

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

The Debate Regarding Native American Precedents for Democracy: A Recent Historiography

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8838h24v>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 14(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Authors

Johansen, Bruce E.
Grinde, Donald A., Jr.

Publication Date

1990

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

COMMENTARY

The Debate Regarding Native American Precedents for Democracy: A Recent Historiography

BRUCE E. JOHANSEN AND DONALD A. GRINDE, JR.

After fifteen years examining the native roots of American democracy, the authors have been intrigued, sometimes mystified, and often surprised as the subject has become a subject of intense debate in several scholarly circles, as well as in the popular press. Having surveyed a rich historical record associating colonial and revolutionary leaders with native peoples and their sociopolitical systems, as well as a similarly rich trail of suggestions by eminent historians and other scholars that the idea is worth pursuing, Johansen and Grinde are mystified that some ethnohistorians and anthropologists in our own time can deny this record, usually without familiarizing themselves with it.

The work of the authors has convinced them that it is not a question of *whether* native societies helped shape the evolution of democracy in the colonies and early United States. It is a question of *how* this influence was conveyed and how *pervasive* it was.

The idea that the political systems of Native American societies helped shape democracy in the United States during its formative years may seem novel, even nonsensical, to anyone who has not studied the history of the time in archival sources. Our

Bruce E. Johansen is Associate Professor of Communication at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Donald A. Grinde, Jr. is Rupert Costo Professor of American Indian History at the University of California, Riverside.

dominant culture certainly does not prepare us for the belief that our intellectual heritage is a combination of European and indigenous American ideas, nor that "life, liberty, and happiness" have Native American precedents. Perhaps, then, one ought to be able to understand people—even people with doctorates—who dismiss the idea out of hand. Even if such people should know better than to prejudge the historical record, or to make up their minds before examining evidence, they, too, are but responding to the perceptual prison their culture has erected for them.

The subject is not a new one. As early as 1851, Lewis Henry Morgan suggested, in his *League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nee, or Iroquois*, that the Iroquois Confederacy might have helped shape the United States. Morgan, who is generally regarded as the "father" of American anthropology, wrote, "The nations [of the Iroquois League] sustained nearly the same relation to the league that the American states bear to the Union. In the former, several oligarchies were contained within one, in the same manner as the latter, several republics are embraced in one republic."¹ "The People of the Longhouse recommended to our forefathers a union of the colonies similar to their own as early as 1755 [sic]. . . . They saw [in] the common interests and common speech of the colonists the elements for a confederation."² Morgan believed that the Iroquois League contained "the germ of modern parliament, congress and legislature."³

Morgan elaborated his argument regarding the democratic character of gentile (kin-based) societies in *Ancient Society* (1877), in which he took the Iroquois as an exemplar, and probably overgeneralized their example on a worldwide basis. Morgan argued that democratic political organization in "primitive" societies preceded the formation of states everywhere, even in Greece, where, he argued, Athens formed a nation-state in 509 B.C., under the auspices of Cleisthenes, containing elements of the earlier kin-based democracy. Speaking of republican Greece and Rome, Morgan wrote that "their governments were essentially democratical, because the principles on which the gens, phratry and tribe were organized were democratical."⁴

Similar beliefs echoed through the writings of the Enlightenment—including those of Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, and Thomas Paine—arguing that native America provided Europeans on both sides of the Atlantic with a living

window on their own premonarchical political ancestry. To Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Morgan's work indicated that matrilineal, kin-based democratic communism had been the original state of humankind. Engels compared the impact of this idea to that of Darwin's theory of natural selection and Marx's theory of surplus value.⁵ To argue that the political systems of native America had a significant impact on the course of transatlantic events in their times and, therefore, also in ours would seem to be a given in any fully developed study of American political and social history, anthropology, literature, and law.

The subject surfaced several times during years following, but was never fully developed in a scholarly manner.⁶ Grinde published the first extensive exploration of the idea in 1977 as part of his *The Iroquois and the Founding of the American Nation* (San Francisco: Indian Historian Press). Johansen explored the idea in his Ph.D. dissertation, completed in 1979 at the University of Washington and revised and published as a book in 1982, under the title *Forgotten Founders: Benjamin Franklin, the Iroquois and the Rationale for the American Revolution* (Ipswich, MA: Gambit, 1982; Boston: Harvard Common Press, 1987).

In the spring of 1987, both scholars got calls from Jose Barreiro, editor of the *Northeast Indian Quarterly*, which is published at Cornell University, only a few miles from Onondaga, New York (near Syracuse), site of the Iroquois' central council fire. Cornell was planning a conference combining traditional *Haudenosaunee* speakers and academics for 11 and 12 September. Grinde and Johansen were invited. Neither the authors nor the organizers of the conference were prepared for the response: roughly four hundred people came from all over the United States, spilling out of preassigned meeting rooms and lecture halls. (A week later, Cornell's "official" conference celebrating the United States Constitution's bicentennial attracted less than a quarter as many people.) The Cornell conference turned isolated inquiries into a scholarly field and built a network of scholars, teachers, artists, and traditional *Haudenosaunee*, all dedicated to challenging ethnocentric notions of American history that treat American Indians largely as objects, fossils of a dead past.

The Iroquois, probably the most studied group of people on the face of the earth, have become so resentful of academic prying that the authors' panel at the Cornell conference was introduced with apologies for their profession. To make the message more

acceptable, Grinde and Johansen were introduced as different from the anthropologists that many Iroquois know so regrettably well.

A public counterattack developed about a year after the conference in Ithaca. In the 7 November 1988 *New Republic*, Michael Newman mocked the idea (as he phrased it) "that [the Iroquois'] ancestors guided Madison's hand in writing the Constitution."⁷ Having said what none of his "renegade historians" assert, Newman characterized an Iroquois ceremony on the Washington Mall as "hokey," then expected American Indians to believe he was coming out against these ideas for their own good: "All the scholarly and political posturing tends to obscure the problems of modern-day Native Americans."⁸

Part of what Newman called "political posturing" was passage of a resolution in late 1987 by the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs observing Iroquois and other Native American contributions to democracy. In the "whereas" fashion typical of legislative acts, the resolution linked an accurate history of native contributions with the enforcement of treaties which could build the Native American economic base necessary to solve basic material problems of poverty and unemployment. Newman missed the point of the resolution, drafted by Senator Daniel Inouye's staff with Iroquois advice: history and today's material needs cannot be easily divorced.

Roughly at the same time Newman's article was published, Elisabeth Tooker, a professor of anthropology at Temple University, took issue with the work of Johansen and Grinde in an article in *Ethnohistory*, the journal of the American Society for Ethnohistory, edited at Brown University. In a 32-page article titled "The United States Constitution and the Iroquois League," Tooker stated, "A review of the evidence in the historical and ethnographic documents offers virtually no support for this contention."⁹

Like Newman, Tooker sought to limit the terms of debate to only the direct effects of the Iroquois on the Constitution as a document, disregarding nearly two centuries of debates over life, liberty, and happiness from which this and other basic documents sprang. Both Newman and Tooker ignored the need to explore a larger cognitive map, because they operated from a woefully incomplete knowledge of history. For example, in blasting Grinde for trying to tie the Iroquois into the Constitution,

Newman said that *The American Museum*, an influential Philadelphia magazine, in August 1787 printed a reference to the Iroquois Great Law of Peace that included the phrase, "Unite, or die." "But the concept of national unity, it is safe to say, had solidified by that point in American history," Newman wrote, seemingly oblivious to the subsequent trials of Constitutional ratification and the Civil War.

In oversimplifying the problems of American unity, Newman failed to mention, for example, that in 1744, the Iroquois sachem Canassatego advised the colonies to unite as had the united Iroquois nations. He broke one arrow, then bound a handful and illustrated how difficult it was to break several at a time.¹⁰ Today, on the United States' Great Seal, the eagle clutches a bundle of thirteen arrows, an image popularized by Benjamin Franklin for two generations before *The American Museum* used it. The proceedings of the Lancaster treaty council (and many others) were printed, bound, and sold by Franklin between 1736 and 1762.¹¹ Franklin used the imagery of "Join or die" in one of the continent's first editorial cartoons in 1754. Several months earlier, Franklin had attended an Iroquois condolence ceremony (a key ritual in understanding the Iroquois League) at a treaty conference in Carlisle, Pennsylvania.¹²

Also in 1754, Franklin played a leading role in proposing to the colonies a plan of union (the Albany Plan) that greatly resembled the counsellor democracy of the Iroquois and other Native American confederacies bordering the original colonies. The plan, also similar to the Articles of Confederation authored by Franklin and others, bound its member states in external matters, but left them free to conduct internal affairs. The one-house legislative body included forty-eight seats, close to the fifty of the Iroquois Grand Council—a working body of forty-nine, with one seat permanently left open for the Peacemaker, the confederacy's founder. The Albany Plan was an early experiment with a federal system—states within a state. The only practicing examples of such a system at that time were the Iroquois and other Native American confederacies.

This is hardly to say that Franklin *copied* the Iroquois. Thomas Paine greatly admired the Iroquois political system, but also acknowledged that it could not be copied to govern people of European extraction in America.¹³ The Indian example could be borrowed from, much as the founders borrowed from precedents

in European antiquity. In fact, Jefferson wrote that Indian polities reminded him of what he believed his ancestors, the Celts, had practiced before the European age of monarchy.¹⁴ Thus, although to Tooker and Newman, drawing examples from both sides of the Atlantic at the same time may seem incongruent, the designers of the United States government seem to have thought otherwise.

Jefferson was a serious student of Native American societies; if not for an untimely theft of his papers, he might have produced the most complete history of native languages in his time. At the end of his second term as president, Jefferson shipped his papers on native languages back to Monticello. Thieves boarded the boat carrying them across the Potomac and, frustrated that they could find nothing worth selling, threw the priceless papers into the water.

In ignoring evidence of Native American influence by claiming it did not exist, Newman and Tooker erected an intellectual strawman, then proceeded to bash its brains out. While reading Tooker's article, one is amused to find scholars being accused of asserting that the Founders *copied* their ideology from the Iroquois, or that Iroquois Great Law provided *the* model for the Constitution.¹⁵ The published work that Tooker examined was between six and ten years old; she did not refer to any of Johansen's and Grinde's later work, much of which had little to do with the Constitution's genesis *per se*. Both authors had concentrated mainly on the thoughts of Franklin, Jefferson, and others leading up to the Declaration of Independence a decade earlier.

Tooker characterizes the idea that Native American confederacies helped shape the United States as a "myth," asserting that Native American and revolutionary American ideas were discrete and distinctive. She argues that the Iroquois League and the United States Constitution are so structurally dissimilar that there is no relationship at all between them. She does not, however, address the factual evidence of Iroquois and American interaction, from the sending of wampum belts to Iroquois sachems by the Sons of Liberty in 1766 to the lodging of the Iroquois on the second floor of the Pennsylvania State House (Independence Hall) in May and June of 1776.

Tooker's work also is marred by factual error. She claims that Tammany Day was 12 May, when, in fact, it was 1 May. She asks how much the founders knew about the league of the Iroquois

and then fails to acknowledge that Benjamin Franklin's papers clearly show that he attended an Iroquois condolence ceremony less than nine months before the creation of the Albany Plan of Union. Tooker also fails to address established research by scholars such as Julian P. Boyd of Princeton University (editor of Franklin's Indian treaties and Thomas Jefferson's papers). In 1942, Boyd asserted that Franklin in 1754 ". . . proposed a plan for the union of the colonies and he found his materials in the great confederacy of the Iroquois."¹⁶ Perhaps we should do Tooker the professional favor of allowing her to define "reputable," bearing in mind that Julian Boyd taught at Princeton for two decades, served as president of the American Historical Association in 1964, and presided over the American Philosophical Society between 1973 and 1976. Tooker also failed to address the assertions of a former president of the American Society for Ethnohistory, Wilbur R. Jacobs. In his book, *Dispossessing the American Indian* (New York: Scribners, 1972), Jacobs stated that Benjamin Franklin and "other framers of the Constitution had knowledge of Indian confederation systems and the ideals of Indian democracy." Are these scholars reputable enough?

The assumption that the idea of Native American influence is not reputable, and therefore cannot be debated at all, seems to have taken on a life of its own, despite its patent falseness. In 1989, a \$400,000 grant proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities to provide production funding for a documentary film on the theme was turned down with the rationale that "no *reputable* historian, ethnohistorian, or anthropologist believes the contention that the Constitution is *in any sense* an imitation of the Iroquois League" (emphasis added).¹⁷ Since 1980, several other funding applications to NEH have been turned down, because its reviewers contend that such evidence could not possibly exist. This reasoning has even been used to deny funding for studies of earlier historical events having little to do with the Constitution itself.

When one shoulders the proprietary mantle of established assumption, one finds it easy to defy historical data. For instance, Tooker states that there is a "lack of resemblance between the forms of government contained in the Albany Plan of Union and in the Articles of Confederation."¹⁸ This statement is not only factually unsubstantiated but also contrary to accepted scholarship on the matter. On 11 June 1776, according to Paul Smith,

editor of the *Letters to the Delegates to Congress*, plans for a confederation based on Franklin's 1754 plan of union were formulated in a committee of Congress, and the ". . . 4th, 7th, 8th and 12th of Franklin's Thirteen Articles are conspicuously incorporated into the committee's work."¹⁹

Tooker's structural anthropological argument bears no relationship to historical events, nor to established historical interpretation. She is an accomplished archeologist and student of the history of anthropology, but she has drawn sweeping conclusions about the question of the Iroquois influence on American government without examining significant sources of historical documentation.

The historical record is much richer and often more subtle than the version that Tooker presents. To use Tooker's terms of argument, the United States' system could not be compared to any other that went before it, since each was unique in its own way. But to argue that American Indian polities helped shape our own is not to deny that the Iroquois system (and others) were unique unto themselves. The British "constitution" is not even written, but that has not kept it from being included in our ideological genealogy. The founders of the United States examined all the examples they could find, and then fashioned their own.

Indeed, Tooker's knowledge of the roots of American political history is so limited that she signed an unpublished statement in December 1987 asserting that the framers of the Constitution ". . . merely codified more than a century of Anglo-American tradition and experience."²⁰ While we do not claim that the founders simply copied the Iroquois or other American Indian precedents, we assert that the ambit of their knowledge was much broader than Tooker argues.

Tooker claims that the treaty councils were "of a diplomatic character, hardly concerned with philosophical questions regarding the proper nature of political relationships between men."²¹ That Franklin conducted diplomacy with the Iroquois and their allies is undeniable, of course, but it is equally true that the treaty councils provided a vital channel of communication between political leaders of both cultures, and that Franklin and others drew philosophical sustenance from them. It was in this context that Franklin observed the assertions of Canassatego²² and made his own observation to James Parker in 1751.²³ The evidence

Tooker cited, placed in proper historical context, refuted her own argument.

This chain of events helped Julian Boyd, editor of Franklin's treaties and Jefferson's papers, to conclude a half-century ago that Franklin "got his ideas from the Iroquois" for the Albany Plan.²⁴ Tooker also ignores a statement by Richard K. Matthews, a recent scholar of Jefferson, that in Jefferson's mind, "American Indians . . . provided the empirical model for his political vision."²⁵ Tooker asserts that "the idea figures *not at all* in the standard histories of the Constitution, *nor in the documents on which they rest*" (emphasis added).²⁶ What is Tooker to make of Professor Arrell M. Gibson's assertion, for example, that "colonists . . . copied [Iroquois] democratic procedures and models"?²⁷

If the idea that the Iroquois and other American Indian political systems provided an inspiration to colonial Americans is a myth, as Tooker contends, why did so many people utilize such images in so many different ways over such a large geographic area for nearly two centuries before and during the writing of the Constitution? If the Iroquois League was so much less democratic at that time than the present-day Iroquois believe, why did so many colonials develop images of it, and of other native confederacies, as exemplars of liberty? If we have so over-romanticized the historical record, why does it brim over with references that agree with our thesis? Tooker offers only a caricature of our argument, not an alternative explanation.

To argue that the Iroquois created a myth to validate their own system or garner prestige is also to operate from an ethnocentric perspective. Such a position might make sense to white anthropologists or journalists, but to Mohawk artist and teacher John Kahionhes Fadden, "it isn't the major source of validation. Actually, influence validates that the U.S. Constitution is truly of this soil. The taste of freedom from this soil, exhibited by native governments, made European monarchies seem bitter. . . . I'm fifty years old. It seems . . . [as if] since I first drew breath I have known that . . . the sun rises in the east, and the *Haudenosaunee* influenced the U.S. Constitution. I learned these things (plus a couple of others) from people who were one or two generations older than I. I could see that the Americans didn't *copy* the *Kiana-rekowa* [Great Law of Peace] because they had slaves, treated their women like dirt, and didn't seem to have any sensitivity about

the environment."²⁸ In these and other areas of fundamental law, the United States has been slowly evolving toward native models—usually without granting them explicit credit for inspiration—for more than two centuries.

Shortly after publication of articles by Newman and Tooker condemning the theme of native contributions to democracy, Grinde and Johansen were treated to a more enthusiastic simplification of the issue in *The National Enquirer*. Headed "Surprise! We Got Our Constitution from an Indian Tribe!" the 17 January 1989 piece by Steve Grenard sounded to us like the type of analysis Newman and Tooker would have liked to respond to. "The men who drew up the United States' Constitution modelled much of the historic document after the constitution of the Iroquois Indians, historians reveal," Grenard wrote, with typical *Enquirer* overstatement.

The *Enquirer* article did contain a couple of historically accurate statements that both Tooker and Newman had missed: One was Thomas Jefferson's assertion (in a letter of Edward Carrington, 16 January 1787) that Indians governed themselves with "a much greater degree of happiness" than Europeans; the other that John Rutledge of South Carolina mentioned some American Indian ideas to the Constitutional Convention's drafting committee, which he chaired.²⁹

To understand how profoundly the societies of American Indians helped shape the English colonists' ideas as they formed a new nation, we must try to place ourselves in the colonists' shoes: relatively small groups of immigrants, or sons and daughters of immigrants, on small islands of settlement surrounded, at least for a time, by more widespread American Indian confederacies with whom they traded, socialized, and occasionally made war for almost two centuries before the Constitution was ratified. In the middle of the eighteenth century, Boston and Philadelphia, each with about thirty thousand residents, were considered large cities.

Our popular history gives as the impetus of immigration the desire for freedom from tyranny and oppression. Political freedom and economic opportunity are two goals that have lain behind every movement for social change in our history. Economic opportunity often came at the expense of the native peoples, at the same time that the immigrants saw in them an exemplar of liberty, a predominant assumption of the Enlightenment on both

sides of the Atlantic. So when the colonists needed an opposing symbol in response to British tea, which symbolized British taxation without representation, it should not be surprising that they dressed up as Mohawks.

No, the founders did not *copy* the Iroquois, any more than they copied the Greeks, the Romans, the Magna Charta, or the Swiss cantons. They wove an intellectual blanket out of history as they knew it, including their perceptions of the native confederacies with which they lived day by day. A knowledge of Native American societies and symbols makes this rushing river of thought easier to understand. There is much more to history than simple conquest: whenever peoples meet, they absorb each other's ideas. Just as the conquering Romans absorbed Greek culture and political ideas, Europeans in America constructed a cultural amalgam in their new homeland.

By late 1988, the debate had still not been joined. The "Fentonites" and the "Influence School" (as Jose Barreiro, editor of the *Northeast Indian Quarterly*, had labeled the two sides)³⁰ lobbed personal potshots at each other in the intellectual battle over an educational resource guide being developed by the Iroquois for the state of New York. A phalanx of "Fentonites" were asked to write reviews of the curriculum. Some suggested it be killed, inferring that they knew the Iroquois' history better than the Indians themselves. Again, the Iroquois were being told to shut up for their own good. William Fenton himself, now a professor emeritus of anthropology at the State University of New York, Albany, has, for several years, refused to speak to Native American audiences.

Jack Campisi, associate professor of anthropology at Wellesley College, Massachusetts, characterized the resource guide (excepting its first seventy pages) as "worthless" and "racist." He, like Tooker, characterized the argument over native contributions to democracy as an all-or-nothing proposition and called it "nonsense."³¹ Hazel W. Hertzberg, professor of history and education at Columbia University, said the Iroquois-composed guide was "one-sided and narrow." She also rejected out of hand the idea that the confederacy provided "a model" (not *the* model) for the Constitution, but she did not recommend completely excising such statements.³² Laurence Hauptman, professor of history at the State University of New York, College at New Paltz, also called the draft guide racist, and urged "starting

from scratch."³³ William A. Starna, professor and chairman of anthropology at SUNY, College at Oneonta, called comparisons between the Iroquois system and that of the United States "nonsensical." He also objected to the use of *Haudenosaunee* for Iroquois. While arguing that he would "not ignore the Indian perspective," Starna went on (in the same paragraph) to say that the version of history in the resource guide "will not be what my students will hear."³⁴

William T. Hagan, distinguished professor of history at SUNY, College at Fredonia, argued, "I know of no evidence that the delegates to the Constitutional Convention were influenced in any significant fashion by the example of the Iroquois Confederacy."³⁵ He added to his critique of the guide a copy of a statement signed by himself and five others "relating to this strange development."³⁶

"Such a conclusion, so at variance with the historical and ethnographic record, could have arisen and been accepted, perhaps, only in a country whose citizens are woefully ignorant not only of Iroquois political institutions and history but also of their own," said the statement, which went on to accuse "those Indians . . . who are now promulgating this dubious reading of history" of exhibiting "a comparable disrespect for the very real and great accomplishments of their ancestors."³⁷

To be told by a group of white academics that their reading of history abused their own ancestors supremely rankled today's traditional Haudenosaunee, reminding many of them that, throughout the history of Indian-white contact, some of the most disastrous policies the same ancestors faced were, in their own times, advanced by self-proclaimed "friends of the Indian." That was how both allotment and termination were "sold" to Congress, the first a century ago, the second six decades after that.

The statement was signed by Hagan, Tooker, Fenton, James Axtell, professor of history at William and Mary College, Francis Jennings, director emeritus, The Newberry Library D'Arcy McNickle Center for the History of the American Indian, and Alden T. Vaughan, professor of history, Columbia University. Axtell has written that "historians need not feel unduly sensitive about their lack of personal research among contemporary tribal cultures. Often the descendants of their historical subjects no longer survive or, if they do, have lost much of their historical

cultural character."³⁸ It is striking testimony to the state of American Indian history that a contemporary ethnohistorian such as Axtell, in this neoconservative age, would feel confident in making such a statement about Native Americans. It is sad to say that American Indian history is the only branch of history where one need not know the language, culture, and traditions of the people studied, and one can also claim that the absence of such knowledge is desirable in the pursuit of objectivity.³⁹

Scholars in other disciplines are not as hasty and derogatory in their analysis. Contemporary American political scientists such as Vine Deloria, Jr. and Clifford M. Lytle recognize that ". . . the Iroquois Constitution provided a written preview of some of the governmental values to be adopted by the whites in America. . . ." ⁴⁰ In spite of these realizations, much American history is still written as if it were an extension solely of European culture. Bernard DeVoto, a historian writing in 1952, stated that despite the fact that

. . . well into the nineteenth century the Indians were one of the principal determinants of historical events . . . American historians have made shockingly little effort to understand the life, the societies, the cultures, the thinking, and the feeling of the Indians and disastrously little effort to understand how all these affected white men and their societies.⁴¹

The evidence available to any reasonably diligent student of American history aptly refutes the notion that European civilization had little to learn from the native people of North America. That these notions still steer the course of thought between the ears of some of our nation's best-known "Indian experts" is evidence of how hard the whole culture must struggle to shed itself of Eurocentric assumptions that do not allow an honest examination of history.

Late in 1988, the debate was nearly joined at the annual meeting of the American Society for Ethnohistory in Williamsburg, Virginia. In a preliminary program for the conference, Axtell listed Grinde as a discussant on a panel with Tooker and Fenton. Tooker was presenting the paper that was published that fall in *Ethnohistory*; Fenton's paper was titled "Return of the Wampum to the Six Nations on Grand River."⁴²

When the final version of the program appeared early in the fall, however, Grinde's name was missing. He learned of the preliminary listing after a news reporter called him about it. Grinde said he had been stiffed—issued an invitation that he never got, then stricken from the program without his knowledge, then called a "coward" because he did not appear. Axtell wrote Grinde on 6 December 1988, telling him, "Don't get your pants in a bunch. You seem to take umbrage at every breath a non-Indian scholar takes these days. Lighten up: there's no conspiracy and no affronts intended."⁴³

Axtell, author of several books on colonial history and Indian-white contact, said Grinde's name was taken off the program because he could not be reached. At about the same time, Grinde was concluding a research trip on the East Coast and driving cross-country with his family to his teaching post at California Polytechnic University in San Luis Obispo. Johansen had no trouble reaching him, even though he himself was moving with a family from Seattle to Omaha after six weeks on the West Coast. On 25 August, the Grinde and Johansen families met for dinner in Omaha.

While Axtell was looking for Grinde, he also was reading advance copies of Tooker's paper, as one of two academics asked to evaluate it for publication. The other was James A. Clifton, of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. Both of Tooker's readers were very much in sympathy with her point of view, and similarly ill-prepared to evaluate the paper on its historical merits. Clifton, like Tooker, phrased the argument solely as a matter of the Iroquois Great Law providing "*the model*" for the Articles of Confederation and Constitution, an idea he called a "bizarre revision of Constitutional history."⁴⁴

Draping himself in the mantle of objectivity ("There is not a whit of objective evidence to support this political myth"),⁴⁵ Clifton, like Newman, attributed the whole idea to a conspiratorial group of hacks and flacks, press release-toting Indians inventing "useful political fables."⁴⁶ In his rush to condemn the idea out of hand, Clifton cited no scholarly sources that oppose his view. Instead, Clifton rested his entire analysis on one footnote to Tooker's paper, in manuscript draft, calling it "an authoritative study of this invented tradition." He also cited no

sources to support his assertion that an American Indian conspiracy was responsible for circulating the alleged "myth" in the mid-1980s.⁴⁷

At about the time he received Tooker's paper for review, Axtell weighed in on the political-influence issue in *After Columbus: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America* (1988), where he discusses the issue along with assertions (which he says are false) that Indians did not "invent" scalping:

Another myth . . . [that] is very much before us during the bicentennial, is that the United States Constitution was closely patterned upon the League of the Iroquois. Each myth contains just enough truth to be plausible, but both are logically and historically fallacious. Should the scholar risk the displeasure of the disabused by constantly and forcefully saying so?⁴⁸

Like the weather forecaster who slips in a 20 percent chance of snow, he is a careful man: "Just enough truth to be plausible" could, after all, someday blossom into scholarly reality, even if not wholly in the restrictive manner in which Axtell phrases the terms of debate. He slams the door on that possibility with his ensuing words, however: "Historically fallacious" seems a phrase etched in marble with a diamond tip.

Axtell's hint of uncertainty is perhaps well-intended, since his footnote to the above statement⁴⁹ reveals two of his own publications: a newspaper article from the *New York Times* (28 June 1987), Tooker's *Ethnohistory* paper in draft form, and an M.A. thesis by a student in the College of William and Mary's history department, where Axtell teaches. Not a primary source in the lot. "The scholar" (by which we assume Axtell means himself) did not exactly break his back carrying books out of the library before leaping to the conclusion he trumpets so "constantly and forcefully."

Until 1989, the two sides mainly talked past each other, holding their own conferences, publishing their articles in separate journals, taking aim at each other in the press. By 1989, a real debate seemed to be taking form: *Ethnohistory's* editor, Shepard Krech III, agreed to consider a reply to Tooker's article from Johansen (meanwhile serving Tooker a second shot, in reply),

while Grinde organized a panel at the November annual convention of the American Society for Ethnohistory in Chicago.

The face-to-face debate was joined at first informally, almost by accident, on 2 May 1989, during a conference titled "Forgotten Legacy: Native American Concepts and the Formation of United States Government." It was the second conference on this theme in Philadelphia, and this time there was more than talk and publicity: advocates of the idea were producing a curriculum for the state education department.

The curriculum was discussed the afternoon of 2 May during a colloquium at the Atwater-Kent Museum in downtown Philadelphia. Participants gave presentations of their work for the curriculum, and Mary Kinnaird reviewed progress on the Haudenosaunee curriculum in New York State. Grinde spoke on how the Iroquois had participated in some of the more important conferences in Philadelphia leading up to the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the writing of the Constitution, citing a rich tapestry of names and dates; Johansen talked about the use of the American Indian as a symbol in revolutionary art, songs, and other forms of late eighteenth-century culture.

After the talks, the floor was opened to questions from the audience. One man asked us to characterize the opposition to these ideas. Grinde talked of the established "Iroquoianists'" refusal to accept facts that had become evident through his examination of archival records and the "experts'" refusal even to allow Native Americans a role in interpreting their own history. "If this was tried before a group of Blacks or Hispanics," he said, "it wouldn't be tolerated."

Johansen said our opponents seem to believe that whatever they do not know cannot exist. As students of history, he said, we should always be acutely aware that new evidence and perspectives await our discovery. To research and write history is to discover these things. Believing that nothing new remains to be found, he said, our opponents use ignorance as a defense, a dangerous thing to do in any scholarly debate.

Opposite us, across an array of tables set in a square, an elderly woman waved her arms emotionally and began to say, "As you know, I am on the other side of this issue." Since Johansen had known Tooker only by her written words, until that moment he had no idea that she was present and was rising to a piece of

intellectual bait he did not even know he had cast. Immediately, a leisurely colloquium was transformed into an ascerbic exchange of opinions on the issue.

Grinde continued to cite the historical record in refutation of Tooker's *Ethnohistory* piece: She had written that no established scholars recognize the link between the Iroquois Great Law and the founding of the United States. What, then, did she make of statements by Julian Boyd, linking the Great Law and the Albany Plan? If, as Tooker wrote, the Albany Plan did not resemble the Articles of Confederation, what did she make of the statement by Paul Smith, editor of the *Letters to the Delegates to Congress* (cited earlier in this article)? Tooker at one point threw up her hands and said, "You historians can quote anything!"

"You either believe it, or you don't," Tooker said of our work several times. We replied that it was Tooker's unsubstantiated beliefs that had to be taken on faith. History is, if nothing else, the citation of sources from records, which we have done. In her argument, her citations were highly selective. She even ignored Morgan's words supporting our thesis, despite the fact that she is the editor of Morgan's papers.

We hesitate to call the three-hour exchange a "debate," because Tooker seemed unable to carve out a position of her own. Instead, as she had in her *Ethnohistory* piece, she fell back on her caricature of our arguments. She asserted, once again, that we argue that the founders copied the Constitution from the Great Law. Both of us replied that she ought to join the real issue: the measure of importance that should be accorded to the Iroquois and other native confederacies as one significant contributing factor.

Grinde asked Tooker whether she was familiar with the historical documents he was citing. For example, he asked, "Have you ever read John Adams's *Defence of the Constitutions . . . of the United States*?" Published in 1787, Adams's *Defence* was a lengthy handbook used by delegates to the Constitutional Convention. In the *Defence*, Adams comments on Native American governments as well as those of Europe. He urges American leaders to investigate "the government . . . of modern Indians," because the separation of powers in them "is marked with a precision that excludes all controversy."⁵⁰ Adams believed that studying "the legislation of the Indians . . . would be well worth the

pains."⁵¹ He observes that "some of the great philosophers . . . of the age" sought to "establish governments [like] modern Indians."⁵² He also commented on "the individual independence of the Mohawks."⁵³ Adams was not advocating replication of native-style governments, but was taking issue with philosophers such as Franklin and Turgot who were. By discussing native governmental structures side by side with European precedents in his *Defence*, Adams illustrates that native examples played a role in debates over the genesis of the Constitution.

Compared to Grinde, Johansen got off rather easily with Tooker. She seemed to acknowledge his analysis of art and symbols such as his belief that the "Mohawk" disguise used at the Boston Tea Party was adopted as a symbol of freedom and American identity opposite the tea. She also did not quarrel with tracing the bundle of thirteen arrows on the United States seal to Canassatego's 1744 speech where he used a bundle of arrows as a symbol for the strength in confederate union. The problem, said Tooker, was that such symbols do not "prove anything," as if such things were picked by a people in revolution at random, without aforethought.

The debate was fully and formally joined for the first time on 16 October 1989 at the annual Iroquois Studies Conference near Albany, New York. Usually an event *about* but hardly *for* the Iroquois and other native peoples, the 1989 conference was attended not only by the usual anthropologists and ethnohistorians, but also by a number of Iroquois people. The result was an unusually lively exchange of opinions, and an indication that the usual patrons of this conference had moved from outright denial of the "influence thesis" to absorbing, if still quite skeptical, interest.

At the conference, Grinde's 25-minute presentation was followed by a two-and-one-half-hour question-and-answer period punctuated by a coffee break, during which the cream of established Iroquois "experts" "tried to find cracks in his presentation. . . . Don never swerved. . . . [He] stuck to his guns, and kept telling [them] to check the cited material for themselves," as they tried to pick apart Grinde's case.⁵⁴

Following the marathon question-and-answer session, the debate was joined anew before microphones offered by radio reporters, who were gathering material for a series of broadcasts. During this interview, William Starna began with a plea for ex-

amination of historical evidence in what he termed a "scientific inquiry." Within a couple of sound bites, however, he was shedding his white frock for a little intellectual mud-wrestling. "I'm afraid that the argument that Grinde's making is that the earth is flat." Starna then likened the idea of native influence on United States governmental institutions to the "story of Washington chopping down the cherry tree. It's about at that level."⁵⁵ Calling Grinde's presentation "bombastic," Starna then lightened his own ballast by calling Grinde's work "awful history," motivated largely by the traditional Iroquois chiefs' desire for power. Starna then continued,

I think that if you brought in a class of undergraduates with majors in history, they would see the fallacy in what Grinde is doing, *without even having to know the information, without even having to look at the documents* (emphasis added).⁵⁶

In other words, as long as the students had been properly biased to begin with, they obviously would be able to keep their fallacies straight without troubling references to the historical record.

Later in the interview, Starna demoted Grinde's research from "awful history" to "simply not history" at all.

What would I call it? I thought his presentation this afternoon was surrealism. I heard a very glitzy, erudite-sounding individual who concluded something and then went out to look for the evidence.⁵⁷

Axtell also played the "good history" theme, invoking the self-assumed right of the well placed to cast their standards and presumptions as universal truths. Additionally, to posit "influence" rather than cause and effect is to do "weasel history," said Axtell, conveniently ignoring the Post-Modernist approach and the flight from cause and effect in the modern scientific method. "The problem in intellectual history is that 'influence' is a word used to cover up lack of tight evidence. . . . We've known for a long time in historiography that those are weasel words."⁵⁸ Axtell seems in search of a "smoking gun" rather than a mosaic of historical evidence. If Grinde could make his goose lay what Axtell regards as a golden egg, Axtell might be impressed. Short of that, he seems ready to ignore the argument. If and when such

a golden egg comes into his intellectual pantry, Axtell indicated he would prize it: "I would love them [advocates of influence] to be right. . . . It would be the best news since sliced bread."⁵⁹

While Axtell certainly says he would like to see the influence argument sustained, he outlines neo-Turnerian assumptions he holds about American history that would seem to make it very difficult for him to factor notions of influence without major surgery on how he looks at history: "We did not emulate the Indians so much as we formed our character against the Indians, by fighting them as enemies. . . ." ⁶⁰ "I think there's very little intellectual debt to the Indian. They [the founders] are trying to build a very European-style civilization in this neck of the woods."⁶¹

In fact, the historical gospel according to James Axtell has the Iroquois smuggling ideas *from the United States' Constitution into the Great Law of Peace* as it was first written in English by Seth Newhouse in the late nineteenth century. "The influence worked almost exactly the opposite from the way these people are arguing," Axtell told the interviewer. He made this statement without qualification and without evident factual (or even argumentative) support, offering no eggs, much less golden ones, to scramble.

Furthermore, Axtell said to the reporter, "The Indians are visible and have such legitimacy as Indians, of course you would expect them to know their history." He inferred that "some of the Onondaga leaders and some of these so-called pro-Indian historians" contribute to "lies passed off as history."⁶³ "We'll be fighting this myth for bloody ever, with very little hope of expunging it totally."⁶⁴ So, is he in the market for golden eggs or a "final solution" that will cleanse the public and historical mind of such notions? One wonders.

Among Axtell's galaxy of assumptions is one that holds that white, male historians have some inherent advantages over those of other races or another gender. "There are very few Indian scholars who know the documentation of their past. . . . They don't know what it [was] like to [have been] an Indian in the seventeenth century," Axtell told a reporter. Besides, according to him, they carry perceptual baggage which attaches them to their "subject," the word Axtell used in the interview to describe his relationship with the Iroquois he studies. Axtell seems to infer that, as a white man, he has the proper "professional and scholarly distance" to carry out a search for historical truth.⁶⁵ Perish

the thought that Axtell himself might hold cultural and ideological assumptions that shape his particular view of history. However, Axtell does harbor a "genetic" and perhaps "eugenic" view of American history. "You know," Axtell told the radio network interviewer, "I think I have a better shot at getting at the truth about this constitutional issue because . . . I'm neither a descendant of a founding father [nor] the Iroquois."⁶⁶ According to the interview transcript, Axtell is writing a book on the subject of influence, one which will adhere to "the right standards,"⁶⁷ one may assume, as he defines them.

At the Iroquois Studies Conference, Tooker was less personal in her comments and, according to Grinde, "tried to stick to the facts. She said 'I would love more than anything to teach this in my courses, but there isn't enough proof.'"⁶⁸ Tooker did recant her earlier assertion that *no* evidence exists after 1775 on which to argue that the Iroquois helped shape the United States Constitution.⁶⁹ After the question-and-answer session, Tooker sought out Grinde at supper, and they discussed their differing approaches.

Perhaps the most unexpected comment of the conference came from William Fenton, who called Grinde's paper the best presented at any Iroquois Studies Conference.⁷⁰ Fadden wrote, "I take off my hat to Don Grinde. He stood here like a Lakota Dog Soldier with his academic lance driven into the earth. . . ."⁷¹ To Grinde, "the trip into the 'lion's den,' as a linguist told me, was not so bad. How many people can say that the question-and-answer session of their paper was three hours long, and it had a coffee break? We now know that they recognize that they have to deal with these ideas and facts."⁷²

Shortly after the Iroquois Studies Conference, Grinde learned that another group had decided to deal with these ideas and facts. He was invited to help organize a panel to address the American Bar Association's National Conference of Special Court Judges in Chicago, 4 August 1990. The panel will include Johansen; Oren Lyons (Onondaga), professor of Native American Studies at SUNY—Buffalo; Leon Shenandoah, Tadadaho (chief of chiefs) of the traditional Iroquois Confederacy; and Kirke Kickingbird (Kiowa), professor of law, Oklahoma City University.

Within less than three weeks, much the same group met again on the nineteenth floor of the downtown Chicago Day's Inn, for a panel entitled "Iroquois Influences on American Life," at the

annual meeting of the American Society for Ethnohistory. The panel had been proposed by Grinde and approved by Frederick Hoxie, program coordinator, with Johansen presiding.

Grinde had twenty minutes to describe Iroquois influences on American government, followed by an equal amount of time for Sally Roesch Wagner, research affiliate at the University of California, Davis, who discussed ways in which the Iroquois' matrilineal society was cited in the writings of nineteenth-century feminists such as Matilda Joselyn Gage and Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Tooker followed in rebuttal with a presentation entitled "The Iroquois League and the United States Constitution Revisited." Alice Kehoe of Marquette University provided commentary within the allotted fifteen minutes, and Johansen then had fifteen minutes to summarize.

Perhaps forty people attended the session, which entertained questions from the audience for about forty-five minutes after the scheduled presentations. The audience included most of the major opponents of the influence thesis—Fenton, Starna, Hagan, and Axtell among them. Unlike the audience at the marathon session of the Iroquois Studies Conference, this audience seemed rather subdued, with most of the debate taking place between the panelists, each of whom hastened to correct factual errors by the others. Tooker, for example, said that when John Adams referred to the study of native governments' separation of powers, he meant "kings, nobles, and people," rather than executive, legislative, and judicial. When Tooker said that Johansen had mistakenly written that George Washington studied Indian languages, he corrected her: it was Jefferson who did that.

"There is absolutely no question of the importance of Indians in colonial history," Tooker told the audience. "And there is no question Indians have been used as a symbol by white Americans. I don't want to argue those issues." Without admitting that her earlier paper in *Ethnohistory* was too narrow in scope, Tooker was backing off some of its assertions. Merely by debating the writings of John Adams regarding Indian governments, Tooker was refuting her earlier assertion that *no* evidence of this sort existed after 1775.

Even while the ambit of Tooker's knowledge expanded as she checked sources Johansen and Grinde had provided her, she rushed to condemn their work as incomplete. She asserted that their work "could be condensed into twenty-five pages," mean-

while missing citations of several published works. She condemned Grinde's *The Iroquois and the Founding of the American Nation* for its brevity on the issue at hand, ignoring the fact that the thrust of the work concerned itself with things other than the Iroquois influence on American government. She also ignored the fact that Grinde had done quite a bit of research on the subject during the dozen years since its publication. Nor, apparently, did she know that Grinde was going to press with a 150-page essay (with more than 270 footnotes), part of an anthology edited by John Mohawk, professor of Native American studies at the State University of New York at Buffalo.

Tooker also apparently had not heard that Johansen and Grinde were preparing a co-authored book, including, in its third draft, fifty-one pages of footnotes. When Tooker criticized Johansen's *Forgotten Founders* for its lack of footnotes, she had apparently missed the fact that the trade book was excerpted from his doctoral dissertation, a longer document with more than three hundred footnotes. As Tooker spoke, Johansen, who was sitting next to her, slid a copy of the Grinde and Johansen 300-page manuscript's third draft onto the table, and offered Tooker a copy of its chapter summary, which she accepted.

Tooker at times seemed confused, as her preconceived notions about the primacy of white thought and values ran headlong into historical data she could not honestly ignore. At one point, she said, "I'm sure there's an influence somehow, but I am not sure we yet have it. . . . Someone has to do it. I'm not. I have other fish to fry." After providing such an opening for the idea, she contradicted herself by saying, "We are driven to this conclusion [that the Iroquois did not help shape democracy] by the fact that they had a council of hereditary chiefs." Tooker then asserted that "such ideas as freedom and democracy are *Western* notions." To believe otherwise, she inferred, was to stumble over "common white misconceptions of Indian governments."⁷³ Tooker, as a white person, was again putting herself in a position of telling Native Americans how they ought to construe their own history, as if they had fallen for the punch line of an Anglo-American joke rather than an attempt to refute a school of historiography that should have died with Gunga Din.

Applying the same narrow-gauge rigor to European precedents for democracy, an honest student of history would be forced to conclude that the United States government drew nothing from

England's system, since that nation very obviously had an hereditary chief—and *not* one chosen by clan members using consensus. Are we to conclude that the United States' democratic ideology developed in a vacuum? As a structural anthropologist, Tooker seems to believe that the historical record can be ignored because it does not support her conception of the Iroquois League's operation. If concepts of freedom and democracy are purely Western in origin, why did they blossom as Europeans discovered the New World and its societies? Why did these same Europeans so often use the Indian, particularly the Iroquois, as an exemplar of the liberty they so cherished, and why did they use the imagery of the native nations in their discussions of government so often?

Out of such face-to-face debates may grow a more complete understanding of just how rich and diverse the intellectual heritage of democracy may be. It is a debate that takes place within broader arguments between those who emphasize learning that centers on the "classics" of Western civilization and those who would rather open history to all cultures, classes, and both genders. Increasing attention is also being paid, for example, to the origins of Greek culture, which, according to Martin Bernal (in *Black Athena* [New Brunswick: Rutgers, 1987]), may have been borrowed, in part, from Black Africa's tribal societies, as well as from wellsprings of thought in Europe. Only out of study that ranges the world will a more honest and complete account of our ideological origins emerge. On the path to that understanding, debate is a good thing. Exclusionary argument, and the denial of opportunities for publication and research funding that have accompanied it, are not. The debate must take place with clear heads and clean ears. If it does, we all will emerge from it rewarded with a better understanding of how ideas of liberty developed that profoundly shape our world even today.

Portions of this commentary were excerpted from *Exemplar of Liberty: Native America and the Evolution of Democracy*, co-authored by Donald Grinde and Bruce Johansen, to be published in 1990 by the American Indian Studies Center, UCLA.

NOTES

1. Lewis Henry Morgan, *League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nee, or Iroquois* (1851; New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1922), 3. For other references to the Iroquois structure and its relation to that of the United States in Morgan's writing, see also Morgan [Shenandoah], "Letters on the Iroquois," *The American Review: A Whig Journal* 26 (February 1847), 177-90; *House and House Life of the American Aborigines* (1881; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 32.

2. *Ibid.*

3. *Ibid.*

4. Lewis Henry Morgan, *Ancient Society* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1877), 67. For other references to the origins and influence of gentile democracy, see *Ancient Society*, vi, 67, 85, 253-53, 273.

5. Frederick Engels, *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, vol. 3 of *Selected Works of Karl Marx* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1968), 201.

6. For a detailed historiography of the idea, see Bruce Johansen, *Forgotten Founders* (Ipswich, MA: Gambit, 1982), 3-20.

7. Michael Newman, "Founding Feathers," *The New Republic*, 7 November 1988, 17.

8. *Ibid.*, 18.

9. Elisabeth Tooker, "The United States Constitution and the Iroquois League," *Ethnohistory* (Fall 1988), 305.

10. Carl Van Doren and Julian P. Boyd, eds., *Indian Treaties Printed by Benjamin Franklin 1736-1762* (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1938), 74-78.

11. The treaties are reproduced in Van Doren and Boyd. See also Archibald Kennedy, *The Importance of Gaining and Preserving the Friendship of the Indians to the British Interest Considered* (New York: James Parker, 1751), 30.

12. The cartoon appeared in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, 9 May 1754; see Van Doren and Boyd, *Indian Treaties*, 197-99, for an account of the condolence ceremony.

13. Philip S. Foner, ed., *The Complete Writings of Thomas Paine*, vol. 1 (New York: The Citadel Press, 1945), 610.

14. Gilbert Chinard, *Thomas Jefferson: The Apostle of Americanism* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1939), 31.

15. Tooker, *United States Constitution*, 305.

16. The wampum was sent by the New York Sons of Liberty in May of 1766; see "Journals of Captain John Montresor 1757-1778," in *Collections of the New York Historical Society*, 2nd set, vol. 14 (New York: Printed for the Society, 1868-1949), 367-68. For an account of the presence of the Iroquois sachems during debates on the Declaration of Independence and their naming John Hancock "the Great Tree," see Worthington C. Ford, ed., *Journals of the Continental Congress*, vol. 5 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1904-1937), 430. Tammany Day was 1 May until well after the American Revolution; see *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, 4 May 1772 and Donald Jackson and Dorothy Twohig, eds., *The Diaries of George Washington*, vol. 4 (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1976-1979), 132. Tooker also mistakenly refers to Paul A. W. Wallace as a "historian" when, in fact, he was a professor of English; see Paul A. W. Wallace Papers in American Philosophical Society. For Boyd's conclusions about the Albany Plan, see Julian P. Boyd, "Meet Dr. Franklin:

Friend of the Indians," in *Meet Dr. Franklin*, ed. Roy Lokken (Philadelphia: Franklin Institute, 1981), 239.

17. Holly Tank, program officer, NEH, letter to Phil Lucas, president, Native Images, Inc., 15 August 1989.

18. Tooker, *United States Constitution*, 321.

19. Paul Smith, ed., *Letters to the Delegates to Congress*, vol. 4 (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1976-), 99, 281. In our own time, Henry Steel Commager states that the Articles of Confederation "should be studied in conjunction with the Albany Plan of Union and the Constitution." See Commager, *Documents of American History*, 7th ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963), 111, cited in Carol L. Bagley and Jo Ann Ruckman, "Iroquois Contributions to Modern Democracy and Communism," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 7:2 (1983), 60.

20. James Axtell et al., Untitled statement on the Iroquois and the Constitution, December 1987, MSS copy, 3.

21. Tooker, *United States Constitution*, 311.

22. *Ibid.*, 309-310.

23. *Ibid.*, 308.

24. Boyd, *Meet Dr. Franklin*, 239.

25. Richard K. Matthews, *The Radical Politics of Thomas Jefferson* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1984), 122. Matthews also asserts that Jefferson's study of American Indians ". . . resulted in a deep admiration of these tribal communities, [and] helped to convince Jefferson that man was a social, harmonious, cooperative, and just creature who, under the appropriate socioeconomic conditions, could happily live in a community that did not need the presence of Leviathan" (*Ibid.*, 17-18).

26. Tooker, *United States Constitution*, 306.

27. Arrell M. Gibson, *The American Indian* (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1980), 580.

28. John Kahionhes Fadden, letter to Gail Landsman, 10 June 1989.

29. Julian P. Boyd, ed., *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, vol. 11 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1950-), 49; Richard Barry, *Mr. Rutledge of South Carolina* (New York: Duell, Price and Sloan, 1942), 338 and Chapter 3. Also see "Propositions, Objections &c in Debates on Adoption of the Constitution," in James Wilson Papers, MSS Div., Historical Society of Pennsylvania, vol. 2, 61-68, for James Wilson's notations on this discussion.

30. Jose Barreiro, "Commentary," *Northeast Indian Quarterly* (Fall 1988), 3, 52.

31. Jack Campisi letter to Mary Kinnaird, New York State Department of Education, 4 August 1988.

32. Helen Hertzberg, letter to Thomas Sobol, 31 July 1988, in files of New York State Department of Education.

33. Laurence Hauptmann, letter to Mary Kinnaird, New York State Department of Education, 25 July 1988.

34. William Starna, letter to Mary Kinnaird, New York State Department of Education, 13 July 1988.

35. William T. Hagan, letter to Mary Kinnaird, New York State Department of Education, 11 July 1988.

36. The statement, of about 500 words, was neither titled nor dated, with only names of signatories, not actual signatures.

37. *Ibid.*

38. James Axtell, *The European and the Indian* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 10. Axtell has even ignored American Indians in an historical context. Rather than deal with Euro-American and Native American interaction, he preferred to postulate an America without American Indians to vaguely argue that some things in America have Native American roots. For his counterfactual argument concerning American history without Indians, see "Colonial America with the Indians: Counterfactual Reflections," *Journal of American History* 73 (March 1987), 981-96. In the past, Axtell has raised fears about the role of contemporary Native American scholars in history and the role of contemporary American Indian cultures in the study of history. Subconsciously, he has finally distanced himself sufficiently from Native American societies in assuming their historical nonexistence. One wonders what Axtell's reaction would be if Native American scholars postulated a history of North America since 1492 without Europeans.

39. See letter of James Axtell to William N. Fenton, 10 September 1975, in William N. Fenton Papers, MSS Collection #20, Correspondence Box 1979-82, in American Philosophical Society.

40. Vine Deloria, Jr. and Clifford Lytle, *American Indians, American Justice* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1984), 82.

41. Quoted from Bernard DeVoto's introduction to Joseph K. Howard, *Strange Empire* (New York: Morrow, 1952), 8. For an example of the continuation of this process, see John A. Moore, Jr., and John E. Murphy, eds., *A Grand Experiment: The Constitution at 200* (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1987).

42. "Preliminary Program—American Society for Ethnohistory" (undated), in possession of Grinde, 6 December 1988.

43. James Axtell, letter to Donald Grinde, 6 December 1988.

44. James A. Clifton, ed., *Being and Becoming Indian: Biographical Studies of North American Frontiers* (Chicago: Dorsey Press, 1989), 2, 8-9.

45. *Ibid.*

46. *Ibid.*

47. *Ibid.*, 2, 9, 33.

48. James Axtell, *After Columbus: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 252.

49. *Ibid.*, 288.

50. John Adams, *Defence of the Constitutions of Government of the United States*, in *Works of John Adams*, vol. 4, ed. Charles F. Adams (Boston: Little-Brown, 1851), 296.

51. *Ibid.*, 298.

52. *Ibid.*, 296.

53. *Ibid.*, 511.

54. John Kahionhes Fadden, letter to Bruce Johansen, 17 October 1989.

55. Catherine Stifter, radio transcripts, 14-15 October 1989, supplied to Grinde, 26 November 1989, 13.

56. *Ibid.*, 15.

57. *Ibid.*, 17-18.

58. *Ibid.*, 28.

59. *Ibid.*, 31.

60. *Ibid.*, 29.

61. *Ibid.*, 30.
62. *Ibid.*, 33.
63. *Ibid.*, 31.
64. *Ibid.*, 33.
65. *Ibid.*, 34.
66. *Ibid.*
67. *Ibid.*, 35.
68. *Ibid.*, 3.
69. *Ibid.*
70. *Ibid.*
71. Fadden, letter to Johansen.
72. Grinde, letter to Deloria, 2.
73. The above account is, of course, a composite rendering by Johansen and Grinde.