

sympathetic at all. And, if you'll read even to this day in the Georgian Historical quarterlys and the materials that comes out in Georgia, they are no less so today. The cause of Georgia was fully justified in the minds of many Georgia historians even at this present time. And, in the total perspective, you have to ask yourself, "was there not sound reasoning on the part of that large group of Indians who suggested that the Cherokee would be better off if he removed himself voluntarily from Georgia and Tennessee. 7,000 Indians or more had come to the Cherokee west. This wasn't Trail of Tears. This wasn't being driven out at bayonet point. This was voluntary selection of a new country which you had been promised would be yours forever beyond the encroachment of the White Man. So some more of the 7,000 of them chose, voluntarily, to come--come West. The question of Indian removal dates the establishment of an Indian state--dates, well, there was discussion of it in Congress in 1782--the idea of removing the Indians. Well, as we know it, (words not clear) this particular period for one reason, and that was that there was no controversy or at least nothing I can think of in the history of the United States until abolition that created such great national furor. You've read about the debates in Boston, at the famous Fano Hall over the question of slavery. Do you know that 10 and 15 years before that, men with such distinguished names as Salton Stall (?) and Tom Wallinger, were then debating the question of whether the Indians should be removed to the West. Would you know that Ralph Waldo Emerson, the great American scholar, came to the defense of the Cherokee Indians with a very impassionate letter. I like looking through old newspapers because I don't think I've ever found a newspaper between 1828 and 1832 that did not have something in it about the removal of the Cherokee Indians.