

ADDRESSES AND ARGUMENTS

BY PROMINENT MEN

IN FAVOR OF

Separate Statehood

FOR

INDIAN TERRITORY.

AUTHORIZED BY

KINTA SEPARATE STATEHOOD CLUB.

An Address by the Principal Chiefs.

Indian Territory has reached the period of transition from tribal government to that of statehood. In the treaties that provided this transition the manner of affecting it was not wrought out in detail. Principles alone were outlined. The decision of the Supreme court of the United States, which declared the status of the tribal governments to be that of "domestic, dependent nations," establishes those principles. It is therefore imperative that the Indian nations shall adopt a method of forming statehood that will in its provisions be fair, just and equal to all its inhabitants. The policy of the United States expressed in the treaties and upheld by executive and administrative offices of the United States government has always consistently maintained the position that out of the country owned and occupied by the nations of the Indian Territory at the right time a state or states should be formed by its people. This time was fixed by the agreements closing the tribal governments March 4th, 1906.

Knowing this, exercising the rights of Americans, we have determined the manner in which a state government shall be established and have called this convention to form and submit to the vote of the people a state constitution for the Indian Territory. The members of this convention, chosen by the people of the several recording districts of the Indian Territory for this work, have been so elected as to embrace the highest moral forces of the Territory and to recognize all classes and conditions of its people. The inspiring hope of winning statehood and becoming an integral part of the sisterhood of states has been a quenchless fire of patriotism and loyalty. This hope has been our center of life, the quickening influence that has been an irresistible power in our homes, our schools and our councils. Our people have striven to master the English, the language of

American liberty, of their future citizenship. We have learned and multitudes of us have embraced the Christian religion. This religion has taught us the divine plan of life from death and to know that from the death of our separate nationalities shall come a larger, better life for all who live within the Indian Territory, a life of equal rights and equal protection through the common citizenship thus established. The right of every inhabitant of the Indian Territory to a part in the establishment of its government is inherent. Failure to exercise this right is un-American. Local self-government is the basic principle of American liberty, and upon this principle we expect to build our government "of the people, by the people and for the people." Through this transition our present government shall not be annihilated but transformed into material for a nobly builded state.

"Thus shall we have life, not death."

W. C. ROGERS,
GREEN McCURTAIN,
JOHN F. BROWN,
PLEASANT PORTER,
Principal Chiefs.

Be sure to attend the election on Tuesday, November 7th, and vote for the adoption of the Constitution and Kinta for the County Seat of Sans Bois County.

AN ADDRESS.

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE INDIAN TERRITORY :

The convention, assembled to frame a Constitution for the proposed State of Sequoyah, presents the result of its labors for the consideration of the people of this Territory. It has been the earnest and united effort of the members of the convention to frame a Constitution which will secure to the people of Sequoyah a just, wise, and economical state government.

In this we believe we have succeeded, and we confidently submit to our fellow citizens the fruit of our deliberations.

That the instrument will be found to contain imperfections we are well aware, but the peculiarity of our situation, while beset with serious disadvantages, has been in some respects most advantageous. The very fact that the general political complexion of the various parts of our State has never been manifested by popular elections has made possible an apportionment of the State necessarily free from partisan political considerations. The nature of the call which brought us together, and the marked scarcity of active politicians in the membership of the convention, made it possible to practically eliminate partisan considerations, and it has been most gratifying to note the high ideals and unselfish unanimity in devotion to the public good which have animated the members of the convention.

In the Article on the Legislative Department of the Government, while all needed legislation is permitted, great care has been taken to circumscribe the powers of future legislators in such a way as to prevent abuse of power or extravagance.

In the Article on the Executive Department the prerogatives and powers of the several State officers are clearly stated, all necessary authority is placed in their hands and all needed checks have been supplied.

The Article on the Judicial Department has been drawn with the utmost care, so as to provide for the doing of justice fully, impartially and promptly.

The clause adopted from the Constitution of the Cherokee Nation providing for decisions in Civil cases by a majority verdict will be specially helpful in preventing protracted and expensive litigation.

Careful provisions have been made to prevent extravagance, and the people of Sequoyah can not be required to pay more than three cents on the dollar in taxes, except in cases where, by their own vote, the people of a city or district shall, to a limited extent, increase the amount for the benefit of the public schools.

Provision has been made for the liberal support of a system of public schools in which shall be taught besides the common branches the rudiments of agriculture and domestic science. High schools, Normal, Agricultural and Mechanical and other colleges and a State University have been provided for. Protection is also secured to children from premature labor in factories or mines.

Most carefully planned machinery for the regulation and control of corporations, modeled on the recently adopted Constitution of the State of Virginia, has been provided.

The provisions for exemptions on homesteads and personal property, while not allowing quite such large exemptions as in the Constitution of the State of Texas, upon which they are modeled, are most carefully drawn so as to give adequate and sure protection.

Provision is made to exclude from the State, lotteries, prize fights and other brutal sports, and to prohibit the traffic in intoxicating liquors. This is done in such a way as to guarantee to the Federal Government that the State will assume the responsibility of keeping the solemn pledge of the United States to the Five Civilized Tribes to forever keep the traffic in intoxicants out of the Territory, which has been their home. In other respects, great care has been taken to amply provide for the keeping of all treaty pledges to the Indian people.

That keen solicitude is manifested for the welfare and protection of those least able to protect themselves is manifested in making provision that the fellow-servant law shall have no place on our statute books, that contracts proposing to relieve employers of proper responsibility shall be void, and the wages of the laborer for personal services for two months shall not be liable to garnishment.

Above all, an earnest effort has been made to make every form of bribery and corruption not only a heinous and detestable offense, but also a crime which shall receive just and unsparing punishment.

When a people is invited to take so serious and important a step as ratifying a Constitution, and asking to be admitted as a State to the Union, it is eminently fitting that full justification for such a step should be given. Under such circumstances they may and should surely be ready to answer three questions about the thing demanded:

First: Is it right?

Second: If it is right, is it also desirable?

Third: If it is both right and desirable, is it practicable?

Is the statehood for which the adoption of this Constitution is a formal demand, a right thing? For answer, we have only to refer to the obligations solemnly assumed by the Federal Government, in the name

of the people of the United States, as to this matter.

These pledges were made in return for considerations of the greatest value and importance at the time when the several tribes relinquished their homes east of the Mississippi and came to this Territory and were expressed in Treaties entered into with all formality. The following are clauses from the Treaties directly bearing on the matter :

TREATY WITH THE CHEROKEES.

Article 5. The United States hereby covenants and agrees that the lands ceded to the Cherokee Nation in the foregoing article shall in no future time, without their consent, be included within the territorial limits or jurisdiction of any state or territory. (Rev. Ind. Treaties, p. 69.)

TREATY WITH THE CREEKS AND SEMINOLES.

Article 4. The United States do solemnly agree and bind themselves that no State or Territory should ever pass laws for the government of the Creek or Seminole Tribes of Indians, and that no portion of either of the tracts of country defined in the first and second articles of this agreement shall ever be embraced or included within, or annexed to, any Territory or State, nor shall either or any part of either ever be erected into a Territory without the free and full consent, or without the legislative authority of the tribe owning the same. (Rev. Ind. Treaties, p. 111.)

CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW TREATY.

Article 4. The government and people of the United States are hereby obliged to secure to the said Choctaw Nation of red people the jurisdiction and government of all the persons and property that may be within their limits west, so that no Territory or State shall ever have a right to pass laws for the government of the Choctaw Nation of red people and their descendants, and that no part of the land granted them shall ever be embraced in any State or Territory. (7th U. S. Stats., p. 334.)

These treaties so far as they apply to the lands owned by the Five Civilized Tribes, and to those lands alone, have never been repealed but expressly ratified in later treaties. Even if it could be held, as of course it can not, that time could impair the validity of such solemn agreements, Congress has in very recent years given them further ratification in a very remarkable way. In the bill creating the so-called Dawes Commission for the purpose of securing the

consent of the Five Civilized Tribes to the relinquishment of the patent to their lands, allotment of the same in severalty and the termination of their government occurs the following:

“The extinguishment of tribal titles to any lands within that Territory, now held by any or all of said nations or tribes, either by cession of the same or some part thereof to the United States, or by the allotment and division of the same in severalty among the Indians of such nations or tribes, respectively, as may be entitled to the same, or by such other method as may be agreed upon between the several nations and tribes aforesaid, or each of them with the United States with a view to such an adjustment upon the basis of justice and equity as may, with the consent of said Nation of Indians, so far as may be necessary, be requisite and suitable to enable the ultimate creation of a state or states of the Union, which shall embrace the lands within said Indian Territory.” Sec. 16, Act of March 3, 1893. (27 Stats. 645.)

In the same Act of Congress, in the clauses defining the work which the Commission was authorized to do, occurs the following explicit statement:

“But said Commissioners shall, however, have power to negotiate any and all such agreements as, in view of all the circumstances affecting the subject, shall be found requisite and suitable to such an arrangement of the rights and interests and affairs of such nations, tribes, bands or Indians, or any of them, to enable the ultimate creation of a Territory of the United States with a view to the admission of the same as a State of the Union.” (27 Stat. L., 645.)

Acting upon this distinct provision the Dawes Commission made treaties with the tribes in the very first of which we find this distinct reference to the foregoing pledges. After stating the method in which tribal government is to be carried on, pending final adjustment of all tribal affairs, the agreement proceeds:

“This stipulation is made in the belief that the tribal governments so modified will prove so satisfactory that there will be no need or desire for further change till the lands now occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes shall, in the opinion of Congress, be prepared for admission as a State of the Union.” (Atoka Agreement as quoted and ratified by the Congress of the United States in the so-called Curtis Act of 1898.)

Referring to these Treaties, Secretary Bonaparte, in a formal report to Congress, issued in March, 1904, said that if such promises, so solemnly made, are not kept by the American people, "They can be bound by no Treaty," and "No one can reasonably place confidence in our National honor."

Plainly there can be no possible question of the righteousness of our demand. Not only so, but as within six months the Five Civilized Tribes will go out of existence, and thus it will become forever impossible for them to officially express their desire, is it not plain that to let them have now the voice so solemnly and repeatedly promised them in the making of their own future, is not merely right, but it is practically the only right thing which it remains possible for the government and people of the United States to do.

As there can be no question as to the righteousness of the thing asked, we may inquire, in the second place, is it desirable? To an American self-government is always desirable. The Indian people belonging to the five tribes which had regular systems of government before the foot of the pale-face had trod the fair soil of this continent desire not that their ancient governments shall come to an abrupt end, but that they shall continue, united into one fair commonwealth. In forming this they invite freely and fully into fellow-citizenship their white neighbors in what has been so long their beautiful home. They would like that on the fourth of next March when the old order passes it shall give place to the new which they have provided to take its place. Surely they are justified in thinking these things desirable. We, as a people, have certain peculiarities, begotten of our long continuance in peculiar conditions. We have been without the open saloon and the traffic in intoxicants, and we wish to remain so. We believe we can do this best as an independent people. We have been to a large extent free from direct taxation and we wish to assume new burdens with the utmost care and economy. We believe we can do this best as an independent State. Indians and whites, we have been together as friends and social equals. In no other state is the Indian accepted in quite this way, and we believe it is most desirable that we should be left to work out our common destiny by ourselves without entanglements with the people of any other Territory. For all these and

many other reasons it seems to us that what we seek is not only right, but eminently desirable.

But in the third place, is it practicable? Some of our friends say it is not, because Congress does not desire and will not consent to give us separate and independent statehood. We ask in return, who has authority to voice the desires and express the intentions of a Congress, one-half of whose members have not yet been seated? Past congresses have been asked repeatedly to unite us in statehood with another territory. The baseless assertion that we all desired it has been insistently iterated. In spite of this, if actions speak louder than words, Congress has said, at every opportunity to speak so far, that it would not give us this joint statehood. Is it unreasonable or impracticable, then, to expect that, having repeatedly denied us one alternative? Congress may consent to give us the other—that is, statehood by ourselves, separate from and independent of any other State or Territory.

Then we are told that it is impracticable for so small a territory to seek independent statehood. Indian Territory, with 31,000 square miles, is almost as large as the average of all the states east of the Mississippi. Substantially its area is equal to that of Indiana. Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Vermont could all be included within its limits and room left for a considerable slice of Delaware. Size surely does not make statehood impracticable.

Then comes the suggestion that its population is not large enough. To that it is surely sufficient to reply that no previous applicant for statehood has had half as many people and that today more than one-third of the states of the Union do not equal it. Want of population certainly can not make the proposition impracticable.

Doubt is expressed as to our ability to support ourselves as a State. We are asked whether our resources are sufficient. Our vast area of fertile soil and our splendid climate, free alike from floods and drought, would by themselves be an adequate answer. But we do not point to undeveloped resources alone. Our far-reaching fields, hidden beneath their covering of golden grain or downy cotton; the countless cattle fattening upon our prairie pastures; our orchards bending beneath their luscious load; our gardens, rendering so ready a return to pleasant toil; our primeval forests of

pine and oak and walnut, through whose mighty aisles has never yet resounded the ringing of the woodman's axe; our coal mines, already yielding a princely tribute, which is but a hint of the hidden horde as yet untouched; our oil and gas, springing from the bowels of the earth, and forming a larger continuous belt than can be found elsewhere in all the land; the daily discoveries of mineral wealth, which a kindly providence has stored in the vast vaults of the eternal hills, and which they are now yielding to us, as men's knowledge and skill learn the combination that opens for us Nature's mighty timelocks, all join to give bond that we shall be no dependent or poverty-stricken member of the sisterhood of States.

We are told, however, that though all we have said of our resources may be true, yet the fact that so large a proportion of our land must, by the agreements between the United States and the Five Civilized Tribes, be exempt for many years from taxation will make it very hard, if not impossible, for us to support a State government. To this we answer, that if many homesteads are exempt from taxation, the same thing has been true of nearly every western State at the time of its admission. The Homestead Act, under which these have been so largely settled, made a very large proportion of these new States non-taxable. We believe we have to begin with more than the average taxable land that most western States have begun their independence with, and we are sure we have a much larger amount of taxable property. We shall not need to be carried through a protracted infancy, but from the first shall be well able to walk alone.

Another suggestion is, that our people are not of the character and grade of intelligence to make statehood a practical thing. The answer to this is to be found in the official census reports, which show that no community in the Union is more thoroughly American, and that, in spite of the serious disabilities forced upon us in the matter of providing public schools, we stand well in the scale of literacy.

The suggestion that our shape would be odd and such as could not be laid off with a ruler, we dismiss as puerile. No one has ventured to suggest for any Territory that irregularity of shape is a practical difficulty in the way of statehood.

We are told that it is impracticable for us to ask state-

hood without the previous passage by Congress of an Enabling Act. Our friends assure us that so unusual a course must end in failure. We reply that our course is not by any means unprecedented. An Enabling Act was not invented till after Vermont, Kentucky and Tennessee had been added to the original thirteen. Maine held several conventions, adopted a Constitution, and was admitted to the Union by Act of Congress the following year. Early in 1836, Arkansas adopted a Constitution at a convention held in Little Rock. This fact was transmitted to Congress several weeks later, and in June an Act of Admission was passed and approved. Our great neighbor, Texas, presented its Constitution to Congress without any previous Enabling Act. In Iowa a year later an Enabling Act followed the adoption of a first Constitution. In 1849, California adopted a Constitution and elected State officers. After several months of debate, the Constitution was accepted and the State admitted. Oregon, nearly ten years later, followed the same example, adopting and ratifying a Constitution in the fall of 1857, and being admitted by Act of Congress early in 1859. The same year our neighbor, Kansas, adopted and ratified the Wyandotte Constitution, and nearly two years later was admitted by Act of Congress. In West Virginia, the Constitutional convention adopted a Constitution, February 18, 1862. This was ratified by the people in April of the same year, and on the last day of that year Congress voted to admit her as a State the following June.

Two of the latest additions to the sisterhood of states, Idaho and Wyoming, adopted and ratified constitutions first, and were then admitted by Act of Congress. A number of other states adopted Constitutions which were rejected. An Enabling Act was passed for Colorado, but the Constitution drafted under it was not ratified by the people. Then she held a convention without authority of any Enabling Act and adopted a Constitution which was ratified. Congress voted twice to admit her with this Constitution, and her admission was only prevented by the President's veto. Several years later another Constitution was adopted and she was admitted. Thus there is certainly nothing unprecedented or even unusual in the course we are pursuing. We claim, however, that if an Enabling Act is to be considered a necessary preliminary step to statehood, that the solemn treaties, pledges and agreements made by Congress with regard to the

country occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes, constitute for it an Enabling Act of the highest authority and giving the fullest sanction which Congress could give.

All legitimate questions as to the righteousness, wisdom and practicability of our demands having been answered, there remains only the last resource of those who can find no valid reason to urge against a proposition; the attempt by personal attacks upon those who are making it and by suggestions of unworthy motives to discredit the whole movement. It is stated in some quarters that this is not a movement of Indian citizens and in their interest, but is the plot of a few scheming white politicians to further their own personal ends and ambitions, and to use the Indians as a means for gaining power. The personnel, the spirit, and, above all, the work of this convention, are the best answer to this mean innuendo. The convention has been called by Indians; the majority of its labor is largely the fruit of the good thought and work of Indians. Throughout the Constitution the most earnest solicitude is manifested for the sacred fulfillment of all treaty obligations and the continued protection of the Indian people. But if the Constitution itself is not sufficient answer to suggestions of this kind, surely the accompanying address of the Chiefs of the Tribes to their people is an unanswerable testimonial to the good faith in which this work has been undertaken, and its genuineness as an expression of the real desire of the Indian people.

Thus we come to the Congress of the United States and ask for recognition as the forty-sixth State of the Union in the assured confidence that we can give such bond as no other State has ever given for future independence and greatness in our magnificent Territory and vast resources.

That we are far larger in population than any other State ever heretofore received.

That we are better prepared to undertake the burdens incident to statehood than any previous applicant has been.

That we are at least as thoroughly American in our citizenship as any who have knocked for admission at the doors of Congress.

That we can and do give to the Congress of the United States the very best and fullest guarantee that in spirit and in letter its obligations to the Indian people will be religiously guarded.

And that we have a higher guarantee and stronger claim for admission to statehood than any other candidate has ever had.

Citizens of Indian Territory: With these considerations, we place the Constitution in your hands, assured that by your overwhelming vote you will ratify it and thus establish and secure admission into the Union of a State having its roots buried deep in the history of this continent, when no white wanderer had ever walked its shores, having its branches already wide-spreading and fruitful, and destined to become one of the fairest, freest and most prosperous of all the States which constitute our Union.

Come to Kinta on Tuesday, November 7th, to vote. Preparations are being made to have a big time. A large number of beeves and muttuns will be barbecued, and a good time is guaranteed for everybody. Come.

Did the Government of the United States Ever Pledge Itself to Give Separate Statehood to Indian Territory ?

Listen to what Hon. Chas. J. Bonaparte, the present Secretary of the Navy, said about this in an official report submitted to Congress, March 7th, 1904. (See Sen. Doc. 189, 58th Congress, 2d Session, p. 25.)

PRESENT SITUATION IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

“To appreciate the situation one must remember the obligations of the Government to the so-called Five Civilized Tribes. These Tribes consented to give up their habitations in other parts of the United States and remove to the Territory in return for certain solemn and explicit pledges made to them by the United States, embodied in Treaties ratified with all needful formalities, and further evidenced by numerous official documents of the highest authority. The removal of these Indians to their new homes was desired and effected by our Government to serve grave ends of public policy, and their consent to it constituted an ample consideration for the promises made them in return. If these promises are not binding upon the United States, then our Gov-

ernment and people can be bound by no Treaty. If we do not scrupulously respect the rights flowing from these Treaties no one can reasonably place confidence in our National honor."

This is not the utterance of some separate state crank or fanatic, but of a great statesman, who has since been counted worthy of a place in the Cabinet. Now what are the promises and pledges to which Mr. Bonaparte refers? Here are some of them in the exact language of the original official documents:

Treaty With the Cherokees of 1835.

Article 5. The United States hereby covenants and agrees that the lands ceded to the Cherokee Nation in the foregoing article shall in no future time, without their consent, be included within the territorial limits or jurisdiction of any state or territory. (Rev. Ind. Treaties, p. 69.)

Treaty With the Creeks and Seminoles of 1845.

Article 4. The United States do solemnly agree and bind themselves that no State or Territory should ever pass laws for the government of the Creek or Seminole Tribes of Indians, and that no portion of either of the tracts of country defined in the first and second articles of this agreement shall ever be embraced or included within, or annexed to, any Territory or State, nor shall either or any part of either ever be erected into a Territory without the free and full consent, or without the legislative authority of the tribe owning the same. (Rev. Ind. Treaties, p. 111.)

Choctaw and Chickasaw Treaty.

Article 4. The government and people of the United States are hereby obliged to secure to the said Choctaw Nation of red people the jurisdiction and government of all the persons and property that may be within their limits west, so that no Territory or State shall ever have a right to pass laws for the government of the Choctaw Nation of red people and their descendants, and that no part of the land granted them shall ever be embraced in any State or Territory. (7th U. S. Stats., p. 334.)

These treaties so far as they apply to the lands owned by the Five Civilized Tribes, and to those lands alone, have never been repealed but expressly ratified in later treaties. Even if it could be held, as of course it can not, that time

could impair the validity of such solemn agreements, Congress has in very recent years given them further ratification in a very remarkable way. In the bill creating the so-called Dawes Commission for the purpose of securing the agreement of the Five Civilized Tribes to the allotment of their lands and the termination of their government, occurs the following:

"The extinguishment of tribal titles to any lands within that Territory, now held by any or all of such nations or tribes, either by cession of the same or some part thereof to the United States, or by the allotment and division of the same in severalty among the Indians of such nations or tribes, respectively, as may be entitled to the same, or by such other method as may be agreed upon between the several nations and tribes aforesaid, or each of them with the United States with a view to such an adjustment upon the basis of justice and equality as may, with the consent of said Nation of Indians, so far as may be necessary, be requisite and suitable to enable the ultimate creation of a state or states of the Union, which shall embrace the lands within said Indian Territory." Sec. 16, Act of March 3, 1893. (27 Stats. 645.)

In the same Act of Congress, in the clauses defining the work which the Commission was authorized to do, occurs the following explicit statement:

"But said Commissioners shall, however, have power to negotiate any and all such agreements as, in view of all the circumstances affecting the subject, shall be found requisite and suitable to such an arrangement of the rights and interests and affairs of such nations, tribes, bands or Indians, or any of them, to enable the ultimate creation of a Territory of the United States with a view to the admission of the same as a State of the Union." (27 Stat. L., 645.)

Acting upon this distinct provision the Dawes Commission made treaties with the tribes in the very first of which we find this distinct reference to the foregoing pledges. After stating the method in which tribal government is to be carried on, pending final adjustment of all tribal affairs, the agreement proceeds:

"This stipulation is made in the belief that the tribal governments so modified will prove so satisfactory that there will be no need or desire for further change till the lands now occupied by the Five Civilized Tribes shall, in the opin-

ion of Congress, be prepared for admission as a State of the Union." (Atoka Agreement as quoted and ratified by the Congress of the United States in the so-called Curtis Act of 1898.)

Citizens of the Indian Territory, is the question at the head of this article answered?

When you are next asked whether independent statehood for Indian Territory is possible, ask in your turn whether or not the only statehood possible is not that which can be granted without putting the United States in a position in which it can be justly said of it, in the language of Secretary Bonaparte, "They can be bound by no Treaty and no one can reasonably place confidence in our National honor."

SEQUOYAH CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE.

It will cost the people of Sans Boise County nothing for the ground on which to build the Court House if Kinta is selected as the County Seat. Two blocks have been donated for the purpose.

IS JOINT STATEHOOD WITH OKLAHOMA THE ONLY KIND POSSIBLE FOR INDIAN TERRITORY?

**Some People Keep on Telling a Lie 'Til They Make Them-
selves and Other People Believe It Is the Truth.**

You have been told again and again that it didn't matter what you wanted, the only statehood possible for you is absorption into Oklahoma.

The same fellows who have silenced your every attempt to say what you want with this kind of a bluff have been sending delegations to Washington to tell Congress that nobody in the Indian Territory wants anything else than joint statehood with Oklahoma. You know this last statement is an impudent and unmittigated LIE. But they have said it so often that they got some Congressmen to believe it and try to give you what they thought was the only thing you wanted. They could not get enough members of Congress to believe the lie, so you are not absorbed into Oklahoma yet.

You will never be if you keep on telling the truth about it as persistently as the other fellows have kept on lying. The next time one of them starts to work this old gag on, you tell him you rather expect those who tell lies about you to tell them to you also. Challenge him for the slightest proof of his statement and tell him that the only statehood possible for Indian Territory is one which does not offer to place the badge of bad faith and the infamy of solemn pledges deliberately disregarded upon the Federal Government, which does not propose to disregard the consent of the governed, in a word that the only statehood possible for Indian Territory is the independent statehood its people want.

Then go and tell your timid neighbor, who has been frightened by lies, the truth which will make him brave and free.

STATEHOOD CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE.

Don't forget the Barbecue at Kinta on Tuesday, November 7th---
the Election day. Come and have a good time.

An Exchange of Views on Independent Statehood.

Muskogee, Ind. Ter., August 26, 1905.

CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE,

Indian Territory Constitutional Convention.

Gentlemen:—

Answering your wishes that the discussion of statehood for Indian Territory may be by such mutual interchange of opinion among people of Indian Territory who entertain different views on the subject to the end that by a comparison of views all sides of the question may be considered, I first hand you the interview of the Hon. S. T. Bledsoe as taken from the Dallas News of the 25th of August, wherein Mr. Bledsoe is quoted as making the statement following:

“Ardmore, I. T., Aug. 23.—Interest in joint statehood

was never more keen than at present. Indications are that the fight for union with Oklahoma will be started early this year. The press of the Territory is waging a fight for joint statehood and the leading papers are urging the people to take action. Hon. S. T. Bledsoe, who was a statehood delegate at Washington last year, said:

“Probably fifteen or twenty per cent of the people of Indian Territory favor separate statehood and eighty to eighty-five per cent joint statehood with Oklahoma. In the Chickasaw Nation less than ten per cent favor separate statehood. Practically all the business organizations of the two territories have combined in anticipation of joint statehood. That the two territories in population, area, resources and conditions, are entitled to immediate statehood is not denied by any one.

“The convention in session at Muskogee, if it contemplates anything other than the defeat of all statehood legislation, looks to an Indian commonwealth, controlled and dominated by the red man, to the practical exclusion of his Anglo-Saxon brother. The convention was called and organized by Indian officials—Indians occupy practically all controlling positions in the convention. No graver error could be committed than in thus arraying the red man against the white and insisting that a small minority of Indians shall make a Constitution for the great majority—the whites. No line should be drawn between the white and red races. They have a common interest in the welfare of the country that should outweigh race partisanship. Certainly, no man can be considered the real friend of the Indian who brings about a controversy of this kind, knowing that the Indians must always be in the minority.

“The people who are making this Constitution for Indian Territory as a State have heretofore insisted that Indian Territory could not bear even its pro rata share, much less the entire expense of a State government. These same people, who have insisted that the Indians are not ready for State government, are now insisting, at least by their actions, that the Indian is better qualified to make a Constitution and laws than is the white man. The fact is, the Indian is as ready for statehood now as he will ever be.

“It is a very serious question if the majority of the delegates to this convention are not shouting for separate statehood and praying and working for no legislation. It is said

that those who have opposed statehood because the Indian objected will be without further support for their contention. The Indian sentimentalist has not been much given to reasoning on this subject, and is likely to be found favoring the Indian's particular kind of statehood to the exclusion of all others, as to accept as a fact in a general way that the Indian is ready for and wants statehood. It would seem, however, if the Indians are sufficiently enlightened to construct a desirable Constitution for a separate State, they are sufficiently enlightened to participate in the making of a Constitution for a State composed of two territories. Separate statehood is an impossibility and no one is better aware of such fact than the dominating spirits of this convention. No separate statehood bill can be reported from any committee of either house of Congress. Single statehood is probable at the coming session of Congress, unless the separate statehood convention furnishes some one an excuse to prolong the fight.

“It can not be denied that some of the delegates are in good faith, making a fight for separate statehood. It may be added, however, that they are not among those who are bearing the burdens of existing conditions.”

While I have not the pleasure of the personal acquaintance of Mr. Bledsoe, I am informed by mutual friends that he is one of the most prominent citizens of the Territory who favor joint statehood with Oklahoma, and that any views he might express would be the outgrowth of honest conviction in his own mind. Therefore, as we claim for ourselves the right to form our own opinion as to what is the best and surest method of securing immediate statehood, we must likewise concede to Mr. Bledsoe the honest belief on his part in his view. It then becomes a question of judgment solely as to whether Mr. Bledsoe is correct or whether we are correct as to the plans that will result in statehood for the Indian Territory in the quickest time and on the most desirable line. In the first place we find it necessary to express a distinctly contradictory opinion as to the sentiment of Indian Territory, More than ninety per cent of the people of the Indian Territory, of all classes, the Chickasaw

Nation included, by preference have a decided choice for separate statehood. In the second place, Mr. Bledsoe's statement as to the Muskogee convention contemplating an Indian commonwealth, is absurd, and he proves its absurdity in a later paragraph of his interview, wherein he says that the Indian population is a minor part of the whole population. This Muskogee convention does not contemplate a Constitution or State government upon any other basis than that a majority of the citizens of the new State will rule. Therefore, when Mr. Bledsoe says in one breath that the Indians will control the new state and in the next breath that the Indians are the smaller part of the population of the new State, he contradicts himself emphatically.

Mr. Bledsoe's statement that this separate statehood movement only tends to excite race prejudice is equally absurd. Do you excite race prejudice when the Indian citizen and the white citizen meet on equal terms and in harmony confer and consult with each other and mutually and in friendly spirit join in an effort for the common good? It strikes me that the joint statehood convention held lately at Oklahoma City by Mr. Bledsoe and his friends, wherein they practically excluded all the Indians of the Indian Territory and simply sought to mix a dose of statehood medicine and bring it home to the Indian Territory for their Indian neighbor to swallow without the Indian citizen having anything to do with mixing the dose and without the Indian citizen being consulted at all on the subject, was rather the kind of a convention to excite race prejudice. It strikes me that Mr. Bledsoe should say that the Oklahoma City convention would tend to excite race prejudice rather than the Muskogee convention would do so, where the Indian citizen and the white citizen are now at work on a State Constitution in perfect harmony with each other.

Mr. Bledsoe is also mistaken in his statement that the people who are holding this convention have heretofore insisted that Indian Territory could not get separate statehood

and could not support the expense of a separate State. The people who are in this convention have never made any such statement, have never admitted the truth thereof when such statement has heretofore been made by Mr. Bledsoe and those of his opinion. On the contrary, the people in this convention, knowing that the Indian Territory already has taxable property in an amount greater than either the state of Wyoming, or the state of Idaho, or the state of Nevada, insist that the Indian Territory can take care of herself and that it does not need the short grass country of Oklahoma added to our Territory for the purposes of statehood. And the Muskogee convention insists that the Indian Territory is ready for separate statehood from every standpoint. Before Mr. Bledsoe again charges the Muskogee convention with exciting race prejudice between the white man and the red man we hope he will explain why the late Oklahoma City joint statehood convention practically excluded the Indian from consideration and membership in that convention.

Mr. Bledsoe makes the declaration that joint statehood with Oklahoma can be secured and that separate statehood independent of Oklahoma is impossible to secure. Will Mr. Bledsoe explain where he gets all this information and why his opinion is any more valuable on the subject than the opinion of gentlemen who disagree with him? Mr. Bledsoe and his associates told us a year ago and the year before that that joint statehood would be obtained before Congress adjourned, but we all know that in both years passed that Congress adjourned and that Mr. Bledsoe and those of his views made no progress whatever toward securing joint statehood. If Mr. Bledsoe was entirely mistaken in times past, what makes his judgment so valuable now that he should insist on our being guided by it? We say Mr. Bledsoe's opinion is worthless on this subject. We say that Congress told Mr. Bledsoe that the Indian must be consulted, and we say that Mr. Bledsoe, knowing that Congress desired to have the Indian consulted, neglected his duty to you and me when

he permitted the Oklahoma City convention to be held and the Indian excluded therefrom.

We want statehood; we wanted it during the several years last past, during which Mr. Bledsoe and his friends have a clear track in their effort to get joint statehood, and during every session of Congress for the last four years; we have chipped in our money when the hat was passed to raise funds to send the statehood committee to Washington to labor for statehood, but we now say that we have tried Mr. Bledsoe's plan and seen it fail too often to permit him to force his views upon us for another season. When Mr. Bledsoe and those of like views say that Congress has promised us joint statehood this winter I want him to tell you who made that promise. Does he pretend that any promise made by the Congress in session last winter would be recognized by the Congress which will be in session next winter? I am sure he will make no such silly claim, for he knows that more than half of the members who made up the Congress last winter retired from office on the 4th day of last March, and that consequently more than half of the members of the next Congress will be entirely new men who never sat in Congress before, whom Mr. Bledsoe never saw, and consequently whose opinions on the subject are as unknown to him as they are to you and me.

The facts are that Mr. Bledsoe is wholly incompetent to form or express an opinion as to the Muskogee convention, because he knows nothing of its membership nor of its doings. It is to be regretted, however, that men of the character and standing of Mr. Bledsoe have not been sufficiently broad in mind to visit this convention and give it the benefit of their advice after they are sufficiently posted to make their advice valuable. But up to date Mr. Bledsoe's opinion on the statehood question is wholly worthless for the reason that every plan that he has recommended has failed and he is incompetent to give an opinion upon the Indian Territory separate statehood plan, because he refuses to ascertain what the

conditions are first, and make up his mind afterwards.

As to the burden of existing conditions, I want Mr. Bledsoe to explain to you whether he is bearing the burden or whether rather it is the Indian citizen whose person and property are afflicted with federal control who is bearing the burden. The presumption would be that Mr. Bledsoe is perfectly free to sell his property, whatever he may have, free from restrictions and to change his place of residence to Oklahoma without consulting the Secretary of the Interior or anybody else. Therefore, the Indian who is not so at liberty to dispose of his property and move to Oklahoma is entitled to fight for his own country with fully as much freedom as Mr. Bledsoe is to insist on the Oklahoma combination.

I am also pleased to note that Mr. Bledsoe's estimate of the per cent of the people in Indian Territory who prefer separate statehood is rapidly growing. About one year ago at Ardmore, when Mr. Bledsoe made the speech of welcome to the Hearst special train party, he said that less than one per cent of the population of Indian Territory preferred separate statehood. In his letter above referred to he now raises up to fifteen or twenty per cent in favor of separate statehood. Hence, by Mr. Bledsoe's estimate, the per cent of people in Indian Territory who prefer separate statehood have increased two thousand per cent in eleven months; so that with this rate of increase the people of the Indian Territory, including Mr. Bledsoe, will be unanimous for separate statehood before next December.

Yours truly,

C. N. HASKELL.

A vote for Kinta as the county seat of Sans Bois county is a vote in the interest of all the people of this county. Cast your ballot for Kinta.

DON'T BE TOO MODEST AND REFUSE TO ASK FOR

Independent Statehood Because Someone Has Said You Are Too Small. Read What One of the Metropolitan Papers Has to Say About the Matter.

TWO BIG STATES.

The Globe Democrat lays it down as law that "the part of the country east of the Mississippi will never permit the creation of two little states in that section," meaning that part of the Mississippi Valley which is allotted on the map to Oklahoma and Indian Territory. Why not? It has in very recent years cheerfully consented to the admission of states much smaller in population and resources than either of these—Idaho, Wyoming and Utah, for example.

But nobody is asking anybody to consent to the erection of two little States in the region between Texas and Kansas; we want two big States there and are likely to get them.

By the last census Ohio, with more than four million of people, was the fourth State in the Union; and yet Ohio, with no better natural resources, is only about 5 per cent. greater in area than Oklahoma.

Indiana, with more than two million and a half of inhabitants, was numerically the eighth State in 1900; but Indiana is only some 15 per cent. larger than the Indian Territory, while the advantages of arable land, mineral deposits and climate are certainly no better than those of the garden spot occupied by the Territory.

Lying between Texas and Kansas there is material for two States almost as large and, in the end, equally as populous as Ohio and Indiana. Their interests and institutions make it better for them that they be admitted separately to statehood, and their application for such admission will receive much favorable consideration from "that part of the country east of the Mississippi."

Why should Illinois, for instance, object to dual statehood for these two territories, or Indiana, or Kentucky, or Tennessee or Mississippi? The inhabitants of those territories have gone in from all parts of the Mississippi Valley, and their application for dual statehood may, with great pro-

priety, receive the united support of the valley.—St. Louis Republic, Feb. 25, 1905.

Isn't it worth while to ask for what you want? Ask, work, vote and you will get it.

STATEHOOD CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE.

Organize a Separate Statehood Club in your neighborhood. The Constitution and By-Laws will be found in this book.

SENATOR BEVERIDGE'S STATEHOOD EXAMINATION CAN INDIAN TERRITORY PASS IT?

Here Are the Questions Which Senator Beveridge Says He Would Ask All Candidates For Statehood; and Indian Territory's Answers.

Question—Is it in your own interest to become a state?

Answer—Yes, Senator, we think it is. We can not now tax ourselves to provide schools for our children, asylums for the insane, reformatories or other institutions for helping the unfortunate. We can not in the same way make roads, bridges and public improvements, and we think it would be decidedly to our interest to be able to do these things as well as many others permitted to a self-governing people.

Question—Is it in the interest of the Federal Government to make a State of you?

Answer—Yes, Senator, it seems very obviously so to us. In six months the tribal governments, which have prevailed for generations, will come to an end. It is surely in the interest of the Union not to have a territory in its midst without a government.

Question—Have you population enough?

Answer—We have considerably more than twice what

any previous applicant for statehood had, and at least thirty times what your own state, Mr. Senator, had when it was admitted. There are now in the Union at least sixteen states with less population than we have. Here are the figures from the census of 1900 to the nearest thousand:

Nevada	42,000	South Dakota	402,000
Wyoming	93,000	New Hampshire	412,000
Idaho	162,000	Oregon	412,000
Delaware	185,000	Rhode Island	428,000
Montana	243,000	Washington	518,000
Utah	277,000	Florida	528,000
North Dakota	319,000	Colorado	540,000
Vermont	344,000	Maine	694,000

Our population is now, according to a conservative estimate, nearly a million, and we are growing faster than any state of the Union.

Question—Are you the right kind of people, with sufficient intelligence?

Answer—We are as thoroughly American as any state of the Union. Less than 4 per cent. of our people are either foreign born or children of foreigners; whereas New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts and Rhode Island have 57 to 64 per cent. of foreigners and their children. We are inclined to think that the brightest people from the other states have come to Indian Territory and that the five civilized tribes have done more to educate their people than almost any of the states. We guess we pass muster as to conditions of citizenship.

Question—Have you a large enough territory?

Answer—We believe so, Mr. Senator. We are within a fraction of the average size of all states east of the Mississippi. We are almost as large as Indiana and could put Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Vermont in our territory and still have some room left.

Question—Have you enough and sufficiently varied natural resources to support yourselves as a State?

Answer—Now you'll get us started, Mr. Senator. You can't beat us anywhere on that. We produce in abundance the finest kinds of wheat, oats, corn, cane, fruit, vegetables, cattle, etc. We have the biggest continuous oil and gas belt in the Union. We are just underlaid with fine bituminous coal. We have millions of acres of pine and hardwood lum-

ber. We have iron, zinc, lead, asphalt and about everything else in minerals worth having. We have no arid land. We have elegant streams and a magnificent climate. Mr. Senator, you needn't be a bit afraid that we are going to be applicants for out-door relief. Give us a chance and we will have everything we need here to take care of ourselves.

Say, Mr. Citizen of Indian Territory, don't we take a pretty good examination? We ought to pass with a hundred per cent. grade and take the prize. There is only one more question to answer and that is, do you want independent statehood? If you say yes, and go to work, you will get it.

STATEHOOD CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE.

The Government has promised Separate Statehood to Indian Territory and the way to accomplish this is to vote for the Constitution on November 7th.

CONSTITUTION, RULES AND REGULATIONS

OF THE

INDEPENDENT STATEHOOD CLUB

OF

CONSTITUTION.

SECTION I.

The name of this Association shall be THE INDEPENDENT STATEHOOD CLUB OF

SECTION II.

THE OBJECT OF THIS CLUB SHALL BE :

To promote Independent Statehood for Indian Territory and local self-government for our own people free from the embarrassment or interference of any people alien to Indian Territory.

To preserve the Treaty Rights guaranteeing Independent Statehood to the Indian Territory, pledging ourselves each to do his full share as a citizen in the great contest now pending for home-rule and self-government.

SECTION III.

The officers of this Association shall be a President, a First Vice-President, a Second Vice-President, a Treasurer, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, and a Janitor.

SECTION IV.

The President in the performance of his duties shall be governed by this Constitution and parliamentary rules.

SECTION V.

In the absence of the President at the time for the opening of any of the meetings of this Club, the First Vice-President shall preside during said meeting. If he is also absent, then the Second Vice-President shall preside during said meeting, and in the absence of all of them at the time aforesaid, then a chairman for said meeting shall be chosen by the vote of the majority of the members present. And five members shall constitute a quorum.

SECTION VI.

The Treasurer shall receive all moneys and pay all orders granted by the Club when signed by the President of the meeting at which granted.

SECTION VII.

The Secretary shall keep a correct record of the proceedings of all meetings, and report same to its next meeting, and in his absence a Secretary pro tem shall be appointed by the President, and the said Secretary pro tem shall see that the minutes of said meeting are reported to the next meeting.

SECTION VIII.

The Janitor shall perform his duties as such and also the duties of Sergeant-at-Arms and for his services shall be paid the sum of fifty cents for each meeting.

SECTION IX

The Corresponding Secretary shall attend to all correspondence.

SECTION X.

Any person over the age of fifteen years, by signing the roll and expressing belief in the purposes of this Club as set forth in Section II, shall, thereby, become a member of this Club, and may be expelled for misconduct by a majority vote of all the members present at the next meeting after the one at which the motion for expulsion is made.

SECTION XI.

The election of all officers of this Club shall be by a viva voce vote, at the regular meeting of the _____, a plurality being sufficient to elect; and all officers shall hold over until their successors are elected and accept the same. Vacancies in any of the offices for the unexpired term thereof shall be filled by a majority vote of all the members present at the meeting at which said vote shall be taken.

SECTION XII.

The regular meetings of this Club shall be held on _____ of each week. Special meetings may be called by a regular or special meeting, or by the President, or if absent, or unable or unwilling to call the same, by a notice in one daily paper of this city, signed by three members. And all meetings shall commence at half-past seven o'clock p. m., unless otherwise ordered at a previous meeting, or by the call for the same.

SECTION XIII.

Any section, or part thereof, of this Constitution may be suspended for a period not exceeding three hours, by a two-thirds vote of all the members present at any meeting, and other sections may be added to this Constitution and any section of it may be rescinded or changed upon motion in writing, by a two-thirds vote of all the members present at the next regular meeting of the Club after the meeting at which said motion is made.

SECTION XIV.

All committees shall be appointed by the chairman of the meeting at which they are authorized.

XV.

No member shall speak on a question longer than ten minutes, nor more than once, until all others have had an opportunity to be heard, nor the second time without permission of the President, and then only for five minutes.

SECTION XVI.

The order of business shall be:

1. Reading of the minutes of the last meeting.
2. Reports of Committees.
3. Unfinished business.
4. New business.
5. Addresses and Readings.
6. Discussions.
7. Announcements by the Chairman.
8. Adjournment.

Kinta is the most convenient place in Sans Bois County for the county seat. It is near the center of the county and is accessible from every direction. The other candidate for county seat honors is in one corner of the county and is convenient only to a few people. Tuesday, November 7th, is election day---the day on which a big barbecue will be held at Kinta.

Is Indian Territory Too Small to Make a State?

Citizens of Indian Territory, don't be misled by those who tell you we are not big enough to make a State, but can only hope to be governed as an appendage to Oklahoma.

We have almost the average amount of land contained in all the states east of the Mississippi.

Look at the following statement of areas in square miles :

Rhode Island.....	1,053
Connecticut.....	4,845
New Jersey.....	7,525
Massachusetts.....	8,040
Vermont.....	9,135
Total of five states.....	30,598
Indian Territory.....	31,300

We could set all five of these states in Indian Territory and still have room for about half of Delaware.

Citizens of Indian Territory, you have area enough for a magnificent independent State. You can certainly have it if you ask, work and vote for it.

STATEHOOD CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE.

Cast your ballot for Kinta as the County Seat of Sans Bois County on Tuesday, November 7th.

IS ABSORPTION INTO OKLAHOMA

Going to Solve Difficulties As To Wanting Public Schools In Indian Territory ?

Citizens of Indian Territory, don't be fooled by any such hope. Oklahoma claims that its school fund is worth \$20,000,000. Its grants per capita for pupils in the district schools amount to from \$1.25 to \$1.75 per annum. The absorption of Indian Territory would more than double its school population and the Hamilton Bill proposed to add \$5,000,000 to the school fund. With over 100 per cent. more children and 25 per cent. more money, if there is equitable distribution the annual grant from the fund would be less than one dollar per pupil. That would hardly pay for two weeks' schooling. Hadn't you about as well tackle the job of providing schools for your own children?

You are told that you would get the benefit of the mag-

nificent State University and other institutions freely. These institutions are now offering free advantages to Indian Territory young people. Why? Because they have spent immense sums on large buildings which they hope to get taxes out of you to pay for. Under the Morrill Bill you can get federal aid at once for an Agricultural and Mechanical College if you are an independent State. Will not that be better than having to send your young people into the adjoining Territory? Congress will undoubtedly help in the establishment of a satisfactory school system. In any case it can not relieve you perceptibly to be absorbed by Oklahoma. You would like some institutions in your own country, would you not?

Then vote and work for independent statehood.

Be independent, don't be absorbed.

STATEHOOD CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE.

Vote for Kinta
as the
County Seat
of
Sans Bois County.

TAKE A DAY OFF AND COME

TO

KINTA, I. T.

AND ATTEND THE

Big Barbecue!

ON

TUESDAY, NOV. 7, 1905

*Come and bring your family and enjoy
yourselves and feast on*

BARBECUED BEEF AND MUTTON