

let it have the approval of the President would be all that would be needed, -- the Indian government would be at an end. General Grant of course, like anybody else knows this, and yet it will be remembered that in his message to Congress transmitting the Okmulgee Constitution just after its adoption by the Council, he recommended a compliance with the wishes of the Indians, so far as "consistent with safety." Where was the danger? Did it threaten the Indians themselves? If we could suppose for a moment that the guardian was so solicious for the welfare of the ward as to apprehend danger to the latter from his own acts, then we would either have to consider the guardian as a paragon of gentleness and good intentions, or that the ward was the feeblest and most abject of human kind. Who, whether white or red is willing to accept either of these conclusions?

Where was the danger -- and whom did it threaten? If the Indian nations, over whom the Okmulgee Constitution was designed to operate were enemies and not friends of the Federal Government -- if their life was one of war and not of peace -- if they rejected civilization instead of fostering and seeking it -- if they were powerful instead of being