**National Register of Historic Places Registration Form**

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form (National Register Bulletin 16A). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the information requested. If an item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. Place additional entries and narrative items on continuation sheets (NPS Form 10-900A). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer, to complete all items.

### 1. Name of Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>historic name</th>
<th>Old Indian Agency House (additional documentation and boundary expansion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>other names/site number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>street &amp; number</th>
<th>1490 Agency House Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>city or town</td>
<td>Portage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>code</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>county</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>code</td>
<td>021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vicinity</td>
<td>021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not for publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vicinity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>code</td>
<td>021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zip code</td>
<td>53901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, I hereby certify that this X nomination request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property X meets. does not meet the National Register criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant X nationally _statewide _locally. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of certifying official/Title: [Signature]

Date: 4/30/12

State Historic Preservation Officer - Wisconsin

State or Federal agency and bureau

In my opinion, the property _meets _does not meet the National Register criteria. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of commenting official/Title: [Signature]

Date: [Date]

State or Federal agency and bureau
4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that the property is:

- [ ] entered in the National Register.
- [ ] determined eligible for the National Register.
- [ ] determined not eligible for the National Register.
- [ ] removed from the National Register.
- [ ] other, (explain:)

[Signature of the Keeper] 6.20.12

Date of Action

5. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of Property</th>
<th>Category of Property</th>
<th>Number of Resources within Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(check as many boxes as apply)</td>
<td>(Check only one box)</td>
<td>(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X private</td>
<td>X building(s)</td>
<td>contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public-local</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>noncontributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public-State</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>2 buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public-Federal</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of related multiple property listing:
(Enter "N/A" if property not part of a multiple property listing.)

N/A

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register

1

6. Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC/single dwelling</td>
<td>RECREATION AND CULTURE/museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Classification</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLY REPUBLIC/Federal</td>
<td>Foundation Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>walls Weatherboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roof Shingle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other Wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)
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INTRODUCTION

The Old Indian Agency House is located at 1490 Agency House Road at the northeastern edge of the city of Portage, Columbia County, Wisconsin. The property is composed of the House (a contributing resource previously listed on the National Register), one contributing archaeological site (the Old Indian Agency House Archaeological Site, CO-0228), and two non-contributing resources (the Caretaker’s Cottage and the Visitor’s Center and Administrative Building). The House is a two-story, front-gabled frame building that displays the influence of the Federal style (see photo 1). Erected in 1832, the House rests on a stone rubble foundation and is finished with clapboards. There is brick infill in the walls. Wood shingles cover the roof. Distinguished Madison architect Frank Riley oversaw the rehabilitation of the House in 1931-32. The Caretaker’s Cottage is a one-story, frame, clapboarded, Front Gable building that was constructed in 1931-32 (see photo 2). The Visitor’s Center and Administrative Building, erected in 1967, is a one-story, frame, Cross-Gabled building clad with clapboards (see photo 3). The Visitor’s Center features details inspired by the Greek Revival style. The Old Indian Agency House opened as a museum on October 22, 1932.

DESCRIPTION

The Old Indian Agency House (hereafter, House) stands on the northwest side of Agency House Road (also known as Rustic Road 69), about one-half mile northeast of Highway 33, and one mile northeast of the central business district of the city of Portage. The old Portage Canal runs parallel to Agency House Road, southeast of the roadway. The historic boundary of the House was created for the 1972 National Register nomination by designating an unidentified 1.4 acres within the 200-acre parcel on which the House sits, presumably with the House at the center of the 1.4 acres. In 2011, the revised historic boundary has been created by drawing lines of convenience within the 200-acre parcel that enclose all those resources associated with the House during its period of significance, 1832-34, as well as all the test units investigated in the archaeological survey carried out in 1988 (see attached Figure 1, Old Indian Agency House, #47-CO-0228). This parcel is about 1.6 acres, requiring a boundary expansion for this nomination. Most of the remainder of the 200-acre parcel has been left undeveloped since farming on the parcel ceased in 1928, and is now a mix of woods and marsh.

Within the historic boundary of the House property, the Visitor’s Center and Administrative Building stands northeast of the House, while the Caretaker’s Cottage is located northwesterly (to the rear) of the House. An asphalted parking lot lies northeast of the Visitor’s Center and Administrative

2 Bertha A. Holbrook, “The Old Indian Agency House,” ca. 1944 typewritten manuscript, on file, Old Indian Agency House Binder, Portage, Wisconsin.
3 “Program for Agency House Rites.”
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Building, at the terminus of Agency House Road. The parking lot lies outside the historic boundary, and the parking lot’s southwestern edge forms part of the northeastern historic boundary. Thick plantings around the Caretaker’s Cottage obscure it from view; plantings also screen the Visitor’s Center and Administrative Building from the House.

A split rail fence, installed in 1933, surrounds the House, a broad lawn, and a few mature trees. A flagpole, installed in 1931, stands just south of the House, and a small gabled structure at the northwest corner of the House marks the location of a well, date unknown (these resources were deemed too small to count).  

Old Indian Agency House (Contributing)

The House is rectangular in plan, with the long axis set perpendicular to Agency House Road. The House consists of a two-story front section, and a smaller, one and one-half story rear (kitchen) section. These sections were both constructed in 1832. John H. Kinzie, the Subagent to the Ho-Chunk who directed the House’s construction, reported that the masons and carpenters were brought from St. Louis, the lumber came predominantly from Green Bay, the stone was quarried nearby, and the brick was made about two miles away on the present site of Pauquette Park. The overall footprint of the House measures about 54 feet (north-south) by about 30 feet (east-west). The depth of the eaves was reduced in the 1931-32 rehabilitation; in 2011, plans are to restore the original eave depth. Plain boards trim the corners, cornice, and water table in both sections. A heavy, square, interior brick chimney rises through the roof in each section. The front section exhibits wooden, double-hung sash windows in 12/8 configuration with simple, wooden surrounds. The rear (kitchen) section possesses 6/6 double-hung sash, and six-pane windows.

The House faces southerly, overlooking Agency House Road. The south-facing (front) façade of the House is three bays wide (see photo 4). The entrance consists of a paneled, wooden door in a plain surround. A gabled portico is set off-center, sheltering the front entrance. Two Doric columns rest on a stone slab floor, and support a simple entablature. The columns and the stone slab were installed in 1931-32. Previously, the porch had wooden flooring and beveled square posts (which may not have been original). Two windows light the first story, and three are evenly-distributed at the second story. Each window is framed with louvered shutters.

Holbrook.
6 John H. Kinzie, quoted in Kellogg, p. 443-444.
The north-facing (rear) facade is dominated by the kitchen section (see photo 5). Two, six-pane windows appear in the gable end; a third is found at the west end at the first story. On the front section of the House, a louvered vent can be seen in the gable end, and a window is set at the first story just east of the kitchen section.

Both the front and rear sections can be seen on the east-facing façade of the House (see photo 6). The front section possesses an entrance at the north end of the façade, composed of a paneled, wooden door in a simple surround (see photo 7). A gabled portico matching the one on the front façade frames the entrance. This portico dates from 1931-32; the roof-line conforms to the roof-line of the original portico.8 Two windows light the first floor south of the entrance, and three windows are found at the second story. A window is centered on the east-facing façade of the rear section (see photo 6).

The front and rear sections are both visible on the west-facing façade (see photo 8). The front section exhibits two windows at each of the first and second stories. A pair of louvered shutters marks a blind window at the second story; these are believed to be original.9 In the center of the façade, a pair of wooden doors is set almost parallel to the ground, giving access to the partial basement. This entrance is said to be original, allowing horses to be sheltered beneath the house in case of emergency. The rear section possesses a recessed porch, with a paneled, wooden door, and a window.

On the interior, the front section first floor plan is laid out with a broad entrance/stair hall, a living room (parlor), a dining room, and a small office (see attached HABS floor plans, Figures 4 & 5). A straight wooden staircase rises along the west wall to the second floor (see photo 9). The second floor of the front section is composed of four bedrooms arranged around the hall. The current dimensions of the rooms in the front section match the description John H. Kinzie reported: "There are on the ground floor, one room 19 x 19 ft.; one 14 x 19; one 10 x 14 and a small Hall. On the upper floor there is one room 19 x 19 ft; one 14 x 19 ft.; two 10 x 10 and a small hall."10

8 Holbrook. There has been some question as to whether there was a portico on this façade originally. In the opinion of the nomination preparer, there was. Juliette M. Kinzie, Wau-Bun: The Early Day in the Northwest," (Portage, Wisconsin: The National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the State of Wisconsin, 1989), 11th ed., p. 388, wrote, "...as we were seated at breakfast, a party of Indians entered the parlor, and came to the door of the room where we were [the dining room]. Two of them passed through, and went out upon a small portico..." (See Figure 4, first floor plan.)

9 Holbrook.

10 John H. Kinzie, quoted in Kellogg, p. 444.
Presently, there is a doorway leading from the stair hall into the office (on the first floor). This doorway post-dates 1932. The kitchen and a small pantry occupy the first floor of the rear section; a curving corner staircase provides access to the bedroom in the attic story (see photo 10).

Interior finishes primarily consist of plaster, applied directly to the brick infill on exterior walls, and to lath on interior partitions and ceilings. The living room is finished with wall paper, a 1932 reproduction of an earlier paper found on the wall. Broad board flooring is found throughout, most of which is original. A large fireplace with a simple surround dominates the kitchen (see photo 11). This fireplace dates from the 1931-32 rehabilitation and was built of old bricks on the foundation of the original hearth. Smaller fireplaces, all believed to be original, can be seen in the living room (see photo 12), the dining room (see photo 13), and the two large bedrooms (see photo 14, north bedroom). The mantelpieces in the dining room and the bedrooms are believed to be original.

Old Indian Agency House Archaeological Site (CO-0228) (Contributing)

The Old Indian Agency House Archaeological Site occupies the area around the house and encompasses the components related to the immediate domestic landscape of the House. These include the house itself, and associated structural remnants such as the remains of the blacksmith shop (exact location unidentified), cistern, privy, and carriage ruts, as well as the reported locations of Ho-Chunk graves (see Figure 1, Old Indian Agency House, #47-CO-0228). Aside from the house, there are no surface features to photograph. Extensive site excavation was undertaken in 1988, but never formally reported or evaluated. It should be noted that there are two other archaeological sites nearby, but insufficient study has been made of these sites to connect them to the period of significance of the House. These sites are: Agency Fields, CO-0326, a very large site with a scatter of pre-Contact and post-Contact artifacts and features, including a reported pre-Contact burial mound and the reported burial site of the prominent Ho-Chunk chief, Four Legs; and the DuBay Post, CO-0331, a smaller site reported to contain the remains of a cabin, the DuBay trading post, which was operated by a series of different traders between 1812 and 1857.

12 Holbrook.
13 Ibid.
14 Amy L. Rosebrough, Staff Archaeologist, Wisconsin Historical Society, to Destinee K. Udelhoven, Executive Director of Old Indian Agency House, December 3, 2009, summarizing archaeological survey records on file in the Wisconsin Historical Society.
Caretaker’s Cottage (Non-contributing)

The Caretaker’s Cottage was constructed in 1931-32, on the stone foundation of the barn (this barn was believed to have post-dated the period of significance). The Cottage faces south, toward the back of the Old Indian Agency House (see photo 2). A screened, shed-roofed porch marks the entrance. The Cottage exhibits 6/6 and 1/1 windows, and a wood-shingled roof.

Visitor’s Center and Administrative Building (Non-contributing)

The Visitor’s Center and Administrative Building, erected in 1967, is T-shaped in plan (see photo 3). The entrance is centered in a projecting, gabled section the displays Greek Revival details such as corner pilasters, a broach entablature, and a pedimented gable. The front door possesses a shouldered surround and is sheltered by a flat-roofed portico with square posts. The Visitor’s Center displays 6/6 windows.

ALTERATIONS

Alterations to the Old Indian Agency House date from the 1931-32 rehabilitation, which the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the State of Wisconsin (NSCDASW) initiated after acquiring the property. The NSCDASW recognized the historical significance of the House and wanted to preserve it, and operate it as a museum. The rehabilitation was planned by Frank Riley, a distinguished Madison architect. Exterior alterations included the replacement of deteriorated siding; rebuilding the two porticos with new Doric columns, and a stone slab floor; the width of the eaves of the roof were reduced (note that in 2011, the eave-width is being restored to its original dimensions), and the roof was surfaced with wooden shingles. On the interior, the kitchen fireplace and chimney was recreated using old bricks, placed on the foundation of the original hearth; the living room mantelpiece was fabricated, using the dining room mantelpiece as a guide; the living room was papered, using a reproduction of old wallpaper found in the room; a doorway was cut from the hall into the office (on the first floor); and deteriorated flooring was replaced to match the original. Overall, the House itself retains a high degree of integrity to the period of significance.

It should be noted that the Ho-Chunk subagency did include an unknown number of (perhaps four or five) small log buildings, which served as housing for the subagent prior to the completion of this house, as well as for the Interpreter (Pierre Pauquette, who also maintained a large home 12 miles from the Subagency), the blacksmith, the driver, and two or three other employees, and a blacksmith shop. Those resources are no longer extant. However, the Old Indian Agency House, which housed the Subagent and his office from 1832-1834, was the principal building at the Subagency, and is the

15 Holbrook.
building that best represents the Ho-Chunk Subagency. The loss of these smaller buildings does not compromise the significance of the Old Indian Agency House.

When the NSCDASW acquired the Old Indian Agency House, the property had been in agricultural use for some 75 years, and there were a few outbuildings. None was believed to have been present during the 1830s, and were demolished. In 1931-32, the Caretaker’s Cottage was built, using the foundation of one of the barns. The Visitor’s Center and Administrative Building followed in 1967. The placement of these buildings, the plantings that screen them from the house, their frame construction, and the one-story height of these buildings minimize their impact on the Old Indian Agency House. Neither the loss of the agricultural outbuildings, nor the addition of the non-contributing Caretaker’s Cottage and Visitor’s Center and Administrative Building compromise the integrity or significance of the Old Indian Agency House.
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for the National Register listing.)

X A  Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

_ B  Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

_ C  Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

_ D  Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark "x" in all the boxes that apply.)

Property is:

_ A  owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.

_ B  removed from its original location.

_ C  a birthplace or grave.

_ D  a cemetery.

_ E  a reconstructed building, object, or structure.

_ F  a commemorative property.

_ G  less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions)

Politics/government (additional documentation)

Period of Significance
1832-1834

Significant Dates
1832

Architect/Builder
Unknown

Significant Person
(Complete if Criterion B is marked)

Cultural Affiliation
N/A

Narrative Statement of Significance
(Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)
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STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Old Indian Agency House was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1972. At that time, it was considered locally significant in architecture, as “one of Wisconsin’s oldest and finest survivals of frame houses.” The Old Indian Agency House was also considered significant at the local level in social history. Although that nomination does not discuss the property’s social history significance directly, it does summarize the role of John Kinzie as Indian subagent to the Ho-Chunk (then known as the Winnebago), implying that the social history significance arises from serving as the house and office of the Indian Subagent to the Ho-Chunk. The 1972 nomination gives only “19th century” as the period of significance, with a specific date of 1832.

This nomination provides additional documentation to raise the significance of the Old Indian Agency House to the national level, in the category of politics/government, with a period of significance extending from 1832 to 1834, dates which encompass the completion of the building, and the end of its service as an Indian agent’s home and office. The property retains a high degree of integrity.

The Old Indian Agency House was built in 1832, using federal funds, to serve as the home and office of the Indian subagent to the Ho-Chunk, a use it served until July 1834. While this is a short period of time, this property represents a pivotal moment in the evolution of federal Indian policy, a policy which was closely intertwined with the settlement and westward expansion of the United States. This pivotal moment is the brief period between about 1817 and 1834, when the federal government struggled to choose between two opposing approaches to Indian policy: to “civilize” Indian people and assimilate them as the nation expanded westward; or to view Indian tribes as an impediment to Euro-American settlement, and remove them west of the Mississippi River. The critical period of this debate took place during the administration of Andrew Jackson, 1829-1837. At the beginning of his administration, public opinion had moved in the direction of removal, the principal issue on which Jackson had campaigned, and he was ushered into office. By the end of Jackson’s administration, 46,000 Indian people had been relocated to the west. The Old Indian Agency House represents the “civilize and assimilate” approach to federal Indian policy, and although the period of significance is quite short, it coincides with the most intense time in the assimilation versus removal debate.

Early federal Indian policy acknowledged American Indian tribes as sovereign nations, with rights to the lands they occupied, which Euro-Americans should respect and the federal government should
safeguard. The Indian agent/subagent\textsuperscript{16} acted as a diplomatic representative of the United States. Much as any ambassador to a foreign nation, the Indian agent/subagent labored to preserve or restore peace, negotiate treaties, and carry out treaty provisions. However, Euro-American settlers continually encroached on Indian lands, and the federal government was located far from the frontier and lacked the political will to enforce treaty provisions. George Washington, General Henry Knox and other Euro-American leaders regarded Indian nations as capable of being “civilized,” that is, of adopting Euro-American agricultural, economic and societal practices, and assimilating into Euro-American society. Ethnocentrically, they saw civilizing and assimilating the Indian people as positive, and as the path to ending conflict between Euro-American settlers and Indian nations. By the mid-1790s, Indian agents/subagents were encouraged to promote Euro-American practices, especially animal husbandry, agriculture, and mechanical arts (such as spinning and weaving), by offering gifts of domestic animals or mechanical equipment. Although these measures met with some success by the standards of the day, Euro-American settlers continued to trespass on Indian lands on the southern and western frontiers.

In 1817, James Monroe became the first president to publicly suggest that Indian tribes be relocated. Monroe declared that the nation’s security depended on rapid settlement along the southern coast and that it was in the best interests of southern Indian nations to move westward. The United States Congress did not concur with Monroe’s view, but the debate over the direction of federal Indian policy had begun: civilization and assimilation versus removal. In 1818, the House Committee on Indian Affairs recommended to Congress, “Put into the hands of their children the primer and the hoe and they will naturally, in time, take hold of the plough; and, as their minds become enlightened and expand, the Bible will be their Book, and they will grow up in habits of morality and industry...and become useful members of society.”\textsuperscript{17} Congress confirmed this support for civilization and assimilation by creating the “Civilization Fund,” with annual expenditures to support the education and Christianization of Indian nations, even as efforts to inculcate Indian tribes in Euro-American agricultural and economic practices continued. Indian agents/subagents supervised these initiatives, although missionary societies undertook the education and Christianization efforts. However, pressure from Euro-American expansionists intensified, while Indian nations increasingly resisted voluntary removal and grew less willing to cede land. In 1825, Monroe presented a plan to Congress that

\textsuperscript{16} Ronald N. Satz, \textit{American Indian Policy in the Jacksonian Era} (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1975), p. 183. Satz explains that the duties of the agent and the subagent were the same. The only real difference was in salary; that of the agent was twice the salary of the subagent.

\textsuperscript{17} Quoted in Satz, p. 247.
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proposed to resettle all eastern Indians on tracts in the West where Euro-Americans would not be allowed to live. That plan was not adopted, but the debate intensified.\(^\text{18}\)

In 1829, Andrew Jackson took office as president of the United States. Jackson was a leading proponent of Indian removal. Jackson had campaigned for the presidency on the issue of Indian removal in 1824 (when he lost) and in 1828. His election marks a shift in public opinion in the direction of the policy of Indian removal. Congress showed its first support of this policy by passing Jackson’s Indian Removal Act in May 1830. Despite the title of this act, its provisions show that the federal government was still struggling with whether to civilize and assimilate, or remove, Indian tribes. Under this act, removal was voluntary, and those Indian people who did not wish to relocate were to be allowed to remain and become citizens of the state in which they lived. The Indian subagency to the Ho-Chunk was established during this period, in 1828, as the struggle over the approach to federal Indian policy played out along the southern frontier, in Georgia and Florida, and in the Northwest Territory, where Indian agencies and Indian agents/subagents represented the United States, served as ambassadors and brought Euro-American practices to Indian nations, testing the ideas of the competing approaches to Indian policy. During this brief period, Indian agents appointed in the Northwest Territory were often men like Henry Rowe Schoolcraft and John Kinzie, who saw value in learning the languages of the Indian nations to which they were assigned, and who appeared to have treated honestly with Indian tribes and to have held them in regard. The Old Indian Agency House was specifically built, at John Kinzie’s insistence, using federal funds, on land that the federal government recognized as belonging to the Ho-Chunk, a sovereign nation, to serve as the home and office of the Indian Subagent to the Ho-Chunk, much like an embassy is constructed in a foreign nation. Federal funding for a dedicated Indian agency building, on Indian land, appears to have been unusual east of the Mississippi; no other such building has been identified. In contrast, Indian agents/subagents of the period were often located in military installations, while others operated out of their homes.\(^\text{19}\)

Under Andrew Jackson’s leadership, the period of federal government indecision in Indian policy came to an end with the renewal of the Indian Trade and Intercourse Act on July 1, 1834. This act designated a large area of lands west of the Mississippi River as Indian Territory, and removal became the official policy. Forced removal began in 1836. The number of Indian agents/subagents east of the

Mississippi River, which had peaked at 25 in 1834, fell to seven by 1840, and to five by 1850. Further, federal Indian policy had come to view Indian tribes as dependents without rights, and the rhetoric had become one of supposedly promoting the welfare of Indians by isolating them from the depredations of unscrupulous Euro-Americans selling liquor and swindling Indians out of their lands. This position solidified through the mid-to-late nineteenth century, and continued well into the twentieth century. This is not to claim that Indian tribes were afforded more consideration prior to 1834. The rhetoric of both eras was paternalistic and ethnocentric at best, and the actions of the federal government toward Indian tribes were consistently reprehensible. It must be acknowledged that Euro-American/Indian relations form one of the most shameful chapters in United States history. However shameful, this story is a major current in the settlement and westward expansion of the nation, and should be recognized. A property like the Old Indian Agency House helps all Americans better understand this story.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE: POLITICS/GOVERNMENT

From the beginning of European colonization in the early seventeenth century through the late nineteenth century, relations with Indian nations were integral to Euro-American settlement and westward expansion. These relations were characterized by two major currents: efforts to “civilize” the Indian tribes, that is, induce them to abandon their traditional way of life and adopt the economic, societal and religious practices of Euro-Americans, and assimilate; and the removal of Indian people from their traditional homelands in the face of Euro-American expansion. Euro-American relations with Indian nations decimated Indian people, and imposed economic, physical and social isolation that persists into the twenty-first century.

Historical Context: Federal Indian Policy

Prior to the French and Indian War, each English colony acted independently (or in concert with the British crown) in response to the conflict that Euro-American occupation of Indian lands generated. As early as 1763, at the close of the French and Indian War, the English colonies banded together to address this problem. Two “superintendents of Indian affairs” were appointed: one for the northern colonies, and another for the southern colonies. Despite this initiative, unrest was widespread along the frontier at the time of the American Revolution. The second Continental Congress replaced the superintendents with three departments (Northern, Middle, and Southern), each charged with

---

20 Jackson and Galli, pp. 48-50; and Hill, pp. 23-50.
21 Jackson and Galli, pp. 1-2.
negotiating treaties that would preserve peace with the Indian nations in their geographical area, and keep them from siding with the British in the Revolutionary War.\textsuperscript{22}

In 1786, the United States Congress reorganized the management of relations with Indian nations, creating the Indian Department, within the War Department, directly supervised by the Secretary of War.\textsuperscript{23} General Henry Knox, the first Secretary of War (1785-1794), instated a federal Indian policy that would guide presidents from George Washington (1789-1797) through John Quincy Adams (1825-1829). Knox maintained that, "the independent nations and tribes of Indians ought to be considered as foreign nations, not as the subjects of any particular State..."\textsuperscript{24} Therefore, Knox reasoned, the United States could only obtain Indian lands by legally purchasing them, through nation-to-nation treaties. This position rejected another view that a few Euro-American leaders of that era advocated, that, in winning independence from Great Britain, the United States had gained outright ownership of all the territory Great Britain had claimed.

In contrast, Knox argued that,

The Indians being the prior occupants, possess the right of soil. It cannot be taken from them unless by their free consent, or by the right of conquest in case of a just war. To dispossess them on any other principle would be a gross violation of the fundamental laws of nature, and of that distributive justice which is the glory of a nation...The principal of the Indian right to the lands they possess being thus conceded, the dignity and interest of the nation will be advanced by making it the basis of the future administration of justice toward the Indian tribes.\textsuperscript{25}

A majority in Congress accepted Knox’s position, and enacted the \textit{Northwest Ordinance} in 1787, which stated:

\ldots the utmost faith shall be observed toward Indians, their lands and property shall never be taken from them without their consent; and in their property, rights, and liberty, they shall never be invaded or disturbed, unless in just and lawful wars authorized by Congress; but laws founded in

\textsuperscript{22} Jackson and Galli, pp. 1-2.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid, pp. 2-3.
justice and humanity shall from time to time be made, for preventing wrongs done to them, and for preserving peace and friendship with them...

Members of Congress were not all swayed by the idealism of Knox’s argument; enlightened self-interest played a part in the adoption of this policy. The value of a political, military, and economic alliance with the various Indian tribes was widely recognized, and in fact, good relationships with Indian nations were acknowledged to be key to the United States’ control of the land it claimed, to its commercial success, and to its continued existence as an independent nation in the late eighteenth century (and into the first quarter of the nineteenth century). Congress wanted to convince Indian nations that it was in their best interests to maintain allegiance with the fledgling country.

However, Congress neglected to establish a system that would ensure the enforcement of treaty provisions that would restrain Euro-American settlers trespassing on Indian lands. General Knox recognized this problem immediately, repeatedly urging that a series of military posts be erected along the frontier in order to enforce treaty provisions and keep the peace. Knox wrote: “The angry passions of the frontier Indians and whites...are too violent to be controlled by the feeble authority of the civil power.” By July 1789, hostilities between the State of Georgia and the Cherokee and Creek Nations over lack of enforcement of the Treaty of Hopewell (with the Cherokee Nation, 1785) had become critical. Knox wrote to Washington:

The disgraceful violation of the Treaty of Hopewell with the Cherokees requires the serious consideration of Congress—if so direct and manifest contempt of the authority of the United States be suffered with impunity, it will be in vain to attempt to extend the arm of Government to the frontiers—The Indian tribes can have no faith in such imbecile promises, and the lawless whites will ridicule a Government which shall, on paper only, make Indian treaties and regulate the Indian boundaries...all treaties with the Indian nations however equal and just they may be in their principles will not only be nugatory but humiliating to the [United States] unless they shall be guaranteed by a body of Troops.

In the late 1790s, Congress began funding a line of military posts along the Ohio River north to Lake Erie, and in the south from Ohio to the St. Mary’s River (Florida). Military posts became an established part of the frontier, and the line of garrisons shifted westward over time, pushed by Euro-American expansion and, following the defeat of Great Britain in the War of 1812, extending

26 Northwest Ordinance (1787), quoted in Jackson and Galli, p. 3.
27 Jackson and Galli, pp. 2 and 8.
28 Knox to Washington.
29 Ibid.
permanent control over the old Northwest Territory.\textsuperscript{30} However, the posts were small, with few troops. Whether it was a lack of will when the frontier would not accept the idea that Indians had rights Euro-Americans must respect, or insufficient funding that would enable the military to successfully enforce treaties, a pattern immediately emerged. The United States would sign a treaty, Euro-Americans would violate the treaty by trespassing on Indian lands, and following little or no attempt at treaty enforcement, the federal government would hasten to make a new treaty, thereby legitimizing Euro-American occupation.\textsuperscript{31} Recognizing Indian tribes as sovereign nations laid the groundwork for the hundreds of treaties that would be made, and broken, until Congress officially declared Indians to be “wards” of the nation, and abolished the practice in 1871.

**Federal Indian Policy: Rise of Efforts to “Civilize” and Assimilate Indian tribes**

General Knox, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Euro-American leaders of the late eighteenth century professed that Indians either needed to become “civilized,” and assimilate, or move to the west. From their ethnocentric viewpoint, this positive and necessary transformation required that Indian men abandon hunting and become farmers, and that Indian nations adopt mechanical arts such as spinning and weaving, and reorganize their society around the family unit instead of clan or tribe.\textsuperscript{32} With regard to farming, it is important to note that Indian nations had a millennia-long history of cultivating crops, and their subsistence depended at least as much on planting as it did on hunting. The Ho-Chunk, for example, were typical of Indian nations circa 1800, planting gardens around their villages, raising corn, beans, pumpkins, melons, cucumbers, and tobacco. However, animal husbandry was not a part of their tradition; and horticulture was traditionally women’s work.\textsuperscript{33} General Henry Knox expressed his view in a letter to George Washington in July 1789:

> As population shall increase, and approach the Indian boundaries, Game will be diminished, and new purchases may be made for small considerations—This has been and probably will be the inevitable consequence of cultivation. It is however painful to consider that all the Indian Tribes once existing in those states, now the best cultivated and most populous, have become extinct. If the same causes continue, the same effects will happen, and in a short period the idea of an Indian on this side of the Mississippi will only be found in the page of the historian. How different would

\textsuperscript{30} Prucha, p. 61  
\textsuperscript{32} Satz, ix.  
be the sensation of a philosophic mind to reflect that instead of exterminating a part of the human race by our modes of population that we had persevered through all difficulties and at last had imparted our Knowledge of cultivation, and the arts, to the Aboriginals of the Country...This might be brought about by making presents from time to time to the Chiefs or their Wives of sheep and other domestic animals, and if in the first instance persons were appointed to take charge and teach the use of them a considerable part of the difficulty would be surmounted...34

Knox’s successor as Secretary of War, James McHenry (1796-1800) also subscribed to the civilizing notion, especially for those nations living on the southern frontier (the Creek, the Cherokee, the Chickasaw, the Choctaw, and the Seminoles). Following a long list of instructions related to diplomacy, McHenry suggested to Benjamin Hawkins, appointed “Principal Temporary Agent for Indian Affairs South of the Ohio River,” in 1796:

Perhaps no period has occurred more favorable than the present to the introduction of a regular civilizing system among [the Creek]...At present as heretofore, the Chief support of the Indian is derived from hunting and trapping...he shall discover that he has it in his power to provide more abundantly for his wants or pleasures by raising horses, cattle or grains than by hunting or trapping...you may promise to furnish the Indian [men] who seem sincerely disposed to make this experiment with such domestic animals as they may be without...With respect to agriculture, you will use your best endeavour [sic] to encourage it among them and to bring the men to take a share in its Soils...It is hoped that the manufacture of coarse woollen, cotton and linen may be introduced by means of their women and girls. Should therefore circumstances favor this hope, you will take measures to furnish them with cotton and flaxseed and the necessary apparatus and an instructor.35

The first legislation to promote the “civilization” of Indian nations was included in the Indian Trade and Intercourse Act of 1793, which authorized the president to provide “friendly Indian tribes....useful domestic animals and implements of husbandry...as he shall judge proper.”36

Promoting “civilization” was an element of increasing importance in the series of federal laws intended to govern Euro-American interactions with Indian nations. This arose, in part, out of a growing national sense of noblesse oblige, a condescending sense of social responsibility that viewed Indian tribes as “poor savages.” The first Indian Trade and Intercourse Act was enacted in 1790; the last in 1834. These laws intended to keep peace on the frontier, primarily by prohibiting any European or

34 Knox to Washington.
36 U.S. Stat., I: 331.
Euro-American from conducting commerce or trade with Indian tribes without a license from the superintendent of Indian affairs of that territory; and by prohibiting trespassing on Indian land. It was hoped that this measure would reduce hostilities by providing goods to Indian tribes that would alleviate problems caused by shrinking hunting territory, and by prohibiting trading liquor; and that unscrupulous private traders and those representing other European powers would be driven out. By the time the third Indian Trade and Intercourse Act was enacted in 1796, the licensing of traders had proven unsatisfactory, and Congress had accepted George Washington’s proposal to create government owned and operated trading houses, called the “factory system,” in lieu of licensing traders. The provisions of the Indian Trade and Intercourse Act of 1796 were renewed biennially until 1806, when they were made permanent. The factory system of government-owned and operated trading posts, each located in a military installation, continued until 1822, when intense lobbying by private fur-trading companies, notably John Jacob Astor’s American Fur Trade Company, abolished the factory system and reinstated government licensing of Indian traders.\(^{37}\)

The Indian Trade and Intercourse Act of 1802 was the first that provided funding for promoting civilization.\(^{38}\) Civilizing efforts continued to emphasize agriculture, animal husbandry, and mechanical arts such as spinning and weaving; education would not be addressed legislatively until 1819. These measures were proposed to be voluntary, for those “friendly” Indian tribes and individuals who might be interested.\(^{39}\)

The treaties negotiated prior to 1818 make no mention of education. They were mainly devoted to the cessions of land and to the establishment of peace after the war of 1812. While alliance with Indian nations had been critical to the survival of the United States as an independent country during the early years of its existence, the successful conclusion of the War of 1812 reduced the need for the allegiance of Indian tribes for defense against European powers, while eliminating Britain as an ally for the Indians. Further, following that war, the United States experienced the “Great Awakening,” a time of religious fervor. Missionary associations formed to provide a Protestant Christian education to Indian tribes, as part of the effort to civilize and assimilate the Indians, and soon secured Congressional support.\(^{40}\)

The House Committee on Indian Affairs reported to Congress in 1818 that “in the present state of our country, one of two things seems to be necessary: either that those sons of the forest should be

\(^{37}\) Jackson and Galli, p. 7-11; Nesbit, p. 65; and Prucha, p. 53.

\(^{38}\) Harmon, p. 158.

\(^{39}\) Satz, p. 247.

\(^{40}\) Harmon, p. 160; it should be noted that the Catholic Church had been sending missionaries to Indian nations for some two hundred years.
In response, Congress established the “Civilization Fund” in 1819, for “the purpose of providing against the further decline and final extinction of the Indian tribes...and for the introduction among them of the habits and arts of civilization.” The annual appropriation for the Civilization Fund was paid largely to missionary societies operating schools for Indians. By 1825, there were 38 Indian schools, all of them founded by Christian missionaries.

These ethnocentric and paternalistic programs undermined the traditions of Indian nations, and did little to bring about the acceptance of Indian people as members of Euro-American society. Neither did these programs reduce Euro-American demand for Indian land. By the late 1820s, Indian nations in the south, such as the Creek, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Seminole, and the Cherokee, striving to retain their homelands, had so thoroughly adopted Euro-American practices as to become known as the “Five Civilized Tribes.” The Cherokee, for example, were farmers, carpenters, blacksmiths, and masons; they established churches, opened schools, built roads, and adopted a constitution. Sequoyah, a Cherokee leader, had developed a written alphabet for the language, and published a newspaper, the Cherokee Phoenix. However, during the same period, Euro-Americans in the south pressured the federal government to acquire land from the southern Indian nations, and a new version of Indian removal was gaining currency: the relocation of Indian nations to the west of the Mississippi River.

This version of Indian removal, rationalized as a means of protecting the Indians from liquor salesmen, gamblers, and dishonest traders, and other unscrupulous Euro-Americans, and to give them time to become “civilized,” dated back to the administration of Thomas Jefferson.

Federal Indian Policy: Rise of Policy to Remove Indian Tribes West of the Mississippi River

With the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, the United States laid claim to territory that extended across the Mississippi River. In a confidential letter to Congress asking for funds to explore the new territory, President Thomas Jefferson noted that Indian nations residing within the limits of the United States might be encouraged to emigrate across the Mississippi River, and “...abandon hunting, to apply to the

---

41 Quoted in Satz, p. 247.
42 Quoted in Satz, p. 248.
43 Hill, p. 155; and Harmon, p. 163.
45 Satz, p. 253.
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raising stock, to agriculture and domestic manufacture, and thereby prove to themselves that less land 
& labor will maintain them in this, better than in their former mode of living…46

However, Euro-American leaders did not publicly advocate Indian removal to the west of the 
Mississippi River until well after the War of 1812 (when the support of Indian allies was no longer 
critical to the existence of the United States as a nation). James Monroe was the first president to 
publicly suggest Indian removal to the west of the Mississippi River in his annual message in 1817. 
Monroe declared that the nation’s security depended on rapid settlement along the southern coast and 
that it was in the best interests of Indian nations to move westward. Monroe took no further action on 
his suggestion at that time. During the 1820s, pressure from Euro-American expansionists intensified, 
while Indian nations increasingly resisted voluntary removal and grew less willing to cede land. In 
1825, Monroe presented a plan to Congress that proposed to resettle all eastern Indians on tracts in the 
West where Euro-Americans would not be allowed to live. That plan was not adopted, but John 
Quincy Adams (1825-1829) would be the last president to acknowledge Indian tribes as sovereign 
nations.47

Federal Indian Policy: the Debate Intensifies and Resolves in Favor of Indian Removal
In 1829, Andrew Jackson took office as president of the United States. Jackson was a leading 
proponent of Indian removal. Between 1814 and 1824, Jackson was involved in negotiating nine 
treaties in which Indian nations ceded millions of acres of lands in the southern United States in 
exchange for lands west of the Mississippi. Jackson campaigned for the presidency on the issue of 
Indian removal in 1824 (when he lost to John Quincy Adams) and in 1828. His election in 1828 
marked the turn in public opinion in favor of Indian removal as federal policy, and brought the issue to 
the forefront of political discussion. Jackson quickly capitalized on public support by presenting the 
Indian Removal Act to Congress. However, significant opposition remained among Euro-American 
leaders, including prominent Christian missionary organizations and members of Congress such as 
noted “Indian fighter” Davy Crockett of Tennessee. After an acrimonious debate, Congress passed the 
Indian Removal Act, and it was signed into law in May 1830. This gave the president the power to 
directly negotiate treaties with Indian nations living east of the Mississippi River for the express 
purpose of inducing them, voluntarily, to exchange their lands east of the Mississippi for lands west of 
the river. Under the terms of the Indian Removal Act, those Indians who did not wish to relocate 
would be allowed to remain and become citizens of the state in which they lived. Despite the Act’s 
express terms that removal be voluntary, Indian nations were subjected to great pressure to exchange

46 Thomas Jefferson, President of the United States, to Congress, 1803, quoted in Howard Zinn, A 
People’s History of the United States (New York: Harper Perennial, 2003), chapter 7, no page 
47 Harmon, pp. 360-62.
their lands for lands west of the Mississippi. The Choctaw of Mississippi signed the first removal treaty in September 1830. Some Choctaw remained in Mississippi, but experienced such mistreatment by Euro-American settlers that they soon moved west. In contrast, the Cherokee fought to prevent the state of Georgia from taking control of their lands, and to retain self-government, appealing to the U.S. Supreme Court. Although the U.S. Supreme Court found in favor of the Cherokee in 1831, the state of Georgia refused to obey the ruling, and President Jackson would not enforce it. During the early 1830s, federal Indian policy moved from encouraging voluntary removal, to delineating as Indian Territory that a portion of the area west of the Mississippi River in the Indian Trade and Intercourse Act of (July 1) 1834, and finally to forced removal, beginning in 1836. That year, the Secretary of War sent troops to remove 15,000 Creeks from Alabama. The forced migration of 16,000 Cherokees from Georgia on the infamous “Trail of Tears” followed in 1838. Thousands died in these removals. The Seminoles resisted, and thousands were killed in the Second Seminole War, which raged from 1835 to 1842.\(^{48}\)

President Andrew Jackson, in his annual message in December 1835, expressed what had become the federal Indian policy:

> The plan of removing the aboriginal people who yet remain within the settled portion of the United States, to the country west of the Mississippi river, approaches its consummation. It was adopted on the most mature consideration of the condition of this race, and ought to be persisted in till [sic] the object is accomplished, and prosecuted with as much vigor as a just regard for their circumstances will permit, and as fast as their consent can be obtained. All preceding experiments for the improvement of the Indians have failed. It seems now to be an established fact that they cannot live in contact with a civilized community and prosper. Ages of fruitless endeavors have, at length, brought us to a knowledge of this principle...\(^{49}\)

By the close of the Jackson administration in 1837, some 46,000 Indian people had been removed from their lands east of the Mississippi River, including in the Northwest Territory. Within the current boundaries of the state of Wisconsin, by 1837, nine treaties of cession had opened up most of the state to Euro-American settlement.\(^{50}\) All these actions were rationalized as benefiting the welfare of Indian tribes. The rapid forced removal that occurred during the late 1830s and early 1840s reflected the


\(^{50}\) Nesbit, p. 98.
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federal government's now firm acceptance of the premise that, while Indian tribes might be civilized if kept isolated from Euro-Americans, they could not be assimilated into Euro-American society. Further, Indian tribes were no longer seen as sovereign nations, but rather, as dependents of the federal government.

Andrew Jackson was the first president to assert that Indian tribes were not sovereign nations, declaring that the use of words like "nation" and "sovereign" in treaties were non-binding rhetorical flourishes, concessions to the vanities of a proud but defeated people. The U.S. Supreme Court gave the first legal ruling that supported this view on the status of Indian tribes in Cherokee Nation v. Georgia (1831), declaring Indian nations to be "domestic dependent nations." Although the United States continued to make nation-to-nation treaties with Indian tribes for some years, the status of Indian tribes as dependents in the eyes of the federal government gradually solidified. This is reflected in the relocation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs from the War Department to the Department of the Interior in 1849, the enactment of the Indian Appropriation Act of 1851, which authorized the creation of reservations and directed that Indians be confined there, and finally, the adoption of the Indian Appropriation Act in 1871, which prohibited any Indian tribe from being recognized as an independent nation and formally defined Indian people as "national wards."51

Indian tribes were not afforded more consideration during the era in which the federal government debated its approach to Indian policy: civilization and assimilation versus removal. Regardless of the federal government's approach, the rhetoric was paternalistic and ethnocentric at best, and the actions of the federal government toward Indian tribes were consistently reprehensible. While the word of laws and treaties in the earlier era promised to protect Indian rights, in deed, the federal government repeatedly failed to uphold those rights, particularly with regard to restraining Euro-American encroachment on Indian lands. The federal government typically intervened on behalf of the trespassers, and then, recognizing the inconsistency with its word, moved to legitimize these violations with new treaties, dispossessing the Indians of more and more of their lands. Alexis de Tocqueville, who witnessed the Choctaw removing to the west of the Mississippi River in 1831, marveled on the way in which this dispossession was carried out "...with wondrous ease, quietly, legally, and philanthropically...It is impossible to destroy men with more respect to the laws of humanity."52

The Role of Indian Agents/Subagents in Federal Indian Policy

The role of the Indian agent/subagent was to carry out federal Indian policy. Prior to the renewal of the Indian Trade and Intercourse Act on July 1, 1834, Indian agent/subagent positions were usually

51 Jackson and Galli, pp. 59-60.
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created by treaty, although the Indian Trade and Intercourse Act of 1793 authorized the President to
appoint Indian agents. This was the first mention of Indian agents/subagents in federal law; however,
the law provided no instructions for Indian agents. Agents/subagents whose positions were created
by treaty, such as the Ho-Chunk (Winnebago) Subagency, were responsible for fulfilling the
commitments spelled out in a specific treaty. The duties of Indian agents/subagents prior to 1834
varied widely but were primarily diplomatic, particularly on the western frontier. Following the War
of 1812, agents/subagents increasingly counted supervising programs promoting civilization among
their duties. After 1834, supervising civilizing programs became a principal duty of Indian
agents/subagents. Diplomatic duties could include overseeing the delivery of goods, medicine, and/or
cash payments (usually made in exchange for ceding Indian land); licensing Indian traders; negotiating
additional treaties; and representing the president and the federal government at important tribal
events, and in addressing treaty violations, settling disputes and other concerns of the Indians. Indian
agents were directed to apply to the military commanders for aid in carrying out their duties, and
reciprocally, the army officers received explicit directives from the War Department to assist the
agents in the enforcement of the laws and treaties. Therefore, although the agent/subagent’s post of
duty was supposed to be at the site of the Indian communities, they were frequently located at military
garrisons.

Aside from fulfilling the provisions of treaties, Indian agents/subagents generally did not have clearly
defined duties, and their terms of office and salaries varied. Even the Indian Trade and Intercourse
Act of 1834, which specified the number of agents, and authorized a “competent number” of
subagents, did not specify the exact nature of the various duties of agents and subagents.

Agents/subagents assumed a very wide degree of personal judgment in deciding what their duties were
and how to perform them.

Those few Indian agents/subagents appointed by the President (in the pre-1834 period) generally
received written instructions from the Secretary of War. These often included promoting the
“civilized arts” of agriculture, spinning and weaving. James McHenry’s 1796 letter to Benjamin
Hawkins, Principal Temporary Agent for Indian Affairs South of the Ohio River, quoted in the
previous section, is typical.

The Indian Trade and Intercourse Act of 1802 was the first legislation that provided funding for
promoting civilization, specifically agriculture, animal husbandry, and mechanical arts. These
measures were initially directed primarily at so-called “friendly” Indians such as the Creek in the

53 Prucha, p. 53.
54 Jackson and Galli, p. 56.
55 Jackson and Galli, p. 34; Satz, pp. 151-52 and 182.
south, and the Iroquois in the north. Education would not be addressed in any treaty until 1817, or in any federal law until 1819, when the “Civilization Fund” was established, providing an annual appropriation for education and Christianization. This marked the beginning of the public debate regarding federal Indian policy, as Congress supported efforts to civilize and assimilate Indian tribes, while some Euro-American politicians began advocating that Indian nations be removed to the west. Gradually, the need to instruct the Indians in Protestant Christianity appeared as well. Agents/subagents increasingly counted the supervising of civilizing efforts among their duties. Up until 1819, these efforts were largely confined to animal husbandry, agriculture, and mechanical arts. After 1819, agents/subagents were often given the additional task of overseeing the educational and Christianization programs (usually provided by Christian missionary societies).^56

In 1818, there were 15 Indian agents and 10 subagents. Agents and subagents were not stationed together, nor was there any difference in their duties. The main difference was in their pay: subagents were paid half the salary of agents. By 1822, these figures had risen to 17 agents and 25 subagents, a number of whom were stationed west of the Mississippi River in what are now Arkansas and Missouri. By 1834, there were 25 agents/subagents east of the Mississippi River. Following enactment of the Indian Trade and Intercourse Act of 1834, these numbers were reduced to 8 agents and 12 subagents in all, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs was authorized to create agencies and appoint agents. During the 1830s, as Indian nations were removed west of the Mississippi River, Indian agencies east of the Mississippi were closed. By 1840, only seven Indian agencies or subagencies remained east of the Mississippi River. These were the: Seminole subagency (Florida); New York agency (Buffalo); Mackinac Island (Michigan) agency; Bayfield/LaPointe agency (Wisconsin); the Green Bay (Wisconsin) agency; the Ohio (Columbus) agency; and the Saginaw (Michigan) agency. The latter two were discontinued in the 1840s. 57

The Ho-Chunk (Winnebago) Subagency

The Ho-Chunk subagency was established following the treaty signed at Green Bay on August 25, 1828. With this treaty, the Ho-Chunk, Potawatomi, Chippewa, and Ottawa nations temporarily ceded the area of their homeland that is presently northwestern Illinois and southwestern Wisconsin, which Euro-Americans called the “Lead Region.” This cession was made permanent by treaty signed August 1, 1829 at Prairie du Chien. The experience of the Ho-Chunk nation with the United States was similar to that of other Indian nations, except that Ho-Chunk land had the added attraction of vast deposits of galena, or lead ore. The Ho-Chunk and other native people had mined lead for some 8,000 years. In 1788, Julian Dubuque, a Frenchman, had begun mining in the Lead Region. Euro-American miners followed, and by

^57 Jackson and Galli, pp. 33, 48, and 50; and Hill, pp. 23-50.
1825, more than 10,000 were illegally mining on Indian land. The Ho-Chunk signed a treaty with the federal government in 1825, establishing the boundary of their lands in hopes of removing intruders. Four Legs, a prominent Ho-Chunk chief, stated, "There are a great many Americans on our land, working it without permission...I want you to tell our Great Father to stop it, to reach out his long arm and draw them back."58

However, by 1827, conditions had deteriorated, and anxiety among the Ho-Chunk was high. In response to the rumor that Ho-Chunk warriors had been executed by federal troops in Minnesota Territory, Red Bird, a war chief among the Ho-Chunk, killed several Euro-Americans near LaCrosse. For the three months of the “Winnebago War,” federal authorities pressured the Ho-Chunk to deliver Red Bird to them. Red Bird surrendered himself in September 1827, and the United States used the incident to effect the 1828 and 1829 treaties in which the Ho-Chunk ceded a large chunk of their homeland.59

At the recommendation of Lewis Cass, then governor of Michigan Territory (of which the present state of Wisconsin was a part from 1818 until 1836), John H. Kinzie was appointed subagent to the Ho-Chunk on December 9, 1828.60 Cass sent Kinzie to Fort Winnebago, which had just been established at the portage of the Fox and Wisconsin rivers, a location of strategic importance midway between Fort Howard at Green Bay, and Fort Crawford at Prairie du Chien. Fort Winnebago stood along the northern edge of lands that the Ho-Chunk had just ceded to the United States. The treaty signed at Prairie du Chien in 1829 specified that an Indian agent would distribute half the annual payment and goods at Fort Winnebago (the other half to be distributed at the Prairie du Chien Indian agency); that said agent would ensure that two yoke of oxen, a cart and a driver would be maintained at the portage; and that a blacksmith shop would be provided for the use of the Ho-Chunk at each of the Fort Winnebago and Prairie du Chien agencies.61

58 Loew, p. 43.
59 Loew, pp. 43-44; and Nesbit, pp. 78-80.
60 Hill, p. 145.
The Prairie du Chien agency had been the first Indian agency established within the present bounds of Wisconsin, opening in 1807 (no resources associated with this agency are extant). The agency served Indians living along the Mississippi River above the Iowa River; and the Indians living in Indiana Territory north of the Illinois River and west of a line running north and south from a point on the Illinois River about 20 miles north of Peoria. These included the Ho-Chunk, Chippewa, Sioux, Menominee, and the Sac and Fox. However, the United States did not have a military presence in what would become Wisconsin until 1815, when Fort Crawford was established at Prairie du Chien, and Fort Howard was erected at Green Bay. An Indian agency was established at Green Bay the same year (no resources associated with this agency are extant). The Green Bay Indian agency was associated with the Menominee, Chippewa, Ottawa, Potawatomi, Oneida, Stockbridge, Munsee, and Brotherton Indians. It also served the Ho-Chunk until the subagency opened at Fort Winnebago in 1828.\(^2\)

John H. Kinzie (1803-1865) served as subagent to the Ho-Chunk from December 9, 1828 until July 1, 1833. Kinzie was born in Ontario, Canada. His father, John McKenzie, a Scottish immigrant, was a fur trader, who brought his family to Fort Dearborn (Chicago) in 1804. In 1812, Fort Dearborn was destroyed by the Potawatomi, allies of the British in the War of 1812. The McKenzies escaped to Detroit, but returned to Chicago in 1816. John H. Kinzie worked for the American Fur Company on Mackinac Island from 1818 until 1823, and then was sent to Prairie du Chien to learn the Ho-Chunk language. Governor Lewis Cass of Michigan Territory engaged Kinzie as his secretary in 1826.\(^3\) As secretary to Governor Cass, Kinzie witnessed several treaties, including the 1828 treaty signed at Green Bay.

Kinzie may have lived at Fort Winnebago when he was first appointed subagent to the Ho-Chunk. However, by the fall of 1830, the subagency had its own buildings, outside Fort Winnebago, at the portage. Kinzie married Juliette A. Magill (1806-1870) of Middletown, Connecticut in New Hartford, New York on August 9, 1830.\(^4\) She accompanied Kinzie to Fort Winnebago, and the memoir she published in 1856, *Wau-Bun: The Early Day in the Northwest*, provides an account of life at Fort Winnebago and the Old Indian Agency House. She describes the location and appearance of the subagency on her arrival in the fall of 1830:

...we arrived in sight of the white walls of Fort Winnebago, looking down from a rising ground upon the vast expanse of low land through which the river winds...Anon we approached another bank, on which was a range of comfortable-looking log houses [not extant]. “That’s the Agency,”

\(^2\) Hill, pp. 71-73 and 142-45.
\(^4\) Announcement, *North Western Journal* (Detroit), September, 1830, quoted in “John H. Kinzie.”
said my husband; “the largest house belongs to Paquette, the interpreter, and the others are the dwellings of our Frenchmen. The little building, just at the foot of the hill, is the blacksmith’s shop [not extant], kept there by the Government...”

From Juliette Kinzie’s memoir we find confirmation of John Kinzie, while Subagent to the Ho-Chunk, fulfilling the terms of the treaties of 1829 and 1832, and overseeing the work of the blacksmith (whose presence was a “civilizing” measure, as the blacksmith fashioned, sharpened, and mended metal tools and agricultural implements, as well as guns and traps). In addition to Juliette Kinzie’s description of the blacksmith shop that appears above, she also wrote, “Teams of oxen and a driver were kept at the Agency...to transport the canoes of the Indians across [the portage].” Mention is made of John Kinzie traveling to Detroit to pick up the annuity and goods that were to be delivered to the Ho-Chunk at Fort Winnebago, and of his distribution of them. Juliette Kinzie also notes that Four-Legs, whom she describes as the principal Ho-Chunk chief, had died just prior to the Kinzies’ arrival at Fort Winnebago in the fall of 1830, and that, although they had arrived too late to attend the ceremonies, the subagent was responsible for providing various articles for the procession of what was, essentially, a state funeral. Kinzie also describes witnessing the formal visit of a delegation of Ho-Chunk leaders, establishing Nau-kau as the new principal chief of the Ho-Chunk nation.

Correspondence from the Office of Indian Affairs document Kinzie’s efforts to address treaty violations, another diplomatic function. In July 1829, Thomas McKenney, director of the Office of Indian Affairs, wrote Lewis Cass, then governor of Michigan Territory, regarding a particular incident in which United States citizens had trespassed on Ho-Chunk lands, directing him to collect evidence from Kinzie regarding the situation, and to punish the alleged offenders. Several letters dating from winter 1830-31 illustrate the difficult nature of addressing treaty violations, and the intermediary role Kinzie played between Euro-Americans and the Ho-Chunk. There were several claims against the Ho-Chunk, made by United States citizens, which Kinzie, on behalf of the Ho-Chunk refused to pay, because they were not authenticated or were charging much more than the value of the property.

---

65 Juliette M. Kinzie, p. 57. Pierre Pauquette had quarters at the agency, but the home he owned, "Bellefontaine," was located about two miles from the agency. The “Frenchmen” were the blacksmith, drivers and laborers who worked at the agency.
66 Kinzie, p. 60.
67 Ibid, pp. 60, 72-75, 266, and 370.
68 Ibid, p. 61.
69 Ibid, p. 63.
70 Thomas McKenney, Office of Indian Affairs, to Lewis Cass, Governor of Michigan Territory, July 2, 1829, copy on file, Old Indian Agency House Binder, Portage, Wisconsin.
Kinzie referred these to the Secretary of War for arbitration. Dissatisfied with Kinzie’s response, William S. Hamilton adopted a policy of revenge, writing to Kinzie:

The guns were taken [from Man-Eater, principal chief of the Ho-Chunk at Rock River] by men in my employ because the Indians had [entered] the Cabin of one of my miners and plundered it, the goods were found in possession of this Indian [Man-Eater]... The little faith I have in the Indian Department has compelled me to adopt a system of retaliation, and I have determined in all instances to pursue the aggressors, retake the property, and allow the persons in company with me to take property enough from the Indians to pay them for their trouble and in some instances to [use] the lash...  

Kinzie forwarded Hamilton’s letter to the Secretary of War, explaining that Man-Eater had complained to Kinzie that an American had robbed him of two guns, requesting that Kinzie write him a letter asking the return of the guns, which Man-Eater could deliver to the man who had stolen his guns, whose name he did not know. Kinzie concluded, “The answer to this note is the letter of Mr. Hamilton... It will show you the spirit by which some of the whites are actuated in making reprisals upon the Indians, and which, if not stopped, may lead to serious consequences.”

Juliette Kinzie also wrote about John Kinzie’s diplomatic efforts during the “Black Hawk War” to encourage the Ho-Chunk to remain neutral. “Mr. Kinzie resolved to hold a council with all the principal chiefs of the Winnebagoes...” The council was held May 26, 1832 at the present site of the city of Madison; General Henry Dodge (who led the militia) and another Indian agent, Henry Gratiot, were present. All but one of the Ho-Chunk chiefs at the council agreed not to support the Sauk, and to abandon their villages and cornfields and move north as a show of their commitment to neutrality.

Black Hawk (1767-1838) was a Sauk war chief with lands near present-day Rock Island, Illinois, which had been ceded to the United States. Black Hawk agreed to move his village to the Iowa side of the Mississippi River only after federal officials promised to replace the corn his people had planted. When the corn arrived, it was discovered to be inferior. The Sauk returned to Illinois, forced “to steal corn

---

71 William S. Hamilton to John Kinzie, November 14, 1830, copy, Old Indian Agency House Binder, Portage, Wisconsin.
72 John H. Kinzie, Subagent Indian Affairs, to John H. Eaton, Secretary of War, December 5, 1830, copy, Old Indian Agency House Binder, Portage, Wisconsin.
73 Juliette Kinzie, p. 319.
from their own fields...where they were discovered by the whites and fired upon.” A Ho-Chunk leader, White Cloud, offered Black Hawk and his people refuge. Army and militia troops, led by General Henry Dodge, chased after Black Hawk as he crossed the Mississippi toward White Cloud’s village. Black Hawk and his people retreated back toward the Mississippi River, attempting to surrender several times, and were eventually slaughtered at the so-called Battle of Bad Axe on August 2, 1832.

Shortly thereafter, John Kinzie received notice to bring the principal chiefs of the Ho-Chunk to Rock Island, Illinois “to hold a treaty for the purchase of all the lands east and south of the Wisconsin [River].” Kinzie did so, accompanying the delegation to Rock Island. There, the Ho-Chunk were forced to cede additional lands, by treaty signed September 15, 1832, despite the fact that most Ho-Chunk had remained neutral during the Black Hawk War. This treaty also demanded that the Ho-Chunk surrender several tribal members accused of murdering Euro-Americans. John Kinzie was responsible for persuading Ho-Chunk leaders to deliver the prisoners. The prisoners were surrendered to Kinzie and General Henry Dodge in a formal ceremony held in front of the Old Indian Agency House.

The 1832 treaty (signed at Rock Island) also provided the services of a physician for the Ho-Chunk at Fort Winnebago, clearly prompted by Kinzie. Writing to Lewis Cass, then Secretary of War, in August 1832, Kinzie noted that when smallpox had broken out in Green Bay the previous fall, he had obtained smallpox vaccine, and he and Paquette had vaccinated some 600 Ho-Chunk and Menomonee themselves. He further stated, “Many Indians come to me for medical aid, and the Physician at the post will not, except in extreme cases, prescribe for them...a Physician would relieve much suffering.” The provision of a Euro-American physician can also be seen as a measure to show the Ho-Chunk the benefits of assimilation into Euro-American society.

---

76 Loew, p. 45.
77 Juliette Kinzie, p. 359.
78 Ibid.
79 Juliette Kinzie, p. 364.
80 John H. Kinzie, Subagent Indian Affairs, to Lewis Cass, Secretary of War, August 27, 1832, copy, Old Indian Agency House Binder, Portage, Wisconsin.
Another provision of the 1832 treaty brought the first reference to “civilizing” the Ho-Chunk. The federal government promised to erect at Prairie du Chien, “a school for the education...of such Winnebago children as may be voluntarily sent to it...and the said children to be taught reading, writing, arithmetic, gardening, agriculture, carding, spinning, weaving, and sewing...”

John Kinzie does not appear to have viewed education as part of his role as Indian agent. No school or Christian mission was ever established at the Ho-Chunk Subagency, although Juliette Kinzie did conduct Sunday school in the Old Indian Agency House in the winter of 1832-33. She had six or seven students, all of them French-Ho-Chunk relatives of Pierre Pauquette. Juliette Kinzie wrote that Mr. Kinzie received a letter in December 1830 from Colonel Richard M. Johnson (who would later serve as vice-president of the United States under Martin Van Buren, 1837-1841). Johnson’s letter promoted a school for Indian children in his home state of Kentucky, and request[ed] the agent use every endeavor to induce the Winnebagoes not only to send their children to this institution for their education, but also (what was still more important) to set apart a portion of their annuity-money to assist in sustaining it. There happened to be... a number of the chiefs in the neighborhood of the Portage, and a messenger was sent to convene them all...

At the meeting, John Kinzie explained the contents of the letter. Decorah, speaking on behalf of the chiefs gathered, rejected the request, concluding, “If we change our minds, we will let you know.” Kinzie did not pursue the matter, and the tone of Juliette Kinzie’s recollection suggests that they believed that Colonel Johnson was mostly interested in securing a portion of the Ho-Chunk’s annuity.

In the winter of 1832-33, the Ho-Chunk were in desperate straits. Having moved north during the Black Hawk War, June to August 1832, to assure the federal government that they would not aid the Sauk, the Ho-Chunk had not been able to plant. Anticipating that this would leave many Ho-Chunk hungry, Kinzie, in an effort that combined diplomacy and social outreach, had arranged for two boatloads of corn to be delivered from Green Bay. However, their arrival was delayed until spring, and many Ho-Chunk starved to death.

82 Juliette Kinzie, p. 278.
83 Juliette Kinzie, p. 87.
84 Ibid, p. 88.
85 Juliette Kinzie, pp. 384-87.
July 1, 1833, John Kinzie resigned as subagent because the government refused to raise the subagency to a full agency (the difference between subagents and agents was not in their duties, but in their pay, which was half that of an agent). On September 10, 1833, Robert A. McCabe was appointed subagent. McCabe lived in the Old Indian Agency House until July 1834. At that point, the Indian Trade and Intercourse Act of 1834 had been passed, and, rather than appoint a new subagent, the commanding office of Fort Winnebago became the acting subagent, and the Indian Agency House was left vacant. Lieutenant Colonel Enos Cutler served during 1834 and part of 1835. He was succeeded by Major Nathaniel Clark, and then by Major John Green, who served until the subagency was discontinued in 1837. By treaty signed fraudulently by no more than 20 individual Ho-Chunk on November 1, 1837 at Washington, D.C., the Ho-Chunk relinquished all their lands east of the Mississippi River, and agreed to vacate within eight months. Their removal was officially completed in 1840, although some managed to stay on, or later return to, their homelands.

The Old Indian Agency House

The Old Indian Agency House is the only surviving building of the Ho-Chunk (Winnebago) subagency. It was erected in 1832. The subagency had been established, outside Fort Winnebago, at the portage, by the fall of 1830, and consisted of an unknown number of log buildings, most of which were houses for the men who worked at the subagency. One building was a blacksmith shop. None of these earlier buildings survive.

When John Kinzie brought his wife to Fort Winnebago in September 1830, the Kinzies had intended to take up their residence at the subagency immediately. However, Fort Winnebago’s commandant, Major Twiggs, insisted that they stay at the fort at least until their furniture had arrived, for “Mrs. Twigg had been without a companion of her own sex for more than four months...” In the spring of 1831, the Kinzies moved into the first agency house, a log building that had served as temporary quarters for the garrison in the winter of 1828-29, and which had been disassembled “and put up again on the little hill opposite the Fort. To these some additions were now made in the shape of dairy, stable, smoke-house, etc., constructed of tamarack logs brought from the neighboring swamp.”

86 Hill, p. 145.
87 Loew, p. 46.
89 Juliette Kinzie, p. 58.
90 Juliette Kinzie, p. 264.
John Kinzie had requested $1,500 for an agency house, and $400 for a blacksmith's house, in December 1830. Funds for the blacksmith's house were approved in the spring of 1831. When the blacksmith's house (not extant), a log building, was completed later in 1831, the Kinzies moved there.\(^91\) Funding for the existing Old Indian Agency House was approved in June 1831. However, notice of approval was accompanied with the recommendation that soldiers from Fort Winnebago should build the house for the agent. In August 1831, Kinzie wrote that the commandant of Fort Winnebago could not spare soldiers to erect his house. Workmen would have to be brought from St. Louis. Kinzie then requested an additional appropriation of $1,000 from Lewis Cass, then Secretary of War. Kinzie began construction on the house in the spring of 1832.\(^92\) October 1, 1832, Kinzie reported:

> The building consists of a Frame dwelling house, 30 by 34 feet:--two stories high; with a kitchen attached thereto of 16 by 20 ft., 1-1/2 stories high and stone cellar underneath; also an Out-house of 6 by 8 feet.\(^93\)

The Kinzies moved into the Old Indian Agency House in early November 1832; its final cost was estimated at $3497.17.\(^94\) They moved out on July 1, 1833. From September 1833 until July 1834, Ho-Chunk subagent Robert McCabe lived in the house. While the Old Indian Agency House was left vacant in the wake of Robert McCabe's departure, it remained under the ownership of the federal government until 1854. Between 1834 and 1854, there were a series of occupants. The house served briefly as a tavern, which the Fort Winnebago commandant expelled. From 1835 until 1840, Saterlee Clark operated a trading post with the Ho-Chunk in the house. A Captain Lowe is said to have lived there with his family for at least 10 years after that. In 1854, the federal government patented the land on which the Agency House was located to James Martin. He sold the land to George C. Tallman in 1857. Tallman put the property into farm use, later selling to James B. Wells. In 1878, Wells sold the house and its lands to Edmond S. Baker, who lived there until his death in October 1928.\(^95\) The National Society of Colonial Dames in the State of Wisconsin (NSCDW) acquired the Old Indian Agency House and the property on which it sits on January 7, 1931. By the time the NSCDW acquired the Old Indian Agency House, it was the only building standing associated with the

\(^{91}\) Ibid, pp. 265-66.  
\(^{93}\) Ibid, pp. 442-43.  
\(^{94}\) Ibid, pp. 444-45.  
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Ho-Chunk Subagency. The organization funded the rehabilitation of the house, and dedicated it on October 22, 1932. The house retains a high degree of integrity, as explained in Section 7, Description, and clearly conveys its historic association as representing the federal government’s struggle to choose an approach to Indian policy, between civilization and assimilation and removal, from about 1817 to 1834.

**Surviving Resources Associated with Indian Agencies/Subagencies of the 1817-1834 Era**

There appear to be few resources remaining that were associated with Indian agencies/subagencies prior to the enactment of the Indian Trade and Intercourse Act of (July 1) 1834, delineating Indian Territory west of the Mississippi River and making removal of Indian nations from east of the Mississippi River to the west of the river the federal policy. The total number of agencies/subagencies during the period east of the Mississippi River peaked at 25. Of these, four were located in each of Wisconsin and Michigan, three in each of Florida, Indiana, and Illinois, and one each in Ohio, New York, Louisiana, North Carolina, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia. Only four properties associated with Indian agencies/subagencies of this period have been identified, including the Old Indian Agency House. The others, including one property that is slightly later than 1834, are described below.

The Henry Rowe Schoolcraft House and Indian Agency at Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan was erected in 1827, and served as his home and agency until 1833, when the agency was moved to Mackinac Island. The Schoolcraft House and Indian Agency is owned by the city of Sault Sainte Marie, and was moved some distance from its original site in the 1980s in order to preserve it. The city intends to restore it; it was converted to office use for the Union Carbide Company in the early twentieth century.

Henry Rowe Schoolcraft (1793-1864) erected an agency house on Mackinac Island when he was transferred, but it was destroyed by fire in 1873. However, the Indian Dormitory, erected next door to the Indian agency in 1838, is extant. It was intended to accommodate Indian leaders visiting for their annuity. However, Indians preferred to camp, and it was primarily used by Indian agents as an administrative building. By 1846, it had been converted to other uses. It served as the Mackinac Island Public School from ca. 1865 until 1964, when it was purchased by the Mackinac Island State
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Park Commission. The building was restored to its original appearance in 1965-66, and was converted into an art museum in 2007.99

The John Johnston Farm & Indian Agency, owned by the Ohio Historical Society, is located northwest of Piqua, Ohio. John Johnston (1775-1861) served as Indian agent at the Fort Wayne (Indiana) agency from 1809 until 1811, and for western Ohio from 1812 until 1829.100 The farmhouse was erected ca. 1811-15, and the farm retains much of its 1829 appearance.101 In contrast with the Old Indian Agency House, and the Indian Dormitory, this property was not owned or funded by the federal government. Rather, Johnston purchased the farm property (in 1804) and built his farm buildings with his own money, and retained ownership of the farm for many years following the end of his service as an Indian agent. The Johnston Farm & Indian Agency is listed on the National Register.

The Joseph M. Street House in Prairie du Chien was erected ca. 1832. Street (1782-1840) served as Prairie du Chien Indian agent from August 1828 until 1837, when he was transferred to the Sauk and Fox Raccoon River Agency near Fairfield, Iowa. He served as Indian agent there until his death. It is unclear whether the Street House also served as the Prairie du Chien Indian agency, although it seems unlikely, since the agency had been in existence since 1807. The Street House has been altered with a ca. 1910, enclosed, full façade front porch, as well as a large rear addition and several altered window openings. These changes compromise the integrity of the Street House, so that it no longer conveys its association as an 1830s house.102

Conclusion

The Old Indian Agency House is significant at the national level, in the category of politics/government, representing a critical period in the evolution of federal Indian policy, between 1817 and 1834, with a specific period of significance of 1832-1834. Federal Indian policy is a major theme in American history, and is closely intertwined with the settlement and westward expansion of the nation. During the brief period between about 1817 and 1834, the federal government struggled to choose between two opposing approaches to Indian policy: to civilize American Indians and assimilate them

102 Wisconsin Historical Society, Division of Historic Preservation, Architecture/History Inventory #6065; and Hill, p. 144.
as the nation expanded westward; or to view Indian tribes as an impediment to Euro-American settlement, and remove them west of the Mississippi River.

Early federal Indian policy regarded Indian nations as capable of being “civilized,” that is, of adopting Euro-American agricultural, economic and societal practices, and assimilating into Euro-American society. Federal government rhetoric also acknowledged American Indian tribes as sovereign nations, with rights to the lands they occupied. The Indian agent/subagent acted as a diplomatic representative of the United States. Indian agents/subagents were also encouraged to promote Euro-American practices, especially animal husbandry, agriculture, and mechanical arts (such as spinning and weaving). Beginning about 1817, the federal government began to question whether American Indians could be successfully civilized and assimilated. Initiatives to promote education and Christianization began at this time, and were typically overseen by the Indian agents/subagents, and provided by Christian missionary societies. Under Andrew Jackson’s leadership, the period of federal government indecision in Indian policy ended with the renewal of the Indian Trade and Intercourse Act on July 1, 1834. This act designated a large area of lands west of the Mississippi River as Indian Territory, and removal became the official policy. Further, federal Indian policy had come to view Indian tribes as dependents without rights, and the rhetoric had become one of supposedly promoting the welfare of Indians by isolating them from the depredations of unscrupulous Euro-Americans selling liquor and swindling Indians out of their lands. This position solidified through the mid-to-late nineteenth century, and continued well into the twentieth century.

The struggle over the approach to federal Indian policy between 1817 and 1834 was played out along the frontier, in Georgia and Florida, and in the Northwest Territory, where Indian agencies and Indian agents/subagents represented the United States, served as ambassadors and brought Euro-American practices to Indian nations, testing the ideas of the competing approaches to Indian policy. During this brief period, Indian agents appointed in the Northwest Territory were often men like Henry Rowe Schoolcraft and John Kinzie, who saw value in learning the languages of the Indian nations to which they were assigned, and who appeared to have treated honestly with Indian tribes and to have held them in regard. The Old Indian Agency House was specifically built, at John Kinzie’s insistence, using federal funds, on land that the federal government recognized as belonging to the Ho-Chunk, a sovereign nation, to serve as the home and office of the Indian Subagent to the Ho-Chunk, much like an embassy is constructed in a foreign nation. Federal funding for a dedicated Indian agency building, on Indian land, appears to have been unusual prior to 1834; no other such building has been identified. In contrast, Indian agents/subagents of the period were often located in military installations. Others operated out of their homes. In 1834, the number of Indian agents/subagents east of the Mississippi River peaked at 25. As removal of Indian tribes to the west of the Mississippi River became the accepted federal policy, agencies/subagencies east of the Mississippi River closed. By 1840, only
seven Indian agencies/subagencies remained east of the Mississippi River. By 1850, this figure had fallen to five.

The Old Indian Agency House retains a high degree of integrity. It has a period of significance extending from 1832 to 1834, dates which encompass the completion of the building, and the end of its service as an Indian agent’s home and office. This period also falls within the most critical time in the debate over federal Indian policy, Andrew Jackson’s presidency, 1829-1837. Removal of Indian tribes west of the Mississippi River was the accepted policy from the passage of the Indian Trade and Intercourse Act of (July 1) 1834. The Old Indian Agency House represents the last efforts in the federal Indian policy that advocated civilization and assimilation of Indian tribes into Euro-American society. While the Old Indian Agency House has a short period of significance, it represents this period of changing national policy.
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VERBAL BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

The Old Indian Agency House is located on parts of Out Lots 107 and 109, being part of the NE ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 33, Township 13 North, Range 9 East, in the City of Portage, Columbia County, Wisconsin, on a parcel created by drawing lines of convenience within the 200-acre legal parcel on which the house sits, as follows: Beginning at the southeast corner of Out Lot 109; then westerly along the south line of Out Lot 109 to the south line’s intersection with the westerly edge of pavement of Agency House Road. This is the point of beginning. From this point, southwesterly along the westerly edge of pavement of Agency House Road a distance of 200 feet; thence northwesterly along a line of convenience west of, and parallel to, the gravel drive that runs southwesterly of the house a distance of 250 feet; thence northeasterly along a line of convenience that is the extension of the northwest edge of pavement of the parking lot a distance of 264 feet to the west corner of the edge of pavement of the parking lot; thence southeasterly along the southwestern edge of pavement of the parking lot a distance of 105 feet; thence northeasterly along the southeastern edge of pavement of the parking lot a distance of 50 feet to the southwestern edge of pavement of the driveway into the parking lot; thence southeasterly along the southwestern edge of pavement of the driveway into the parking lot to the westerly edge of pavement of Agency House Road a distance of 90 feet; thence southwesterly along the westerly edge of pavement of Agency House Road to the point of beginning, a distance of 90 feet. The total historic boundary encloses about 1.6 acres and represents an expansion of the boundary from the 1972 nomination, which did not provide a boundary description.

BOUNDARY JUSTIFICATION

The historic boundary of the Old Indian Agency House follows lines of convenience drawn within the 200-acre legal parcel on which the House sites, and encloses all the resources historically associated with the property during its period of significance, 1832-1834, and all of the test units of the 1988 archaeological survey of the site (see Figure 1, Old Indian Agency House, #47-CO-0228). The boundary expansion was made to enclose the archaeological resources.
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WI_ColumbiaCounty_OldIndianAgencyHouse_0001  
South façade (left) and east elevation, camera facing northwest; Caretaker’s Cottage in background.

WI_ColumbiaCounty_OldIndianAgencyHouse_0002  
Caretaker’s Cottage, south façade (right) and west elevation, camera facing northeast.

WI_ColumbiaCounty_OldIndianAgencyHouse_0003  
Visitor’s Center, south façade, camera facing north.

WI_ColumbiaCounty_OldIndianAgencyHouse_0004  
South façade, camera facing north.

WI_ColumbiaCounty_OldIndianAgencyHouse_0005  
North (rear, right) and east elevations, camera facing northwest.

WI_ColumbiaCounty_OldIndianAgencyHouse_0006  
East (left) and north (rear) elevations, camera facing west-northwest.

WI_ColumbiaCounty_OldIndianAgencyHouse_0007  
East elevation, camera facing west.

WI_ColumbiaCounty_OldIndianAgencyHouse_0008  
West elevation, camera facing east.

WI_ColumbiaCounty_OldIndianAgencyHouse_0009  
Entrance/stair hall, camera facing south.

WI_ColumbiaCounty_OldIndianAgencyHouse_0010  
Kitchen, showing corner staircase, camera facing southeast.

WI_ColumbiaCounty_OldIndianAgencyHouse_0011  
Kitchen, camera facing north.

WI_ColumbiaCounty_OldIndianAgencyHouse_0012  
Living room, camera facing north-northeast.
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WI_ColumbiaCounty_OldIndianAgencyHouse_0013
Dining room, camera facing south-southeast.

WI_ColumbiaCounty_OldIndianAgencyHouse_0014
North bedroom, camera facing south-southeast.
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Figure 1: Old Indian Agency House Archaeological Survey, 1988
Figure 2: Old Indian Agency House Site Plan A
Figure 3: Old Indian Agency House Site Plan B
Figure 4: Old Indian Agency House First Floor Plan
Figure 5: Old Indian Agency House Second Floor Plan
Figure 6: Old Indian Agency House Historical Photographs
Figure 2: Old Indian Agency House Site Plan A
Portage, Columbia County, Wisconsin
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Figure 3: Old Indian Agency House Site Plan B
Portage, Columbia County, Wisconsin
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Portage, Columbia County, Wisconsin

Ca. 1910, in farming use.

Ca. 1932, after rehabilitation.
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State Historic Preservation Review Board
Wisconsin Historical Society
816 State Street
Madison, WI 53707

Dear Members of the State Historic Preservation Review Board,

For the people of Wisconsin and the United States, the Historic Indian Agency House in Portage stands as an important connection to our past. I am pleased to recommend that the Wisconsin Historic Preservation Review Board officially recognize its considerable historical significance within the context of national history.

As European settlers continued to travel westward in 1832, John H. Kinzie moved just north of Fort Winnebago into one of Wisconsin's first frame houses, the Indian Agency House. During these years, the United States government's relations with Indian nations had reached a critical juncture between co-existence and forceful removal. Although within a few short years the United States would effectively declare war on many Indian nations, the Indian Agency House stands as a monument to a period in time when it was America's intent to live in this country alongside its original inhabitants. Because the purpose of the House was to trade and communicate with the Winnebago through an ambassador, few other standing sites exemplify this historical crossroads as well as the Indian Agency House.

It is my belief that we must continually try to understand and connect to our past by preserving, recognizing and experiencing what previous generations of Americans left for us. By officially giving the Indian Agency House status as a national historic site, future generations will be able to continue to experience the rich history contained within its walls.

Sincerely,

FRED CLARK
State Representative
42nd Assembly District
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