigenous People and the New England Town Meeting: Stockbridge, Massachusetts, 1730-1775

Abstract

In the 1730s, Mahicans along the Housatonic River settled the mission town of Stockbridge, Massachusetts. They participated in town meetings and elected "traditional" leaders to typical New England offices. Even after a growing population of English settlers began dominating town offices, the Indians remained a strong presence in meetings, which was conducted in the Mahican as well as English language, and all voting done *viva voce*. In 1763, a major battle when an English faction tried to take control by introducing secret balloting; the Indians complained and mostly won their case. Stockbridge thus provides a case study comparing Indian and colonial New England decision-making, and highlighting the evolution of the town meeting during the 18th century.

Keywords

Town Meeting, French and Indian War, Mahican, Mahawk, Mtockson, Tithingman, Umpachene, Viva Voce

In the 1730s, Mahicans from several villages in the upper Housatonic River Valley came together to create the Christian Indian town of Stockbridge, Massachusetts. Until they were marginalized and pushed west after the American Revolution, these Natives regularly participated in town meetings and elected their "traditional" leaders to typical New England town offices such as selectman and constable, easily following the norms of their colonial neighbors. About a decade after the establishment of the town, conflicts between the Indians and the Anglo-American minority developed, and the newcomers began dominating the slate of town officers and occasionally operating independently. But the Indians remained a strong presence in town meetings, with all matters proclaimed in the Mahican as well as English language, and as a new generation of sachems emerged they were also elected to important town offices. Their vigilant participation in the town meetings demonstrated that North American Indian groups could comfortably adopt that polity, at least after decades of connections with Euro-Americans. The Indians' active role in the town meeting highlighted the wider shift from *viva voce* to secret balloting, after one faction tried to suddenly impose ballots and the Natives cried foul. The battle over that meeting, which lasted more than a year, also laid bare a long-standing conflict between two prominent colonial families; while the Indians lay at the center in this instance, such struggles over land and power existed in other towns. Stockbridge thus serves as an excellent case study of the differences and similarities in indigenous and colonial New England decision-making, the structure and dynamics of the New England town meeting in the mid-18th century, and the manner in which modes of governance evolved over the half-century.

I first encountered Stockbridge in 1981, and the experiences of the town's Natives and their relations with the English became my focus for my master's thesis and part of my dissertation ("Behind the Frontier," 1992). At that time, the relevant scholarship came from anthropologists Ted Brasser (*Riding on the Frontier's Crest*, 1974), Philip Colee ("Housatonic-Stockbridge Indians, 1734-1749," 1977); and Marion Mochon, ("Stockbridge-Munsee Cultural Adaptation," 1968). Their work examined Mahican social, political, and cultural norms before and during the Stockbridge mission. I was more fascinated by the social and political drama revealed by the unusually rich town and provincial records, particularly the regular participation of Natives in town meetings and offices, their dealings with officials, complex relations with the settlers in their midst, and their efforts to maintain a majority in the town and keep most of its land. For me their story bridged two rich and recent bodies of early New England scholarship: town studies and ethnohistory.¹ But Stockbridge lay

¹On the burgeoning field of colonial American ethnohistory in 1977, including New England, see James Axtell, "The Ethnohistory of Early America: A Review Essay," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 35 (1978): 110-144. For scholarship since see my brief bibliographic essays in *King Philip's War: Colonial Expansion, Native Resistance, and the End of Indian Sovereignty* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010), 155-59; and *Behind the*

outside the arena of my first book and subsequent work, so I abandoned the community. Since then two significant works have been published: Lion Miles's analysis of how the Stockbridge Natives were dispossessed ("Red Man Dispossessed," 1994), and Patrick Frazier's expanded depiction of the Indians through the Revolution (*Mahicans of Stockbridge*, 1992). Neither of these works really examined the participation and role of the Natives in town meetings and offices.

One of the primary concerns of scholars studying Native people in New England has been the process and extent of their adaption to colonial ways. Because Puritans seemed to dominate the colonial effort in the region, the main focus of these studies tends to be religion, and over time has moved from assimilation (akin to the Christian view of conversion) to creative melding of Native concepts, leadership, and customs with Protestant theology, institutions, and rituals.² Some recent studies have approached the period, region, and people involved in Stockbridge, most notably Rachel Wheeler's work on the Moravian Mahican community in northwestern Connecticut (*To Live Upon Hope*, 2008), and my piece on the Iroquoian church at Oquaga ("'Turned Their Minds to Religion'," 2013). But also significant, though relatively rarely explored, was the Native adoption of New England forms of governance, gradually or rapidly, in communities that survived behind the colonial frontier. This special issue of *Participations* provides the opportunity for me to go back to Stockbridge, revisit the town meeting and provincial records with an eye for Native *political* creativity, adaptation, and persistence at Stockbridge, and reconsider what happened and what it shows about Indians and the New England town meeting. What I found was a relatively easy embrace of New England public meeting norms and town offices: proposals were discussed in the Mahican language until a community decision (probably a consensus) emerged in a voice vote, and tribal leaders were elected as selectmen and constables. That initial success highlighted the flexibility of the New England town meeting; its failure in the 1760s pointed to the increasing dominance of legal formalism in that process. Comparing developments and controversies in Stockbridge's meetings and

Frontier: Indians in Eighteenth-Century Eastern Massachusetts (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996), 242-44.

²Significant recent works on New England Native Christianity since 2000 include David Silverman, *Red Brethren: The Brothertown and Stockbridge Indians and the Problem of Race in Early America* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2010); various works in *Native Americans, Christianity, and the Reshaping of the American Religious Landscape*, ed. Joel W. Martin and Mark A. Nicholas (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010); Silverman, "Indians, Missionaries, and Religious Translation: Creating Wampanoag Christianity in Seventeenth-Century Martha's Vineyard," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., 62 (2005): 141-75; and Kristina Bross, *Dry Bones and Indian Sermons: Praying Indians in Colonial America* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004). On Native syncretism see Gregory Dowd, *A Spirited Resistance: The North American Indian Struggle for Unity, 1745-1815* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992); and Kenneth M. Morrison, "Baptism and Alliance: The Symbolic Mediations of Religious Syncretism," *Ethnohistory* 37 (1990): 416-37.

elections among the Natives *and* the colonists also highlight important social and political patterns in the town, and relationships between and among those peoples.

River Indians Make a New England Town: The 1730s

The Mahicans (“River Indians”) were a major power in seventeenth-century America, holding territory along the upper Hudson River and gaining the initial monopoly over the Dutch fur trade at Fort Orange (Albany). That trade along with other longstanding conflicts led the Mohawks to attack and apparently subordinate the tribe in 1630; four decades later, an attempt by the Mahicans to regain status and direct connections with Albany drew an Iroquois counterattack that shattered the tribe and drove them east of the Hudson. Mahicans were also decimated by epidemics and pressured by Dutch and English colonists who stole or bought their best farmland. Many of the survivors of these tribulations moved west to the Housatonic Valley, joining smaller Native villages along that river and forging a “River Indian Confederacy” that connected the Mahican, Highland, and Housatonic communities. They made their livings by farming, fishing, hunting, and trading furs, ginseng, and corn to English merchants; the men regularly worked for Dutch farmers (Wheeler, 2008, p. 24-25).

After 1713, the colonial energy unbound by the Treaty of Utrecht allowed Massachusetts to cast its eye on the Housatonic Valley. Both Massachusetts and New York claimed the area, but New York's unstable social and political situation encouraged Massachusetts to press its claim. In addition, the peace with France promised to be temporary and the region was a potential invasion route for Canadians and their Indian allies. The Indian communities along the upper Housatonic River provided a strategic lever for Massachusetts, which continued to see its “errand into the Wilderness” in religious as well as political terms. Thus the last Massachusetts “praying town” (Stockbridge) would be established for the same reasons as the first (Natick): to increase provincial power and authority in the borderlands, attract Natives into a single location to be more easily managed, and to spread the English gospel.

The two largest Native villages along the upper Housatonic were Wnahtukook headed by Konkopot, and Skatekook, ten miles to the south, headed by Umpachene, with about five families each. More Housatonics (and their Mahican relatives) resided in hamlets, wigwams, and cabins scattered through the valley. Konkopot, Umpachene, and their connections with the larger River Confederacy first appeared in 1724, when the two village leaders and 19 other men met with a delegation from the Massachusetts General Court and signed a deed that sold a large region that became the southwest corner of the province while reserving the two village areas for their inhabitants. There are no details on the conference, but the document demonstrated that traditional norms of

consensual decision-making remained strong.³ Ten years later, as Massachusetts sought to establish towns in the region, the province invited Konkopot (ne Pophnehonauwoh) and Umpachene (ne Sonkeuenawkheek) to Springfield to be awarded commissions in the provincial militia; a captaincy for Konkopot, a lieutenantcy for Umpachene. At the ceremony, several ministers and provincial officials proposed settling a schoolteacher and a minister near the Housatonic villages. Konkopot endorsed the proposal, primarily so their children would be taught to read; Umpachene deferred to Konkopot--noticeably reluctantly (Hopkins, 1753, p. 14-17; Wheeler, 2008, p. 34-40).

The two men and their villages were connected by kinship and governing networks, locally as well as regionally through the River Confederacy, although the precise social and political relationships are not clear. The English considered Konkopot to be Umpachene's political and social superior, but a more nuanced and persuasive view is that Konkopot led the native Housatonics while Umpachene headed more recent Mahican immigrants. (Brasser, 1974, p. 32) The manner in which the two men dealt with the English and each other seemed to reflect the indigenous paradigm in which the group of newcomers acquired a substantive right to the place where they were invited or allowed to settle, but were expected to follow the lead of the original "owners" in larger matters including war, alliances, treaties, and negotiations. (Wallace, 1957, p. 317) Konkopot was probably interested in the mission because it offered not only the power of reading and writing, but strategic benefits. Massachusetts was growing and gaining influence in the region, and the deeper connection of a mission would allow the Housatonics to become important political, economic, and cultural brokers between the colony and Indian communities farther away.

But before they could accept the missionary, the two men told the provincial representatives, their villages needed to be consulted in accordance with indigenous standards of community consensus for important decisions. In July 1734, two ministers representing provincial authority journeyed to meet the people of both villages. The Housatonics told the ministers that they needed four days to discuss the proposal—far longer than the usual New England town meeting—and “at the end of those days they all gave in their names, and signified their desires . . . that a minister might be sent to them.” One of the ministers sealed the agreement by presenting the Indians a string of wampum, in accordance with the customs of all indigenous peoples in northeastern North America (Hopkins, 1735, p. 17-18). In the fall, John Sergeant, a Yale student in

³At this conference Umpachene's name was given as Sunkewenaugheag; Harry Wright, *Indian Deeds of Hampton County* (Springfield, Mass., 1905), 116-18; Wheeler, 2008, p. 257 fn1. On the fundamental importance of consensus decision-making among the Mahicans see Wheeler, 2008, p. 23, 36, 125; for a more detailed description of this characteristic among the Iroquois neighbors of the Mahicans, see Daniel K. Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 7, 41-43.

his final year, agreed to serve as minister and went for two months to preach and teach (with the help of an Indian interpreter) in a “publick house” built by the Indians between the two villages. In late November, as Sergeant prepared to return to Yale to finish his studies, the Housatonics agreed to accept Timothy Woodbridge from Springfield as their teacher (Hopkins, 1735, p. 19-33).

The Housatonics also sought the consent of the rest of the River Confederacy, which was necessary for a major decision that would almost certainly affect Native groups throughout the region. In fact, rumors were circulating that the Mahicans and other allies in the Hudson Valley “highly resented” the commissions given Konkopot and Umpachene as well as their acceptance of the missionary and teacher, and that some were plotting to poison the two headmen. Massachusetts authorities sent a minister and assemblyman to speak for the project. The gathering at Housatonic in mid-January 1735 drew about two hundred River Indians “great and small”—sachems, counselors, and young men. The minister, Stephen Williams, reported having “diverse conferences with the Indians . . . and endeavoured to answer their objections” (Hopkins, 1735, p. 34). At the end, the meeting agreed to allow the mission to proceed.

Eight months later, the Housatonic leaders travelled to another major gathering, in Deerfield, with Schagticokes, Caughnawaga Mohawks, and Massachusetts authorities including Governor Belcher. There Konkopot and Umpachene challenged Belcher to give them the same political and legal status as the English colonists and demanded that the law not be used to take their land or imprison their people for debt. While Belcher’s reassurances were hardly ironclad, the meeting ended with Sergeant’s ordination and the Indians’ formal acceptance of the minister. (Wheeler, 2008, p. 37-45)

In February 1736, after Sergeant and Williams had been working with the Housatonics for more than a year, provincial authorities proposed establishing a mission community for the missionary, teacher, and all of the Indians in the area, protected under provincial law. The English thought it an act of “great charity,” but though Konkopot was interested, he (and others) feared that the Indians would lose more land than they would gain (which they did, exchanging 52 square miles for the 36 square-mile township). He did get to pick the locale, which increased Umpachene’s resentment since his village was part of the area obtained in exchange by the province. The Housatonics’ motivations for accepting the township were similar to the Natives who founded other praying towns during the previous century in New England: their land seemed more secured under Massachusetts law, and they gained a holy man (minister), a teacher, and material assistance in their adoption of Euro-American agriculture. Unfortunately, the seeds of the Indians’ ultimate alienation and emigration were sown at the same time, as Sergeant and Governor Belcher persuaded them (reluctantly) to accept four additional English families to serve as guides along the hard road to civilization, with each to receive a four-hundred-acre lot. Those

seeds would sprout into a growing and often-antagonistic colonial population (Wheeler, 2008, p. 53-57; Frazier, 1992).

Native Polity and New England Town Meeting

In the seventeenth century, New England missionaries sought to have Natives conform to “civilized” norms as a necessary foundation for their particular form of Christianity. Prospective converts were expected, before becoming church members, to adopt colonial clothing and short hair, patriarchal nuclear families, European gender roles (particularly male farming), and sever their traditional political networks and allegiances—which is why John Eliot had his “praying towns” adopt a Biblical political system. Those demands created major difficulties, although Native leaders embracing Christianity were able to maintain much of their traditional authority under new titles. New England norms and Native cultures clearly changed over the subsequent century: Sergeant and Williams did not seek to compel the Natives to adopt English ways and continued to recognize the authority of Konkopot and Umpachene—despite the latter’s growing ill will—and many of the Housatonics easily embraced marriage, baptism, Anglo-American farming, and added English names when baptized (Konkopot added John, and Umpachene added Aaron). Sergeant quickly learned the Native tongue and began drawing interested Mahicans from distant villages. In June 1739, 40 Native and four white families lived in the mission community, and the Massachusetts General Court voted to give the community full status as the town of Stockbridge (Frazier, 1992, 39-48; Wheeler, 2008, 30-64).

Provincial law required every town to hold at least one annual meeting, in the spring. Other essays in this volume examine the nature and process of the New England town meeting in more detail, but here it is useful to note that the town and its meeting remained through the early Republic the primary focus for individuals and groups in the region. Town meetings exercised legislative, judicial, and executive powers, and had the authority to deal with all aspects of life: moral (individual behavior), economic (wages and prices), administrative (markets and roads), and even household relations. While only men with sufficient property could participate and vote in town meetings, the bar was low enough that—particularly in farm towns—about three-quarters of all men qualified, and there is evidence that sometimes those below that bar were allowed to participate. The primary duty during the required meeting was to elect a set of officers to execute delegated authority at other times: those included several selectmen (similar to councilmen), one or more constables, and men to lay out roads, inspect fences, prevent stray hogs and evaluate their damage (hog reeves), enforce Sabbath rules (tithingmen), assess property for taxes, and other community needs. Generally men with the most prestige and wealth were repeatedly chosen selectmen, and often after they died their sons were given that authority, since deference and habit shaped community

decisions. While conflicts and contests could erupt, the normal New England town meeting was more an exercise in building consensus than a battleground for rough and tumble democracy (Gross, 1970, p. 11-15; Zuckerman, 1970, p. 154-186). That purpose was, of course, matched the consensus building (or confirming) goals of the councils and more informal meetings among Indian communities.

Konkopot and Umpachene formally called Stockbridge's first meeting for July 11, a month after the Court created the town. Three of the five Anglo-American men living in the town were selected for the posts necessary to conduct the gathering: Ephraim Williams was chosen moderator, to lead the meeting; Timothy Woodbridge became town clerk, responsible for keeping a written record of the meeting's decisions; and Josiah Jones was chosen constable, with duties including formal notice (in advance) of the town's meeting date, place, and agenda. No doubt the Indians, who vastly outnumbered the settlers, chose the others for these positions because they felt unfamiliar with the procedures and norms for the annual New England town meeting, and none knew how to read or write. But the Housatonics did choose Konkopot and Umpachene to be selectmen, the most powerful office in New England towns. Over the subsequent decade, until 1751 when Umpachene died and Konkopot "retired" from holding town offices, the two men would dominate Indian "representation" on the board of selectmen even as the former became increasingly resentful about provincial officials and settlers in the town. Like Native deacons, preachers, magistrates, and "Rulers of 100s" in the seventeenth-century Massachusetts Christian Indian communities, these eighteenth-century Mahican leaders easily took on the new roles and titles.⁴

The Housatonics also seemed to easily adapt to the format of the New England town meeting. Two decades later, Timothy Woodbridge and other Englishmen told the General Court that the Indians always attended town meetings and "acted with great unanimity in conjunction with the English." Since the beginning of the town, every proposal made at a general meeting would be explained in Mahican, and in every election each nominee would be introduced and the duties of their office explained in the same language—and no doubt in English as well. Those present would discuss the matter, person, and office for as long necessary, since (as the colonists put it) Indians "never form any schemes or plans of publick business beforehand." When all were ready, "the

⁴Stockbridge, Massachusetts, Town Records, 1739-1760, Stockbridge Town Hall (hereafter Stockbridge 1739-1760); Massachusetts, Massachusetts Archives, Colonial Records, Indian Series, Volume 33 (hereafter MA 33), p. 250. On the relatively easy adoption by Native Christians of some English leadership titles and roles in the seventeenth century see David Silverman, *Faith and Boundaries: Colonists, Christianity, and Community among the Wampanoag Indians of Martha's Vineyard, 1600-1871* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 84-93; and Harold W. Von Lonkhuyzen, "A Reappraisal of the Praying Indians: Acculturation, Conversion, and Identity at Natick, Massachusetts, 1646-1730," *New England Quarterly* 63 (1990): 396-428.

matter was determined by the lifting up the hand.” The additional language, *viva voce* voting, and lack of property restrictions (since few individual Indians owned land) reflected an adaptation of the standard New England town meeting to Native needs. At the same time, the ready participation of the Housatonics highlighted how New England town meetings were in many ways similar to contemporary Native gatherings.⁵

Indians and English in Stockbridge: The 1740s

During the 1740s, Stockbridge’s meetings, or at least the records from those meetings, highlighted various developments in the community, particularly the growing control of the town government by the English settlers. Through 1745, more Indians than whites were elected selectmen, usually three and two, reflecting the majority of the Stockbridge population while also giving the Anglos far more clout in the town government than “deserved” by their numbers. But beginning in 1746, as the English population in the town began to increase, the ratio shifted so that only two Indians and three whites were elected selectmen.⁶ The Indians seemed to accept that shift without protest, perhaps because they were not aware that a simple majority of the selectmen could meet and transact official business, and their “patron” Timothy Woodbridge continued to serve as moderator and clerk.⁷ But the shift had significance consequences: one result, described seventeen years later by a committee from the General Court, was that the English selectmen sometimes met and made decisions without telling their Indian counterparts, including issuing the legal warrant setting the date, time, and place for town meetings. As the Indians told the visitors, while two Indians were chosen every year, they “heard no more of it till chosen again.”⁸ Clearly the colonists were far more familiar with the intricacies of their customs including the rules for town governments, and while a significant justification for bringing English families to Stockbridge was to help the Indians learn “civilized” law and other habits, as the number of settlers increased they would increasingly seek ways of managing town concerns without the Natives.

Stockbridge’s government also became more complex as more English (and Indians) settled in the town, and in the process reflected the widening divide between Indians and English communities. Perhaps more significantly, beginning in 1747 the town meeting chose one Indian and one settler to be constables, whereas before it had always elected a single white man to that office. No records explain that change, but it seems clear that the Indians wanted one of their own to explain and enforce the laws, and from that point on each of

⁵MA 33, p. 250.

⁶Stockbridge 1739-1760.

⁷The General Court’s committee in October 1763 noted that Woodbridge “is looked upon as the Patron of the Indians”; MA 33, p. 277.

⁸MA 33, p. 279-280.

the constables were responsible for notifying their own people about town meetings. Beginning in 1742, the meeting chose one or two tithingmen: only Indians were elected to that position; why is not clear: perhaps because most of the inhabitants were Mahicans, and the tithingmen had to know the language of their people, or perhaps because the minister (first Sergeant and later Jonathan Edwards) was chosen and paid by the SPG officially on behalf of the Indians rather than the town. Two years later, the meeting began to elect fence viewers and road surveyors, and in 1746 hog reeves: one Englishman and one settler was chosen for each of these positions, emphasizing the existence of two distinct communities as well as Native acculturation. Through 1748, Timothy Woodbridge as town clerk recorded only the election results and (in 1745) the routes for several roads approved by the town, although it seems logical to assume that more *must* have been discussed at each meeting in the new town.⁹

In fact, the first recorded conflict between Indians and Anglos in Stockbridge involved the town meeting. On October 31, 1748, Sergeant, Woodbridge, and the heads of the other four English families in the town complained to the General Court of "irregular Proceedings" and asked it to nullify the meeting results. The Indian constable Benjamin Kaukauenaunat (the first one ever elected) was away when he was supposed to notify the town (or least the Indians in it) about the upcoming meeting, so Konkopot and Umpachene, the two Indian selectmen, did instead. The six men told the Court that they had objected at the start and wanted to schedule a second meeting, but the Indians refused for they "could not be convinced that the first Meeting was illegal." Perhaps the Indians had not been told until that point that only a constable had the power under provincial law to call an official town meeting, or perhaps they did not understand why such a prerequisite was necessity. The General Court in June 1749 ordered another town meeting, but none transpired and so Stockbridge apparently managed without officers that year.¹⁰

The conflict within the meeting was driven in part by growing tensions between the Housatonics and the settlers over landholding and the original agreement that created the town. During the 1748 meeting, the Englishmen had sought to establish specific allotments for individual Natives, apparently in an effort to make clearer the boundaries of otherwise vague claims; various Indians protested, leading the English to ask for another meeting that the Indians refused. In the fall of 1749, the Indians gave a visiting General Court committee a long accounting of their grievances about the settlers. Perhaps the greatest irritation was that more Anglo families had come to Stockbridge than initially promised, they were taking about twice the area initially allocated to the English including the best meadow and no swampland, and were preventing Indian representatives from monitoring the allotments. There were other land issues as well; in particular, Ephraim Williams had obtained several pieces that the

⁹Stockbridge 1739-1760.

¹⁰Stockbridge 1739-1760; MA 31, 604.

Natives claimed without delivering the promised compensation. While he agreed to a new survey, no changes were made. But the General Court did get the Indians to form a proprietorship to make formal land allotments, a change that (although Umpachene apparently continued to object) may have become attractive as the social disruptions increased and the conflicts with their white neighbors went unresolved. In June 1750, the 42 Indian proprietors met and agreed to divide a large part of their lands; those allotments were almost entirely between 50 and 80 acres, highlighting the continued importance of consensus and how their landholding (unlike other Massachusetts towns), did not reflect hierarchy. The Indians also managed to avoid dividing half of their area, officially because they wished to keep part of the town open to new immigrants (Frazier, 1992, p. 83-87).

The Housatonics indeed received a noticeable number of Native immigrants through the early 1750s. Between 1739 and 1742, many Mahicans from northwest Connecticut moved there, and in 1744 the entire village of Kaunameek (about fifteen families) in New York arrived. Stockbridge also became the capital of the Mahican tribe and the River Confederacy ("fireplace of the Nation") after the tribe's sachem Corlair died in May 1741 and Umpachene (married to Corlair's daughter) inherited the position. The connections also went the other way, as Umpachene developed warm relationships with the German Moravians who had established a mission at the Mahican village of Shekomenko in New York along the lower Hudson River, and Moravian missionaries regularly visited the new sachem and other Mahicans at Stockbridge. But the flow of Indian migrants was mostly to Stockbridge, and the Natives continued to vastly outnumber their white neighbors; in 1749, the town contained 218 Indians in 53 households and perhaps 60 whites in 12 families. The most noteworthy arrival was a group of nearly 100 Mohawks in October 1751, who came in large part so their children could attend a school for their people established by the province in the town, as Massachusetts used the mission school to foster direct relationships with the tribe. The records do not indicate that the Housatonics resented the sudden arrival of so many members of the tribe that had once been deadly enemies, perhaps because the newcomers apparently lived separately and did not try to attend the town meetings (Wheeler, 2008, p. 180-181).

Changes in Tribe and Town at Mid-Century

During the 1750s, Stockbridge's meetings and elections pointed to noteworthy changes in the town and the region at mid-century. Timothy Woodbridge continued serving as town clerk as well as meeting moderator, and in addition to the officers elected he began to record issues and items discussed and decided by the meeting. The detailed accounts began in March 1750, when the town voted against establishing either a grist or a saw mill, decided to build a new or better animal pound and for Josiah Jones to serve as pound keeper, and to allow

hogs to “go at large” for the year. It took four more meetings--in April, June, July, and finally August—before the meeting voted to approve several road proposals. Six months later, in February 1751, another special meeting was held that agreed to “settle” and support the Rev. Jonathan Edwards to replace Rev. Sergeant, who had died in 1749.¹¹

A month after that, the regularly scheduled annual meeting voted to replace window glass in the meetinghouse and allow several Englishmen to build gates on their land across the road—and as usual elected a slate of officers to manage things for the next year. During the decade the list of officers continued to grow, including (in addition to tithingmen, fence viewers, and hog reaves) more road surveyors (whose plans became a standard agenda item each year), a treasurer (always Timothy Woodbridge), and occasionally sealers of leather and of weights and measures. Woodbridge may have become more careful or competent at his clerk duties, but it is more likely that these “ordinary” decisions and the additional offices—both of which were typical for New England town meetings--became necessary as more colonists and their families moved to Stockbridge and the surrounding valley began to fill with new towns and settlers.¹²

Another noteworthy change appeared in the division of offices between Indians and colonists. Two Natives and three Englishmen continued to constitute the board of selectmen, and one Native and one Englishman continued to serve as constable for their respective groups—except in 1755, perhaps because nearly all of the Indian men went to fight for the English in the Seven Years War (Frazier, 1992, p. 110-112). But the more minor (though still important) offices were increasingly dominated by settlers. In the 1740s, Natives were usually all of the tithingmen, but beginning in 1753 the office was shared by one Native and one settler. Before 1754, usually the town elected one Indian and one English hog reeve, but that year two Englishman were chosen and that pattern continued with one exception (in 1756). Not surprisingly, colonists dominated the (occasional) offices of sealer of leather and sealer of weights and measures. More unexpected is that the fence viewers were nearly all English, with only one Indian elected after 1746.¹³ One might think that, because indigenous horticulture had no use for fences, the fence viewers served (and were elected by) solely the English households, but even in 1739 a visitor noted that the Stockbridge Indians “have good fence about their Field, made with their own hands” (*Boston Post Boy*, September 3, 1739). Perhaps the primary reason for the shift from Native or shared governance to white domination was the notable increase in the number of English settlers between 1751 and 1763 (from 70 to 160) and a less-precipitous but still noticeable decline in the town’s Indian population (from 220 to 206), along with the absence of so many Native men at

¹¹Stockbridge 1739-1760.

¹²Stockbridge 1739-1760.

¹³Stockbridge 1739-1760.

the war during the second half of the decade (Miles, 1994, p. 74).

A decade of instability in the Stockbridge Indian leadership may have helped to reduce their power in the Stockbridge government. In 1751, Umpachene died and Konkopot “retired” from holding office (although he continued to sign petitions from the Indian community). The Natives who had immigrated during the previous decade played a more prominent role in the town, but no one replaced the two Housatonic leaders in terms of their influence and no individual dominated Indian representation in the town government. Only two men were elected selectman more than twice 1750-1759: Peter Pophquanupeet four times and Johannis Mtockson three. Mtockson spoke and wrote English, had kinship connections to Corlair, and was a “Great sachem” in northwest Connecticut before moving to Stockbridge, was first chosen the Indian constable in 1748 and again in 1756, and elected surveyor five times during the decade. Benjamin Kakhkauenaunauk, another immigrant and Umpachene's successor as Mahican sachem, was chosen the Indian constable four times 1746-1752, tithingman twice, and selectman twice. One other prominent Mahican, Isaac Waunaupet, also served only two years, and five men served one term each.¹⁴ This volatile office holding reflected Native service in the Seven Years (French and Indian) War: Kakhkauenaunauk, his grandson Jacob Cheeksaunkun, and Solomon Uhhaunauwaunmut left to fight in the war and so did not begin serving as selectman until the late 1750s, as well the passing of prominent tribal leaders (Frazier, 1992, p. 12, 112). By comparison, English office holding in the town was extremely stable and continued to be dominated by the original families: their “slots” on the board of selectmen were controlled by Samuel Brown (eight years) and Timothy Woodbridge's brother Joseph (seven years); Timothy and original settler Josiah Jones both served four years.¹⁵

During this decade, Stockbridge was torn by conflict among the English settlers, primarily between the Williams and Woodbridge families, which involved the Indian majority. Those battles are invisible in the town records—we know about them from personal letters and provincial archives—but would have certainly affected its meetings and elections. The struggle erupted when famed “New Light” minister Jonathan Edwards, who had been driven out of Northampton by the Williams family, applied for the Stockbridge pulpit. Ephraim Williams along with Josiah Jones and a few others sought to recruit the younger Ezra Stiles instead, while Timothy and Joseph Woodbridge and their friends supported Edwards. Both sought the support of the Mahican majority: their dislike of Williams and long friendship with Timothy Woodbridge decided the matter. After Edwards arrived in June 1751, the battle intensified over a school being established in the town for Iroquois children. Joseph Dwight, a powerful man in the province and trustee for the school, came to Stockbridge and married

¹⁴Stockbridge 1739-1760.

¹⁵Stockbridge 1739-1760.

Ephraim's daughter Abigail, creating an alliance that fought Edwards at every turn and attempted to profit from the school. Edwards fired a barrage of letters accusing schoolmaster Martin Kellogg, backed by Williams, with gross incompetency and embezzling funds. With the backing of another fund, Edwards hired a different schoolmaster, Gideon Hawley, who proved to be quite successful with the Mohawks and left few with Kellogg—who reacted by assaulting Hawley. The “school war” finally ended in early 1753 when Hawley's schoolhouse burned down—Edwards suspected arson—and the Mohawks left in disgust. Nothing in the town meeting records hinted at these conflicts, except perhaps the Woodbridges' prominence in town offices and the relative absence of the Williams family in 1753 and 1755-1757 (Frazier, 1992, p. 90-92, 98-103).

The 1763 Town Meeting Battle

Even as these factions fought each other, the social and political divide in the town between Indians and English widened. In the 1730s, Massachusetts had agreed to supply the Housatonics with a minister, school, and other needs, but by 1750 Stockbridge's English residents were becoming irritated at the need to pay some town expenses (such as Edwards' salary and apparently poor relief to some Indians) on their own. In November 1751, the settlers complained to the General Court, and in response, the assembly authorized the creation of a separate English precinct, allowing the settlers to caucus and raise money separately from the regular town meeting—often the morning before the larger gathering. Judging from the precinct records, their paramount concerns were insuring defensive measures against Indian attacks and building a separate schoolhouse (Miles, 1994, 59).¹⁶ In 1753, the acquittal of a white man who killed the son of Solomon Waunaupaugus drew Mahican anger, generating colonial concerns that some of the younger Indians were forming a conspiracy with some Shawnees to massacre the English. Tensions grew as the Seven Years War erupted, and in September 1754, an Indian attack on the cabin of Samuel Brown's son-in-law triggered near-hysteria and lingering, widespread suspicions that Stockbridge Indians were involved (Frazier, 1992, p. 105-109).

The first effort to substantively separate the two peoples emerged in May 1761, when Elijah Williams--son of Ephraim, Princeton graduate, merchant, and one of the selectmen elected that March--petitioned the General Court to allow the English “to transact all Matters relative to the Premises by themselves.” Williams complained that the Indian “manner of living” was so different that the white inhabitants faced “many inconveniencies”; in particular, the Indians had their school funded by outside charity and had no interest in raising or paying taxes to pay for roads, meetinghouse improvements, schools for the settlers' children. The Assembly passed a bill that would have authorized the English to deal with “certain matters” without the Indians, but, after the Indians

¹⁶English Precinct Records.

were asked for comments, the Governor's Council killed the bill, perhaps because of Woodbridge's opposition. To drive the point home, the General Court told Stockbridge's English settlers that they were responsible for paying the town tax, over £93 (Miles, 1994, p. 59-60). While this initiative failed, Indians may not have been present at a special town meeting held that October, which voted to remodel and repair the meetinghouse, or at another three months later that voted a small sum to support a school. It is certain, however, that Natives did attend the March 1762 meeting that not only chose the usual "mixed" slate of officers (with an Indian constable, tithingman, surveyor, and two selectmen), but enacted several measures to establish a school specifically for the English children and voted large sums creating and repairing highways.¹⁷ Clearly the entire town meeting continued to be able to enact substantive matters, although these measures pointed at the division between English and Indians in the community.

But one year later, in March 1763, Elijah Williams and a large group of supporters sought to take control of the town meeting. Williams and the two other English selectmen, Stephen Nash and Samuel Brown, met around March 10, called the meeting for the 21st, and issued a warrant for the English to be alerted – but failed to inform the Indians.¹⁸ Timothy Woodbridge was in Albany on business.¹⁹ Nearly all of the Indians were miles away gathering maple sugar; as a result, few were able to attend. The meeting began with Joseph Woodbridge chosen as moderator and treasurer, perhaps in place of his younger brother Timothy who usually held those offices, and Samuel Brown elected town clerk. The trouble began when it came time to choose selectmen. The Indians later charged that the English chose that moment to bring out ballots, while Williams told the General Court's committee that the earlier elections were handled in the same way. Both agreed that this was the first meeting in which ballots were used and that the Indians were mystified and objected to the procedure. When the votes were counted Elijah Williams had been reelected selectmen along with Samuel Brown and John Taylor, as well as Kakhkauenaunauk and Mtockson – who may not have even been present at the meeting.²⁰ The few Indians at the meeting demanded that the absent Timothy Woodbridge also be named to the board of selectmen; when the English demurred, the Indians walked out and refused to participate in the town government, along with Joseph Woodbridge and constable Elihu Parsons. In the meantime, the three English selectmen called a meeting to choose the town's

¹⁷Stockbridge, Massachusetts, Town Records, 1739-1760, Stockbridge Town Hall (hereafter Stockbridge 1760-1815).

¹⁸Stockbridge 1760-1815.

¹⁹Woodbridge was a stockholder in the Susquehanna Company of Connecticut, and beginning in the mid-1750s often traveled as the company's interpreter and representative in dealings with Native peoples, particularly in the Wyoming Valley of Pennsylvania. In March he went to Albany, New York, to meet with Native leaders contesting with some of the Company's recent purchases. Marsden, 2003, p. 184-185.

²⁰Stockbridge 1760-1815.

delegate to the General Court; again, little notice was given to either the Indians or the “dissatisfied English,” and with the backing of several questionable voters Elijah Williams was elected in place of Timothy Woodbridge.²¹

After Woodbridge returned from Albany, the Indians told him about the events and together they persuaded two of the English selectmen to join Mtockson and Kakhkaunaunauk in calling for a new meeting, on March 30. Elijah Williams refused to sign the warrant, and he and his allies refused to acknowledge the results of the election held at that meeting—results entirely absent from the town records--leaving Stockbridge with two sets of officers for various positions. Williams, Brown, and Taylor issued a warrant for a meeting in May to replace Woodbridge, Parsons, and the Indian officers, but (according to the Indian petition) “the Town Judged they were supplied with Those officers and so refused to Act.” In the meantime, Joseph Woodbridge and the Indians sent two separate petitions to the General Court complaining of how Williams had tried to manipulate the meetings through secrecy, the new use of ballots, bringing “many Strangers to vote for him,” and other devious procedures. The Indians were particularly upset that the Williams faction refused their demand to have Timothy Woodbridge placed on the board of selectmen, since only “father Mr. Woodbridge” ensured that the Indian selectmen participated in board meetings; they also charged Williams and his faction with seeking to obtain their lands as well as all of the power in the town.²² In response, the General Court dispatched an investigative committee to the town in early October to meet with the all of the parties. Williams denied nearly all of the charges except deliberately giving short notice about the meeting to elect the town delegate so (he said) “the Indians who paid nothing towards a Representative might not . . . choose a person for the English, who paid the whole Charge.”²³

At the end of December, after the committee left Stockbridge, Timothy Woodbridge wrote another petition to the General Court, signed by his English allies and nine leading Native men, complaining about the “illegal and imprudent conduct” at the meeting, and bitterly noted that it “appears very injurious” that the settlers would “croud into the Town and to get estates and then to cry out that they cannot bear to be a Society with Indians.” He reemphasized that it had always been the town’s custom for voting was done by a show of hands, that “the Indians have always attended Town meetings have been chosen into Town offices and acted with great unanimity in conjunction with the English,” but that lately some of the settlers had been trying to “worm them out of their privileges”—referring either to the particular promises made by the province in 1736, or the more general privileges of freeholders to participate and vote in town meetings and to serve in town offices. Finally, he warned the

²¹MA 33, p. 265-268, 277-283.

²²MA 33, p. 265-268; the petition from Joseph Woodbridge (and others) is not extant.

²³MA 33, p. 265-268, 277-283.

General Court that if the Indian concerns were not addressed, the recent events would prove a means of destroying all the benevolent designs of the Government toward the Indians by creating such Jealousies in their minds.”²⁴

In early February 1764, the committee reported to the General Court with its findings on all of the charges made in the two petitions. Their report often included different views of a particular event and details on particular charges without passing judgment. But they did find that, until March 21, the Stockbridge town meetings had always featured long discussions in the Mahican language and open voting, that the meeting on that date was legally called and held, and that it was likely that, given the increase in English population in the town, even if all the eligible Indian voters had attended, the results would probably not have been different. They also noted that Stockbridge now had nearly as many English as Indian residents, and that soon the former would “become the governing Interest of the place.”²⁵ The committee recommended that, considering that the conflicts resulted from “the different Interest of the English & Indians,” the two should be separated “into distinct Societys.” In response, a bill was introduced requiring future town meetings to choose at least two English and two Indian selectmen; each “set” would call for a separate election for their people to choose (and pay for) a delegate to the General Court.²⁶ Timothy Woodbridge threw his weight against the proposal, scorning the “violent and inconsiderate disposition” of many settlers and telling the Court “I am unwilling to be controlled by them if I can avoid it.” Besides, he noted, the Indians had shared the cost of everything except the school and in other matters were perfectly willing “to bear the burden with the English.”²⁷ In the end, the proposal died.

Much remains mysterious about the Stockbridge meeting controversies. As already noted, the town records include only the results of the meeting on March 21 and none of the objections or disruptions during or after that gathering. In fact, there is no mention in the town records of any election, in any year, for a delegate to the General Court. But even the petitions to the General Court and the Court’s investigative committee report fail to answer some significant questions. Joseph Woodbridge, who joined the protest in support of the Indians (and his brother), served as moderator during the March 21 meeting and was at least nominally in charge when the ballot was suddenly introduced as the Indians protested—yet apparently said and did nothing.²⁸ Why? Elijah Williams told the committee that he was frustrated at Indian prominence in the town meeting in part because the English wanted a school to which the Natives would not contribute, yet one year earlier the town meeting had voted funds for

²⁴MA 33, p. 249-251.

²⁵MA 33, p. 277-287.

²⁶MA 33, p. 256-259.

²⁷MA 33, p. 260-261.

²⁸On the powerful role of the town meeting moderator see Zuckerman, 1970, p. 162-163.

a school for the English and elected a committee (all Englishmen) to find a schoolmaster, so why did he see it as a problem? On the Indian side, their petition argued that Timothy Woodbridge had been selectman “a great many years” until “several years past,” but in fact since 1745 he had held that position only twice, 1752 and 1756; instead it was his older brother Joseph who was normally one of the five selectman, holding that position when Timothy was not on the board. These are hints of a “Woodbridge seat,” so that when Timothy was in town he was able to attend selectmen meetings and act as intermediary for his Indian connections.²⁹

Indigenous People and New England Town Politics

The Housatonic-Mahican experiences in Stockbridge reveal important aspects of the development of Native and New England town politics during the late colonial period. The Indians seemed to adapt readily to New England town governance, electing their sachems and local leaders to the board of selectmen and other offices, and easily participating in town meetings. In fact, 18^e siecle Stockbridge highlighted the common ground of the Indians’ standard of community consensus and the puritan New England paradigm of the town as a community infused with harmony (Hoffer, 1998, 50-74; Richter, 1992, p. 7, 40-42; Gross, 1970, p. 14-15; Zuckerman, 1970). At the same time, there were limits. The Stockbridge Indians lacked the experience with and aptitude for English rules of procedure, which caused them to run afoul of various rules (some unwritten), such as who needed to warn town residents about upcoming meetings. They knew little about ballots and were horrified by the idea of secret voting. They may have been exaggerating for effect when they told the General Court that they depended upon Timothy Woodbridge to “gently and gradually to Lead our people into the knowledge of government and benefit of the english Laws”³⁰—after all, Johannis Mtockson and other Housatonics could read and write, and by 1763 had over a decade of experience in town government—but there seems little doubt that the Indians were at a disadvantage when it came to knowing and applying the details of English procedure and law. The larger lesson is that those who study indigenous-colonial political relations would do well to embrace the paradigm of syncretism and adaptation already adopted by scholars of Native American Christianity (Martin, Nicholas, 2010).

The Stockbridge experience also highlights certain aspects of town meeting procedure. Perhaps most strikingly, it shows that not all New England towns had embraced secret ballots, even by the mid-18th century.³¹ There is no indication until the 1763 controversy that the English settlers were upset or baffled by the *viva voce* norms in the town meetings, nor that the General

²⁹Stockbridge 1760-1815.

³⁰MA 33, p. 265.

³¹Michael Zuckerman found that “a secret, unidentifiable ballot was employed” in town elections in Massachusetts “from early on”; Zuckerman, 1970, p. 177.

Court's investigating committee was surprised by it, and the assembly did not direct Stockbridge to adopt the ballot. Stockbridge may have been somewhat unique with regards to the apparent lack of property requirements to vote in the town, since few individual Indian men held land in their own right until the 1750 allotment, but on the other hand, town meetings elsewhere in New England similarly learned towards inclusivity (Zuckerman, 1970, p. 164-165). Finally, the various meeting controversies emphasize how the General Court often played a significant role in town politics. The Court had broad powers, and although towns were assumed to have large amount of autonomy, aggrieved parties could and did appeal to it in the hope of achieving a favorable resolution of conflicts. No doubt the Stockbridge Indians were more likely to take that step because their experience and legal status placed them in a boundary area between provincial subjects and sovereign indigenous groups, but the Woodbridges and other aggrieved colonists took the same step. More broadly, the conflict between Woodbridge and Williams and their respective "parties" demonstrated that contests over individual and community needs shaped town meetings even (or perhaps because) participants were supposed to find and focus on the actions that best meet the needs of the town.

The Stockbridge controversies also highlighted how Native Americans linked politics and land. Almost from the beginning of the town, the Williams family had alienated the Natives by seeking to get as much land in the town as possible, and their 1763 petition complained that Elijah Williams and his friends were "endeavouring not only to get all the power but our Lands too into their hands"³² The committee investigated that concern and reported various illegal transactions including Elijah Williams's 500-year lease obtained from Konkopot's son Robert Nangkauwaut, a notorious drunkard, and urged that no future purchases of Indian land be allowed without approval of the General Court. But the Court could not or would not invalidate the deals, and the sales continued. Through the 1760s, individual Indians used the collective responsibility (and land) of the community to obtain credit, building a pile of debt that could met only by selling, leasing, or mortgaging Stockbridge land at poor rates since provincial law banned the sale of Indian land to whites. In 1765, the General Court allowed the Indians to sell land to meet current debts, and within just four years the settlers more than doubled the percentage of land that they owned in the town, from 22 percent to 48 percent. By 1773, the Indians owned about 1,400 acres in their town, just 6 percent of the original area (Miles, 1994, p. 69-70).

Yet even as the Stockbridge Indians hemorrhaged land to the English, much of it to the detested Williams, they retained a strong presence in the town's government. The Indian "representation" on the board of selectmen resumed the stability that it had in the 1740s, and inevitably included one or more Mahican leaders. Benjamin Kakhkauenaunauk, who inherited the sachemship from

³²MA 33, p. 67.

Umpachene and became known as “King Benjamin,” was elected seven times between 1760 and his death in 1771. His grandson, Jacob Cheeksonkun, as commissioned a lieutenant for a Stockbridge Indian company during the Seven Years War, was part of the tribe’s delegation to England in 1765. He served as selectman five times during the decade. Solomon Uhhaunauwauunmut, another wartime officer and delegation member, served three years in the 1760s, succeeded Kakhkauenaunauk as Mahican sachem, and then was chosen a selectman every year until he died in 1777. Johannis Mtockson, the leader of immigrants from northwest Connecticut and apparently the one sachem who remained in the town during the Seven Years War and was also on the 1765 delegation, served on the board of selectmen fifteen times during the nineteen years between 1760 and 1778, a record far more consistent than that of any of his white contemporaries. Only one other Indian, John Naunaumphonk, was chosen a selectman before the Revolution, and just once, in 1765 (Frazier, 1992, p. 112-164).³³

Indians also continued to fill “inferior” positions in Stockbridge; in fact, the range and number of offices that included an Indian member increased notably in the second half of the decade. In 1765, the town meeting chose not only an Indian to serve as constable, tithingman, and surveyor, but also for the first time hog reeve. Two years later, one Indian was elected to every position, including the recently established office of warden (possibly tree warden, with the responsibility to monitor cutting and removing trees from public land); one year after that, all offices except hog reeve; and the following year (1769) all offices except fence viewer. The Native men who filled these minor but important positions, like their colonial counterparts, were not the most prominent men in the community, except for Johannis Mtockson who served several times as surveyor and once as fence viewer.³⁴ Although the English were the majority of Stockbridge voters by mid-century and after 1765 were allowed to tax and spend by themselves, the Indians clearly continued to play a significant role in town government.

In fact, Elijah Williams seemed to have been the loser and the Indians the victors in the 1763 controversy: while he continued as county sheriff, he was elected selectman only twice, in 1764 and 1769, whereas Timothy Woodbridge was chosen every year from 1765 until his death in 1774. Woodbridge’s constant presence would certainly have ensured that the Indian selectmen took part in board meetings and encouraged all of the Indian men to resume participation in the annual meeting. Those meetings may have, in fact, discarded the ballot and resumed use of *viva voce*, since the Indians never again complained about that matter. It is clear that every annual Stockbridge meeting, in addition to electing officers, dealt with the same substantive matters as in the 1750s: deciding to allow swine to run free, funding English schools and highways, approving plans

³³Stockbridge 1760-1815.

³⁴Stockbridge 1760-1815.

for new roads, and paying town creditors. It took ten years for Williams and his allies to be rid of the Indians; finally, in 1774, after Woodbridge died, the General Court voted to allow their western section of Stockbridge to become a separate town. Even that somewhat hollow victory was short-lived because, in May 1777, as the Revolution bogged down, Williams was arrested and jailed for loyalist views (Miles, 1998, p. 70-73).³⁵

The Stockbridge Indians did decide, after the American Revolution, to leave that town and move west. In 1774, the Oneidas in New York offered land to various New England Indian communities that had been reduced to "a Small Pittance of Land," including the Housatonics in Stockbridge; the Indians discussed the offer, but made no decision. That same year, the Massachusetts Provincial Congress asked the Stockbridge Indians for their support and persuaded several to represent the "rebels" before the Kahnawake Mohawks. The Stockbridgers labored (unsuccessfully) on behalf of the colonists because they considered themselves part of Massachusetts society. One year later, after the war began, the town's Indians and whites went in separate companies to fight in the same army for American independence. The Indians fought in the Battle of Bunker Hill and the siege of Boston, but were decimated at the Battle of White Plains in 1778. At the end of the war, George Washington honored their loyalty with a special feast; at its end, the warriors ceremonially buried their war hatchet. Not long after, they decided to accept the Oneida offer. The Indians did not leave as a body, but gradually moved in small family groups to "New Stockbridge." After 1800, the rise of an Oneida prophet and Tecumseh's confederacy against the Americans increased tensions at New Stockbridge, and led them to obtain land from the Miamis and Potawatomis at White River, Indiana. Most of the community moved there in 1818, but found that the U.S. government had in the meantime signed a treaty and claimed the entire area, forcing them to obtain more land from the Menominees in Wisconsin, where they found a new home in 1822. The Stockbridge-Munsee tribe is still there, and still manages to straddle American and Native ways of life (Silverman, 2010).

References

Brasser, T. J., 1974, *Riding on the Frontier's Crest: Mahican Indian Culture and Culture Change*, Ottawa, Canada: National Museum of Man, Mercury Series, Ethnology Division Paper No. 13.

Colee, P. "The *Housatonic*-Stockbridge Indians, 1734-1749." Ph.D. diss., State University of New York, Albany, 1977.

Frazier, P., 1992, *The Mahicans of Stockbridge*, Lincoln, University of

³⁵Stockbridge 1760-1815.

Nebraska Press.

Hoffer, P., 1998, *Law and People in Colonial America*, 2nd ed., Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hopkins, S., 1753, *Historical Memoirs, Relating to the Housatunnuk Indians*, Boston: S. Kneeland.

Mandell, D. "'Turned Their Minds to Religion': Oquaga and the First Iroquois Church, 1748-1776." *Early American Studies* 11, no. 2 (Spring 2013): 211-42.

Mandell, D. "Behind the Frontier: Indian Communities in Eighteenth-Century Massachusetts." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1992.

Mochon, M. "Stockbridge-Munsee Cultural Adaptation: 'Assimilated Indians.'" *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, no. 112, June 1968.

Martin, J., Nicholas, M., 2010, eds., *Native Americans, Christianity, and the Reshaping of the American Religious Landscape*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press.

Marsden, G., 2003, *Jonathan Edwards: A Life*, New Haven, Yale University Press.

Miles, L., 1994, "The Red Man Dispossessed: The Williams Family and the Alienation of Indian Land in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, 1736-1818," *New England Quarterly*, 67, p. 46-76.

Richter, D., 1992, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Silverman, D.J., 2010, *Red Brethren: The Brothertown and Stockbridge Indians and the Problem of Race in Early America*, Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press.

Wallace, A.F.C., 1957, "Political Organization and Land Tenure Among the Northeastern Indians, 1630-1830," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 13, p. 301-321.

Wheeler, R., 2008, *To Live Upon Hope: Mahicans and Missionaries in the Eighteenth-Century Northeast*, Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press.

Zuckerman, M., 1970, *Peaceable Kingdoms: New England Towns in the Eighteenth Century*, Boston, Knopf.