

AMERICAN INDIAN IDENTITY IN THE LIFE OF
ARTHUR CASWELL PARKER, 1881-1955

by Joy Porter, B.A., M.A.



Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, October, 1994.

CONTENTS

Prefatory notes

Introduction	Origins and Influences	1
Chapter Two:	Parker and American Museums	51
Chapter Three:	Parker and The Society of American Indians	95
Chapter Four:	Parker as Anthropologist	147
Chapter Five:	Parker and American Indian Assimilation: Change Over Time	174
Chapter Six:	Parker and American Fraternalism	207
Chapter Seven:	Parker and the Indian New Deal: 1935-1941	243
In Conclusion & Recapitulation		276
Bibliography		281

ABSTRACT

This thesis is an analysis of the life and work of Arthur Caswell Parker, 1881-1955. It investigates the complex and problematic nature of the position and status of a mixed-blood, acculturated Indian in the early twentieth century through study of the ways in which Parker attempted to create or re-create an identity. Close attention to Parker's texts and speeches will highlight and isolate the self-representation and self-invention that shaped his career.

I will discuss how Parker attempted to achieve full integration within American society whilst retaining an Indian identity. He began life with the example in his great-uncle Ely S. Parker, of one who had successfully crossed the boundaries between white and Indian cultures and achieved respect and acclaim among both. The associated figure of Lewis Henry Morgan, the renowned pioneer anthropologist and friend of the Indian, provided Parker with a further example of how "Indianness" and Indian culture could have a positive and enabling role within the dominant culture. Parker found within Morgan's ideas on social evolution a way in which the "assimilated" Indian could be seen in a positive and progressive light, as someone in advance of his unassimilated contemporaries on the scale of evolutionary development. His choice of a museum career allowed him to re-present the Indian within a dislocated sense of time and therefore interpret Indian history within a social evolutionary framework that complemented the triumphant optimism of early twentieth century modernity. His "Indianness" enabled his ethnographic fieldwork and the professional niche he

carved as "museologist" facilitated his integration within the dominant culture as Indian authority, intellectual and professional.

His prominence as spokesman and leader within the Society of American Indians provided a base from which he could mediate between white and Indian cultures and allowed him to contribute to a specifically Indian construction of Indian identity in relation to the dominant culture. Parker's speeches and texts on the issue of Indian assimilation questioned the authority of American representation of Indian identity and his shifting self-identification within them reflected the discontinuity between being American, being Americanized and being Indian. His contributions to the Iroquois Indian New Deal involved the re-production of an "authentic", "primitive" past, furthered his museum career and allowed him to engage with the legacy of Morgan. As a high-ranking Freemason, Parker was able to engage in the wider construction of the "proper" role of the Indian within twentieth century American society.

PREFATORY NOTES

1.1 Sources and Methodology

Because what is known about Parker is limited almost completely to sources which he himself created, I have in large part approached this discussion of his life and work through a close textual analysis of his publications, supplemented by an examination of his personal papers and associated archives. The arguments contained in this thesis stem from primary research conducted in 1992 at archives in the United States. These sources include: the Arthur C. Parker Papers, 1860-1952 held at the Rush Rhees Library of the University of Rochester, donated to the University by Parker in 1952 and 1953 (UR); the Arthur C. Parker Papers, 1915-1953 and the Society of American Indians Records, 1911-1916 held at the New York State Museum (NYSM) and State Education Department, Albany (SEDA); the Joseph Keppler Papers at the Museum of the American Indian Library in New York City which contain letters from Parker to Keppler from 1905 until 1940 (MAIL), the Parker Archives and Indian Arts Project Correspondence held at the Rochester Museum & Science Center, in Rochester, New York (RMSC); Ely S. Parker Papers at the Buffalo & Erie Historical Society, Buffalo, New York (BEHS).

A secondary and invaluable source of information and opinion has come from those who knew or worked with Parker and who kindly

agreed to give personal interviews. These included Professor Emeritus William N. Fenton, the distinguished Iroquois scholar and anthropologist; W. Stephen Thomas, Director Emeritus of the Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences; Ramona Charles, Director of the Tonawanda Longhouse, Tonawanda Indian Reservation, New York and Parker's relative, Esther Parker Blueye who kindly translated for me the Seneca Iroquois words and phrases used by Parker in his correspondence. These conversations, together with correspondence with Parker's secretary at the Rochester Museum in the 1940s, Miss Mabel Smith, and with his old friend the former New York State Archaeologist, Dr William A. Ritchie have given me insights into Parker's character and Indian and white milieu which cannot be gleaned from either existing archives or his published work. I also wish to acknowledge the help, direction and inspiration of Laurence M. Hauptman, Associate Professor of History, State University of New York College at New Paltz.

1.2 Nonmenclature

Within this thesis I use the term "white" to describe non-Indian Americans. I use "Indian" and "Native American" interchangeably to describe the original inhabitants of the United States and their descendants. I realise that the term "white" is both problematic and inaccurate but because Parker used the term, I have retained it in certain instances. "Indian" is also a misnomer but it is the term most often used by Parker to describe his ethnic group and for clarity I have retained it as a general descriptive term.

INTRODUCTION

Origins and Influences

The life and work of Arthur Caswell Parker (1881-1955) provides an insight into one man's ethnicity as mixed-blood Indian in the first half of the twentieth century. Both his white and Indian identities were integral to his work as author, archaeologist, folklorist, anthropologist, Indian leader and spokesman, museum administrator, public speaker and Freemason. This thesis will show how, within these differing roles, Parker attempted to succeed within the dominant culture whilst retaining an Indian identity.

The particular presentation of Indians as both in and out of historical time within museums both facilitated the development of Parker's career and reflected certain of the paradoxes of his life as an assimilated Indian. The context of the museum allowed Parker to re-present the Indian in the twentieth century within the nineteenth century framework of social evolution developed by the pioneer anthropologist Lewis Henry Morgan, long after such thinking had lost much of its authority within the anthropological discipline and among American intellectuals and reformers. As an Indian leader and spokesman within the reform organisation, the Society of American Indians (SAI hereafter), Parker contributed to the construction of a definition of Indian status and identity in relation to the dominant culture. The Society provided Parker with an organisational base from which he could mediate between white and Indian cultures and attempt to influence the direction of

governmental Indian reform. Parker's anthropological publications developed the work of Lewis Henry Morgan, attempted to demonstrate connections between white and Indian cultures and presented a positive characterisation of the Indian in history. He constructed for the Iroquois among whom he had grown up, an ancient "constitution" and in so doing, characterised their forebears as progressive, enlightened and democratic early Americans. I will show how his "Indianness" both facilitated and placed limits upon his success as anthropologist.

Parker's "assimilative" writings were symptomatic of the complex and problematic status of the assimilated Indian in the first half of the twentieth century. Within these writings, he used the social evolutionary thinking developed by Morgan in the nineteenth century to argue for the full integration of Native Americans within American society in the twentieth century. Parker's success within fraternal organisations allowed him to use the discourse of fraternalism to bring the idea of the Indian closer to the American mainstream. Fraternal association provided Parker with a context within which he could succeed as middle-class professional without sacrificing his Indian identity. In fact, I will show how Parker used his Indian identity to gain special purchase within American Freemasonry and used the fraternity's construction of an alternate past which included the Indian, to influence its construction of the Indian as "Other". During the New Deal period, Parker contributed to the drive to facilitate Indian integration into the dominant culture through the production by Native Americans of Indian art as cultural commodities. His engagement in the Indian New Deal allowed him to further his museum career and to

emulate Morgan, who remained of primary significance to Parker throughout his life.

This thesis is a comprehensive, detailed analysis of the life and work of Arthur Caswell Parker, 1881-1955. It develops and extends existing work on Parker which has dealt with selected aspects of his life and presented him variously as a pioneer within American museums, as an anthropologist, an historian, as a "pan-Indianist" or as a leading Indian intellectual. (Thomas 1955; Hertzberg 1971, 1979; Zeller 1987, 1989) Parker was indeed considered one of the leading Indian intellectuals of his day. He published extensively in the fields of archaeology, ethnology and anthropology, produced a series of newspaper and journal articles on the "Indian problem" and Indian assimilation and was perhaps most prolific in publication on museum practice. The late Hazel Hertzberg in particular, has produced invaluable, detailed scholarship on Parker's contribution to American anthropology and modern "pan-Indianism". Although she has referred to his authorship of "over 300 publications", in fact, Parker produced at least 440 separate books, articles and addresses in addition to at least 32 published newspaper articles and at least 45 separate unpublished articles, speeches and plays. (Hertzberg 1979:47) He also edited five separate periodicals, at times simultaneously, from 1913 to 1944, a total of 129 separate editions. He produced 86 radio scripts which were broadcast for the Rochester War Council Speaker's Bureau between 1942 and 1943, and 28 radio scripts sponsored by the Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences between 1937 and 1938. Not only was Parker clearly an exceptionally prolific writer, he held from his early twenties a series of respected

professional positions. He began as assistant archaeologist at the American Museum of Natural History, New York and ended his professional career as Director of the Rochester Museum, New York. As those who knew him have pointed out to me, he would to-day be considered a workaholic. (Interview Thomas 1992; Charles1992).

To begin to understand the nature of Parker's white and Indian identities, it is necessary to examine Parker's family history, early reservation life and descent status.

Parker was born on the Cattaraugus Seneca Iroquois Reservation in western New York State on 5th April, 1881. The Seneca nation, together with the Onondaga, Cayuga, Mohawk, Oneida and Tuscarora Indian nations, have since the earliest records banded together as a larger grouping, the Iroquois League, or Six Nations Confederacy. Today the Iroquois population resides in Ontario and Quebec in Canada and New York, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin in the United States, a landbase which represents a fragment of their eighteenth century domination of the Northeast portion of the continent. The Iroquois, since the fifteenth century, have from necessity interacted with and responded to the presence of a population from the "Old World". From the earliest Western records their history has been characterised by adjustment to change, diplomacy, war and acculturation.¹ Arthur Parker's ancestry included some of the most illustrious and prominent

¹ The Iroquois League began at some time between 1450 and 1630. For an introduction to the debates over the date of the founding of the Iroquois Confederacy and discussion of its early operation see: [Hayes, Charles F. III (1981) Ed., The Iroquois in the American Revolution: 1976 Conference Proceedings sponsored by the Arthur C. Parker Fund for Iroquois Research, Research Records No.14, Research Division, Rochester Museum and Science Center].

figures within Iroquois history; those of supreme religious and political significance: the Peace Queen of the Neuter Nation, Handsome Lake, Cornplanter, Old Smoke and Red Jacket, the renowned Seneca Iroquois orator of the eighteenth century. Although Parker grew up aware that these great figures within Iroquois history had a place within his family tree, for the purposes of this thesis, I intend to begin in the nineteenth century with Parker's great-grandparents and the origin of the Parker name. The following account of Parker's family history is derived primarily from the biography of Arthur Parker's great-uncle, Ely S. Parker, which Arthur Parker published in 1919, and a variety of supplementary primary and secondary sources. This account is based upon Parker's own versions of his family history and therefore records what he himself saw as significant or salient about his heritage and his ancestry.

The name Parker was bestowed upon Arthur Parker's great-great-grandfather, Joy-e-sey, by an American officer taken captive during the Revolution; an exchange of names following the officer's adoption into the Seneca Hawk clan. Although Joy-e-sey never used this English name, it was passed down to his three sons, Samuel, Henry and William. After serving on the American side in the War of 1812, William Parker (1793-1864), Arthur Parker's great-grandfather, erected a mill on the Tonawanda reservation. He took up settled farming and hunting on the reservation and developed "one of the best farms along the [Genesee] valley". The record of William Parker's life created by his great-grandson characterised him as both an American patriot and an early Indian assimilationist in this period. Arthur Parker wrote, "Whatever may

have been William's early training he now resolved that the old days had passed and that neither he nor his nation could live on memories or succeed by lamenting the events that had gone by". Arthur Parker described how his great-grandfather's adoption of white ways caused some resentment among his peers, who, "affected to despise him and looked with jealousy upon his cleared fields with their winding rail fences", although, "The example of industry that he taught inspired many of the young men, who like him had fought in the war". (Parker 1919e:40-41)

William Parker married full-blood Elizabeth Johnson, a direct descendant of Handsome Lake, the Seneca prophet and a grand-niece of Red Jacket, Seneca orator. The Parkers were "progressives" and followers of the Iroquois Handsome Lake faith, which had strong Christian influences and their union marked the amalgamation of a white name and white influences with illustrious Seneca Iroquois descent. (1919e:53) The marriage produced seven children: Spencer Houghten Cone, Nicholson, Levi, Caroline, Newton, Ely, and Solomon.² Their children "Though reservation Indians ... were industrious and valued education. All obtained excellent schooling, including some technical instruction". (A.C. Parker "Notes for the Biography of Ely S. Parker", 1919, Parker Papers, SEDA) William and Elizabeth Parker "together controlled more than 1,000 acres" and their home was to become and remain a meeting-place for both whites and Indians for generations. As Arthur Parker wrote; "Scientists such

² Spencer Houghten Cone, the eldest child, is in a sense, the black sheep within the Parker family tree. Early in life he had taken the name of a Baptist clergyman who furthered his education, rather than the name Parker. Alone among the Parker family, he approved of the Treaty of 1838 which ratified the sale of the four Seneca reservations in New York to the Ogden Land Company and provided for the removal of the Seneca within 5 years.

as John Wesley Powell, Lewis H. Morgan and Henry Schoolcraft frequently visited this home to find there historians and foreign savants engaged in conversation".

William and Elizabeth's son, Nicholson Henry Parker (1819-1892), made his home on the Cattaraugus reservation. It was here, in the home of his paternal grandfather, that Arthur Parker was born and lived until he was eleven years old. Fenton has argued that Nicholson "exerted a marked influence on his grandson's character". (Fenton 1968:4) Nicholson Parker was a successful reservation farmer and served as a United States Indian Interpreter. Arthur Parker proudly wrote of him:

Nicholson, or "Nick" as grandfather was known to his intimate friends, passed the greater part of his life on the Cattaraugus reservation. He was a man of great energy, and worked with method and regularity. He never allowed Sunday work on his farm and never would permit a drop of liquor on his premises. He was a true "son of the prophet" [Handsome Lake] in this respect. His industry and sobriety, too, may have been due in some measure to the influence of Rev. and Mrs Asher Wright, the sainted missionaries who gave their very lives to the Senecas. He was first employed as an interpreter, printer and clerk by Dr. Wright. With him he translated the Bible into Seneca. (Parker 1919e:191)

In Arthur Parker's preparatory notes for his 1919 biography of Nicholson's famous brother Ely, he perhaps stretched the truth somewhat, describing Nicholson as "a ranking officer of the Indian nation, being Secretary of State". The notes recorded that Nicholson had graduated from Albany Normal School in 1854 and that "his contacts had been wide, while his ability as an orator placed him in great demand for patriotic meetings". The biography

itself records how Nicholson married a white woman, Martha Hoyt, the niece of Mrs Laura Sheldon Wright (1809-1886), missionary to the Cattaraugus Seneca. Initially the couple lived in the Mission House and here their six children were born: Frank Spencer, Frederick Ely, Albert Henry, Sherman, Ulysses Grant and Minnie Clark.(A.C. Parker "A Brief History of the Parker Family" n.d., Parker Papers, SEDA) After the death of Rev. Asher Wright, M.D. (1803-1876) Mrs Wright moved into a nearby house, newly built and occupied by Nicholson and Martha Parker. Like the Tonawanda farm house of William and Elizabeth Parker, Nicholson and Martha's home became a meeting-place for both Indians and whites: "It was to this farm that many distinguished men and women of a generation ago came - writers, scientists, missionaries, newspaper men, tourists, philanthropists. In this home and the Mission across the fence - in this family, of the grandfather generation - grew and were nursed the forces that did most to bring civilization to the Senecas of New York". (Parker 1919e:201)

Parker described his grandfather as exemplary in conduct, "ever proud of his blood and ancestry", a dignified and cultured man who employed a coloured coachman to care for the horses he bred. The mixing of both worlds was reflected in the house's decor. In one room Indian tools and heirlooms were displayed alongside engravings from Pilgrim's Progress. (Parker 1919e:192-201) Arthur Parker recorded how, before he was nine, his grandfather had read Milton's Paradise Lost , Shakespeare's "King Lear" and "A Midsummer-Night's Dream" to him and had done his best to make him understand them. He described his grandfather as "ever

a pioneer of progress among his people", who "had an eye for business", owned a blacksmith's shop which adjoined the fair grounds near the reservation, helped to form a stock company and was the first on the reservation to acquire "all the best farm machinery". He boasted that his grandfather had been "clerk of the [Seneca] nation, United States interpreter, census agent, marshal of the nation, orator, agriculturalist and civil engineer". However, Parker compared Nicholson to his famous brother Ely and described his character in a way that could stand as an explanation of his own ambivalent position as acculturated Indian:

Like his brother Ely, he never could completely accept civilization's teachings or wholly neglect the philosophy of his fathers. Seeing true virtue in each, according to his mood he argued for each. Many Indians have this same characteristic and often appear vacillating and uncertain in judgement when in reality the quality is merely the involuntary mental struggle between hereditary impressions and proclivities and those acquired. Until civilization crushes out all of the old instincts, or wisdom brings with it a strongly balanced judgement, Indians will ever be at moral sea; for character, point of view, methods and philosophy, like religion, may be historical and ethnic.

There will ever be confusion, until in the course of cosmic alchemy all bloods revert to an original strain, like Darwin's pigeons [sic]. How dreary and hideously uniform the world will be then! There will be no mental flint and steel. It will be flint or all steel. (Parker 1919e:197-199)

Arthur Parker's father, Frederick (1857-1929), attended a reservation school which his father Nicholson had helped to build and later attended Fredonia Normal School along with his brothers to train as a teacher. Frederick graduated in 1878, began teaching in local schools and the following year married Geneva Hortenese

Griswold, a white teacher. He eventually gave up teaching and around 1891 became a clerk for the New York Central Railroad and worked for many years as a committed member of the patriotic fraternity, the Junior Order of United American Mechanics. According to Parker's notes, "Patriotism and patriotic work became a passion...and he spent much of his time in the service of his Order". Parker wrote of his father:

His ancestral background gave him the fire of conviction and the courage to express it. His older American blood came from a famous line; on his mother's side his New England blood was that of the earliest families, dating back to 1628. His Indian ancestors had helped Sir William Johnson break the power of New France in the New World. They were the stalwart champions of an English speaking civilization. They were the friends of the settlers and often gave asylum to the needy.

Arthur Parker included a speech by his father with the records he donated in the early 1950s to the University of Rochester. From this, it would seem that both father and son had an interesting and complex understanding of their relationship to the dominant culture. Frederick Parker's speech in 1927 to the Mens Brotherhood at Peekskill, New York gave an extended history of the Indian, and in particular, the Iroquois, since contact. In his characterisation of Indians as noble American patriots, he acknowledged the aid of his son, Arthur, whom he flattered by describing as "the greatest authority on Indian matters in the United States". The author identified himself very obviously as Indian and concluded in a mass of contradictions that his son would also find himself negotiating throughout his life:

The story of the Red Man is a sad one. One of its lessons, seems to me to be to take warning and keep

out immigrants from the old world and admit them only as fast as you can assimilate them. Those that are allowed to come should not be allowed to segregate themselves.

We the natives of the soil, I mean the white natives, come here and have to wait twenty one years before we can have our say in the conduct of our great Government. Place such a condition on all who seek to make this land an opportunity to get all they can, and I believe we shall solve the immigration problem. Beware the fate that overtook the Red Man, cultivate his virtues and we the United States of America, - the promised Land, - Gods [sic] Land will so remain as long as the sun shines and the rivers run. ("Talk at Men's Brotherhood, Peekskill, NewYork" 23rd April, 1927, Parker Papers, UR)

Frederick and Geneva, whom Arthur Parker recorded as "a teacher, and a member of an old Scotch-English-American family" had three children, Arthur, Edna and Dorothy. (A.C. Parker "A Brief History of the Parker Family", Parker Papers, SEDA) Arthur Parker described the family farm where he grew up as "an ideal 'boy's' farm". It was close to the Government medical dispensary, the Seneca national fair ground, the Thomas Indian School and next to the reservation mission house. In 1919, Parker wrote how; "Members of the family by this rare situation get the daily paper; can be married and preached to, attend the fair, get sick, call a doctor, die and be buried, with all the rites of the church, without even leaving the neighbourhood, - so 'civilized' has the reservation become". (Parker 1919e:192) It would seem that Parker's father brought him close to nature and to his Indian heritage. From the few examples of correspondence between Arthur Parker and his father in the final years of Frederick's life, it would seem that father and son had an affectionate relationship.(F.E. Parker to A.C.

Parker 7th December, 1924; 30th January 1929; 20th , 25th, 28th February, 1929, Parker Papers, UR). In 1927, Parker published a popular illustrated "Indian" book entitled, The Indian How Book: Authentic Information on American Indian Crafts, Customs, Food and Clothing, Religion and Recreations and dedicated it to his father. It read: "TO MY FATHER, Whose loving hand first gave me guidance to the wonders of the woodland, glen and glade, and whose knowledge of the red race through ancestral inheritance gave me a sympathetic understanding of its history and culture".

Around the time of Parker's birth in 1881, around 1,500 Seneca Indians lived on the Cattaraugus Reservation, thirty miles south of Buffalo. The majority were "pagans" or longhouse people and a minority, which at this time included Parker's family, were Christians and lived around the mission church and school. It is symptomatic of the Seneca's long tradition of association and acculturation with whites, that by the time of Parker's birth they had abandoned a tribal system of government. On 5th December, 1848 the Seneca had held a convention and voted to abolish government by chiefs (sachems) and substitute an elective council. Perhaps ironically, it had been Seneca adoption of white ways such as the practice of settled farming and their positive attitude towards education in white schools, which had provided a rationale for their removal westward in the early nineteenth century. The change to a republican form of government was a response to the failure of the older system of clan chiefs to cope with the attack upon the Seneca land base in the early nineteenth century. By 1826, the Seneca had lost their sovereignty over more than three million acres and their remaining reservation land base which totalled around fourteen

square miles, was under threat from a land company. (Fenton 1965:260) In 1848, after removal from the Buffalo Creek Reservation, young educated Christian Senecas had rebelled against the traditional form of government, "de-horned" the tribe's life chiefs, and set up a constitutional democracy on the reservation. In the 1880s, this group was still in control. The group had been the pupils of missionaries to the Seneca, Rev. and Mrs Wright. The Wrights had brought literacy to the Senecas and had set up a printing press on the reservation which published teaching material in the Seneca language. The pair left a lasting legacy on the reservation and their memory was very much alive among Parker's generation. However, the other Seneca band at the Tonawanda Reservation, 50 miles from Cattaraugus had not approved of the new form of government and resisted the abandonment of government by a council of chiefs. As Parker described the situation in 1919, "The Seneca nation, be it known, is a republic, self-governing and recognised by the State of New York and by the United States. It had revolted from the 'chiefs' government' in 1848 and set itself up as a democratic state. However, the older system of aristocracy continued as an undercurrent". (Parker 1919e:195) The non-Christians on the reservation followed the teachings of Handsome Lake, and retained certain older customs and traditions, such as medicine societies. Most on the reservation spoke Seneca and/or a mixture of Iroquois and English called "Reservation English" or "Asylum-geh". The Parkers however, spoke English well.

Parker's formative years on the reservation gave him a Presbyterian background which valued hard work, temperance and self-

improvement. According to Fenton, although Parker's mother and grandmother did not speak Seneca, during his early years on the reservation Parker learned how to "comprehend and make himself understood in Seneca" and this later aided his ethnographic fieldwork. Thomas notes that, "As a boy Arthur Parker roamed the woods and fields of Erie County. Nurtured in a rural environment, he played with Indian boys and girls and listened to the history, legends and folklore which later had such influence on his future". (Thomas 1955a:2) Perhaps because of the cabinet of curiosities in his grand father's home, Parker at nine years old, began collecting bird's eggs and Devonian fossils. Aged eleven, the family moved from the reservation to the suburb of White Plains, New York. Parker's move to the New York suburb would have brought him towards a realisation of the nature of his position as "Indian" within the dominant culture. As Hertzberg has argued;

It is likely that at Cattaraugus Parker did not feel so keenly this exclusion, linked as he was to a Christian family powerful in Seneca and Iroquois affairs, and to a household in which the mingling of Indian and white was so natural and everyday a phenomenon. In White Plains, however, an Indian boy was bound to be somewhat exotic and to seem a symbolic figure to other children, to whom "Indian" meant an undifferentiated, perhaps romantic representative not just of the Senecas, but of all Indians. No doubt it was here that Arthur began his lifelong effort to interpret one way of life to another. (Hertzberg 1979:52)

It would seem that away from the reservation Parker proved to be a good student. His local Presbyterian minister, who had known him several years, wrote him a letter of recommendation prior to his graduation from White Plains High School in 1897:

He is one of the best lads I have known. He is a good student, fond of reading the more valuable books, conscientious, faithful steadily [sic] to the duties of any position where he may be placed. I look to him to commend himself soon to the confidence of anyone in whose employ he may be placed...³. (Parker Papers, UR)

After High School, from 1900-1903, Parker entered the co-educational Centenary Collegiate Institute but after a few months enrolled to study for the ministry at Williamsport Dickinson Seminary at Williamsport, Pennsylvania. He left in 1903 without graduating and began his first professional appointment as assistant archaeologist at the New York State Library and State Museum.

As the brief history of the Parker family above shows, Arthur Parker was one quarter Seneca Iroquois and three-quarters white. This fact, was extremely significant given that the Seneca practice matrilineal descent. Even though Parker had a prestigious Seneca lineage, because his mother was white, he was not eligible to be enrolled as a Seneca Indian. His white blood through his mother made him one of "the outside people" and limited his political and social role on the reservation. Hertzberg has noted that Parker records contain no reference to his white mother, although he wrote warmly of many of his other female relatives including his white grandmother.⁴ Hertzberg argues that he, "resented the circumstances which made him one of 'the outside people' and he may have resented his mother, whose origins excluded him from birthright membership in clan and tribe". (Hertzberg 1979:52) In

³ Rev. A.R. MaCombray, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church White Plains, N.Y. to Whom It May Concern, 20th July 1896.

⁴ The University of Rochester records, do however, contain at least one affectionate letter from mother to son [eg. Geneva H. Parker to Arthur C. Parker 10th December, 1900 Parker Papers, UR].

terms of Seneca laws of descent, even though he grew up on the reservation and was the product of an influential Seneca family, Parker was not in fact a Seneca Indian. His non-Seneca status was mitigated around 1903 when he was *adopted* into the Seneca Bear clan and given a ceremonial name whilst carrying out ethnographic fieldwork among the tribe with whom he had grown up. Ceremonial adoption was a long-established Seneca custom towards significant whites. Parker's father, Frederick, who also had a white mother, had similarly been adopted into the Seneca Snipe Clan. Arthur Parker referred to his father's adoption in a 1926 children's text, and stated that Frederick Parker "was given Deerfoot's Indian name and belonged to the clan of TipUp [Snipe]". (Parker 1927a: Preface)

Parker's status as Indian within the Seneca was therefore, circumscribed and ambivalent. Seneca descent, reckoned through the mother's line, designated Parker as non-Seneca and therefore non-Indian. However, in the eyes of the dominant culture, where descent is reckoned through the father's line, and given his phenotypical appearance and the fact that he grew up on a reservation, Parker would have been considered Indian. Citizenship had been made available to those Indians who allotted tribal lands under the provisions of the Dawes Act, or General Allotment Act of 1887.⁵ The Senecas' long-held resistance to the allotment of Iroquois land meant that they were specifically excluded from the Dawes Act. Section 8 of the Act stipulated:

⁵ The Dawes Act stipulated under Section 6: "And every Indian both within the territorial limits of the United States to whom allotments shall have been made under the provisions of this act, or under any law or treaty, and every Indian born within the territorial limits of the United States who has voluntarily taken up, within said limits, his residence separate and apart from any tribe of Indians therein, and has adopted the habits of civilized life, is hereby declared to be a citizen of the United States, and is entitled to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of such citizens..." [in Hurtado, A.L. & P.I. Iverson, P.I. *Major Problems in American Indian History* Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath & Co. 1994:372].

"The provision of this act shall not extend to...any of the reservations of the Seneca Nation of New York". (quoted in Hurtado & Iverson, 1994:372) The Seneca would not enjoy the legal status of United States citizens until 1924, when Congress decreed that all Indians were citizens, even though still subject to wardship status. (Hoxie 1984:211-239) As an Indian and therefore a non-citizen, Arthur Parker occupied a liminal position within white society which matched and corresponded to his status within the Seneca as non-Indian. Parker was therefore, truly, a person in between.

It can be seen from the above that Parker's descent affected his status and identity within both white and Indian worlds. However, during Parker's lifetime significant change occurred within the dominant culture in terms of political and intellectual approaches towards Native Americans. Several factors influenced how both Indian identity and American nationality were defined within the United States. I will detail this change in ideas about Indian assimilation and connect it to the work of two figures who dominated the discipline of anthropology, Lewis Henry Morgan (1818-1881) in the nineteenth century and Franz Boas (1858-1942) in the twentieth.

In the 1880s, as large-scale military conflict with the Indians of the Plains came to a close, American citizens began the process of adjusting to the new realisation that Indians now constituted a minority within the borders of the United States. In 1893, Frederick Jackson Turner signalled the end of the frontier and with it what he characterised as the closing of the first period of American history. (Turner 1894:79-112) The late nineteenth

century retained a belief that Native Americans could be transformed into "civilised" citizens and that it was possible for them to achieve full incorporation into the fabric of American society if they abandoned their "primitive" condition. This belief was epitomised by the assimilationist assumptions behind the Dawes Act of 1887. The Act, in essence, attempted to create "civilised" Indians worthy of citizenship within a generation. As Hoxie has pointed out, part of the bargain which rationalised the colonisation of Indian lands in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was the promise of full membership within a "civilised" nation for those Native Americans willing and able to conform to the norms of the dominant culture. (Hoxie 1984:xiii)

By the early twentieth century a new concept affected how certain Native Americans envisaged integration into the dominant culture. In the nineteenth century, the United States required Anglo-conformity for both Indians and immigrants and for them to surrender or lose every vestige of their traditional culture. Around 1908 a new idea came into vogue which Indian intellectuals like Parker, used to argue for the conditions necessary for full Indian assimilation. This was the concept of an American melting pot which, although the idea was not new at this time, is usually held to originate with the play, "The Melting Pot", produced in 1908 by an English Jew, Israel Zangwill. Zangwill's basic idea, that through the fusion of America's divergent immigrant nations, a superior being would come into existence - the American - is contained in the following excerpt from the end of the play. Here, the central character, David Quixano, speaks to his girlfriend and delivers the play's primary message:

There she lies, the great melting-pot. Listen! Can't you hear the roaring and the bubbling? There gapes her mouth [points East], the harbour where a thousand mammoth feeders come from the ends of the world to pour in their human freight. Ah, what a stirring and seething! Celt and Latin, Slav and Teuton, Greek and Syrian, black and yellow...

VERA [his girlfriend] Jews and Gentile-

DAVID Yes, East and West and North and South, the palm and the pine and the equator, the Crescent and the Cross, how the great Alchemist melts and fuses them with his purging flame... (Israel Zangwill 1909:Act 1)

However, in Zangwill's play, as in general thinking, this melting pot did not include or even consider the Native American. The Indian was not envisaged as a contributor to the new mixing of European nations which would constitute the United States. However, for a decade or more, like other Indian intellectuals of the period, Parker would use the idea of an American melting pot to posit future Indian integration within the dominant culture.

By 1922, as this thesis will show, Parker had abandoned his faith in the melting pot concept, just as the idea of an ethnically unified America was under attack. In this, he reflected a change in how American nationality was defined in the second decade of the twentieth century. This change can be related to the publication in 1915, by Horace Kallen of his essay "Democracy versus The Melting Pot" and the coining of the term "cultural pluralism". (Kallen 1970:11) Kallen's experience of immigrant-life in Chicago had given him an understanding of what sociologists would today term behavioural assimilation, that is, assimilation in terms of public behaviour. This type of assimilation is usually contrasted to

full, or structural assimilation where an immigrant would achieve or consent to some full integration into the personal and intimate relationships of the dominant society. Kallen argued that at the time of the Declaration and Constitution, white men in the United States, "were possessed of ethnic and cultural unity", together with the conditions of "*like-mindedness* and *self-consciousness*". (Kallen 1970:68) Emphasis in original. In the intervening period, Anglo-Saxons had become the ruling or upper class and the norm to which those of other "nations", who had come to constitute the working class, had to conform. As Kallen put it; "The relationships of 1776 are...reversed. To conserve the inalienable rights of the colonists of 1776, it was necessary to declare all men equal; to conserve the inalienable rights of their descendants in the 20th century, it becomes necessary to declare all men unequal". Kallen argued that ethnicity was a fundamental and necessary way for peoples to define themselves and that the United States should cease requiring all its constituent peoples to conform to a single normative standard. Rather, Kallen argued;

'American civilization' may come to mean the perfection of the co-operative harmonies of 'European civilization' - the waste, the squalor and the distress of Europe being eliminated - a multiplicity in a unity, an orchestration of mankind. As in an orchestra every type of instrument has its special *timbre* and *tonality*, founded in its substance and form; as every type has its appropriate theme and melody in the whole symphony, so in society, each ethnic group may be the natural instrument, its temper and culture may be its theme and melody and the harmony and dissonances and discords of them all may make the symphony of civilization. (Kallen 1970:68)

In Kallen's analysis, as Hertzberg has noted, the melting pot was unnecessary and the idea of a single "American race" a fiction. Cultural pluralism would allow the perfection of the democratic ideals of the Declaration and Constitution through allowing men to perfect themselves according to their own ethnic group. Kallen emphasised the group rather than the individual and argued that rather than "melt", ethnic or national groups would continue indefinitely forming the basis of the social order with English as the public national tongue and ethnic groups using their own languages for their own group life. (Hertzberg 1979:48)

However, further and separate challenges to cultural pluralism came from other quarters. Those, like Theodore Roosevelt, who spoke against "hyphenated Americans", those for whom a single Anglo-Saxon norm was a national imperative and those who extended Roosevelt's desire at the Republican convention of 1906 that, "There can be no fifty-fifty Americanism in this country. There is room here for only 100 per cent. Americanism, only for those who are Americans and nothing else".⁶ As I will show, Parker adopted much of this thinking for a period around 1922, along with the new science, eugenics. By 1920, those concerned with Indian affairs no longer held to the assumption that full Indian integration into American society was either possible or inevitable. The failure of the earlier drive to incorporate Native Americans into the framework of the dominant culture was increasingly obvious and Native Americans assumed a more peripheral and minority status.

⁶ [Theodore Roosevelt, 1906 Republican Convention at Saratoga and *Metropolitan Magazine*, October 1915:7].

Another factor influenced how Native Americans were viewed and discussed within the United States around the turn of the century. The young science, anthropology, moved from the context of the museum to that of the university. The Bureau of American Ethnology was founded in 1879 and its endowment created a major national institution for the study of American Indians. Although it was originally staffed by old-school, self-taught anthropologists, their day was ending and structured, university-based training was replacing self-education in the field and within museums by the end of the century. Franz Boas is the anthropologist most associated with this shift within the discipline and with its most significant changes in approach in the early twentieth century. Boas and his disciples began an attack upon a number of ideas which had dominated American anthropology. In the first decades of the twentieth century Boas and his school attacked the older evolutionary schemes based upon an overarching idea of "progress" which had dominated anthropological thought in the nineteenth century. In the United States, these ideas had found their perhaps most extensive and renowned exegesis in the work of Lewis Henry Morgan, who posited an inevitable human development through stages of savagery and barbarism to the condition of civilisation. Although Boas focused his attack upon the British anthropologist, Edward Tylor, within American anthropology Tylor's thinking most closely corresponded to that of Morgan. Boas and his stable of anthropological professionals found the social evolutionary approach central to Tylor and Morgan's thinking generalising and ethnocentric. They sought to replace it with a "scientific" concern for "objectivity" which would lead to the meticulous recording of data on "primitive" cultures.

These were assumed to be rapidly "vanishing" and this led to an imperative to salvage information on these cultures before what was envisaged as their imminent disappearance. Cultural relativism, in which each culture was considered valid in its own terms, began to replace the idea of "progress" which had been at the heart of evolutionary theories like those of Morgan.

The nineteenth century approach of early anthropologists such as Morgan had provided an explanation of both the past and contemporary relationship of Indians to the dominant culture. Those Indians most acculturated, those whose lifestyles compared favourably with the "civilised" condition of the dominant society were seen as having progressed to a higher position within a linear evolution of human society. Those concerned with Indian affairs could use social evolutionary schema to justify reform which would encourage Indian progression from the "savage" or "barbarous" condition to that of civilisation. Social evolutionary thinking, like that of Morgan, was in the main rooted in a respect for Indians as noble examples of stages within the history of human progress. Cultural relativism, by comparison, did not easily lend itself to applied Indian reform or systematically address the contemporary relationship of Indians to the dominant society. Instead, the new professionals vigorously attacked the concept of "race". Indeed, Boas' direction served to separate race, language and culture in terms of disciplinary thinking, into specific and independent categories. To a limited extent, the Boasian school did consider the biological mixings of human groups, especially immigrants and to a lesser extent the progeny of Indian-white intermarriage. For example, Boas' Race, Language and Culture

discussed favourably, "The Indian Half-Blood". (Boas 1940:138-148) Here Boas presented evidence which contradicted the view that half-bloods were less fertile and of persistently smaller stature than full-blood Indians. In this context, cultural relativism validated the identity of Indians like Parker who were of mixed-blood. However, cultural relativism did not specifically investigate the relationship of Indians to the dominant culture or pursue theoretically the relationship to modern American culture of acculturated Indians, that is, those who had adopted the social, economic and cultural mores of the dominant society to a lesser or greater extent. The absence of "scientific" anthropological investigation in the twentieth century on the products of Indian-white intermarriage, left modern acculturated Indians like Parker essentially in a non-relationship to the dominant culture. Further, salvage anthropology and cultural relativism tended to assume that what was most non-acculturated and most "primitive" was by implication, most "Indian". It was therefore increasingly difficult in the twentieth century for acculturated Indians such as Parker to retain an Indian identity within the dominant culture whilst striving to achieve success within that culture.

Irrespective of the impact that changing definitions of American nationality had during Parker's lifetime, it is essential to understand the personal significance to Parker of two particular nineteenth century individuals. These were Parker's great-uncle, Ely S. Parker (1828-1895), whose biography Parker published in 1919, and Lewis Henry Morgan, the early exponent of systematic study of the American Indian and of social evolutionary thinking within the United States. In Ely, whom Arthur Parker first met when he was

seven years old, he found a model of the successful, educated Indian, respected by powerful and significant whites and Indians alike. In Morgan, Arthur Parker found a white professional who had similarly crossed the boundaries between white and Indian worlds and achieved acclaim through interpreting and representing the Iroquois to the dominant culture. The achievements of both figures provided the framework for Parker's personal and professional aspirations in the twentieth century. As will be shown, Lewis Henry Morgan's career as anthropologist began with an early friendship and association with Ely Parker and the "grandfather" Parker generation. In order to contextualize Parker's respect and admiration for both figures, it is necessary to discuss their achievements and approaches. What follows is a brief evaluation and discussion of Parker's great-uncle and a more detailed analysis of the anthropology of Morgan which records the connections between the two figures. Morgan and Ely Parker were ideal ancestors to Parker, one in a literal sense, the other intellectually. Their histories and achievements were central to the development of Parker's life and work and an understanding of each will give essential access to many of the themes and correlations developed within this thesis.

Parker's great-uncle, Ely S. Parker achieved prominence in the nineteenth century, at a time when a fuller integration was held possible for Native Americans within the United States. Arthur Parker's respect and veneration for the achievements of his relative, prompted him to write an extremely laudatory biography of his great-uncle which was published in 1919. The text's preface states that the author had spent twenty years compiling the data. Parker's

version of Ely's life is a tale of the American Dream in many respects similar to an Horatio Alger tale. Its subject comes from humble origins and through education, self-improvement and endeavour rises to fame and fortune. As Parker described the biography, it told, "the story of a man's struggle against adversity - of an effort to achieve". (Parker 1919e:7) Parker described Ely as the very first Indian to succeed within both white and Indian worlds. He described Ely Parker as "a Seneca of pure lineage" and reminded his readership not to lose sight of the fact that Ely, "was a red man, a native product of the soil". Parker's central point in the biography was to make clear that his great-uncle deserved the "special honor" of being: "the only American Indian who rose to national distinction and who could trace his lineage back for generations to the Stone Age and to the days of Hiawatha". (Parker 1919e:7)

In the text's first few pages, Parker discussed the issue of Ely's success within the white world. He described how a sculptor, working on a bust of Ely, had once remarked to his great-uncle:

...you are a man who has 'pierced the enemy's lines'. You have torn yourself from one environment and made yourself the master of another. In this you have done more for your people than any other Indian who ever lived. Had you remained with your people, and of your people alone, you might have been a Red Jacket, a Brant or a Tecumseh, but by going out and away from them you added to the honor that you already had and won equal, if not greater, honors among the white people. You proved what an Indian of capacity could be in the white man's world.

Ely's reported reply to this remark, highlighted what Parker would later refer to as "the cost of assimilation":

That may be true, but why should you test the capacity of the red man's mind in measures that may have an improper scale?

I am credited or charged by you with being 'great', 'powerful', and finally crowned as 'good'. Oh, my guardian genius, why should I be so burdened with what I am not now and never expect to be! *All my life I have occupied a false position. I have lost my identity and look about me in vain for my original being.* (Parker 1919e:10 Emphasis added)

Parker cites no source for this exchange, but the reported dialogue reflects the fact that Parker was sensitive to what he presented as the dislocation which accompanied his great-uncle's success within white and Indian cultures. Irrespective of Parker's strategic use of the dialogue above, Ely S. Parker was in fact one of the most illustrious figures within Iroquois culture and he also achieved considerable success and position within the dominant culture. Parker's biography of his great-uncle described how the direction of his life had been accurately prophesied in a dream of his mother's. The dream prophesied that he would be a peacemaker, that he would become "a wise white man, but will never desert his Indian people nor ' lay down his horns' (sachem's title) as a great Iroquois chief". (Parker 1919e:48) Encouraged by his parents to study, he attended school at the reservation Baptist mission, entered Cayuga Academy, in Aurora, New York in 1845, took a course in civil engineering at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York and went on to become, as one twentieth century biographer has remarked, "conspicuously successful, holding various important posts". (Yeuell 1934:219) In 1852, Ely Parker, a grandnephew of the renowned Iroquois orator Red Jacket, inherited the grand sachem title, Do-ne-ho-ga-wa, Keeper of the Western

Door of the Iroquois Confederacy. By the mid-1800s, Ely Parker's abilities as public speaker, interpreter and scribe became increasingly essential to the Tonawanda Seneca's fight to retain their land. He took on a large part of this responsibility and it was whilst visiting Albany as part of a Seneca delegation to plead their case, that Ely met Morgan. Ely Parker studied to become an attorney but found that he could not be admitted to the bar because, as an Indian, he was not an American citizen. Undeterred, he then worked his way up the ranks to become a successful civil engineer, finally receiving several commissions to supervise the construction of canals, hospitals and custom houses. Whilst supervising government works at Galena, Illinois he first met Ulysses S. Grant, then working as a clerk in a leather store. (Waltmann 1979:124) In 1863, he secured a commission with the Union Army and went on to become General Ulysses S. Grant's military secretary the next year. Most Civil War texts contain an image of Ely Parker with Grant at Appotomax, or some reproduction of pictures or sketches which include Ely Parker amongst the officers and aides surrounding General Grant. Ely, as Grant's secretary transcribed the official copies of the articles of surrender that ended the Civil War. (Parker 1919e:129-141,320) He continued his military career after the civil war and achieved the rank of brevet brigadier-general of volunteers in 1867. The same year, he married Minnie Orton Sackett, aged 18 and white, with President Grant as best man.

Grant made Ely Parker the first Indian Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1869, a post from which Ely Parker resigned in 1871

under somewhat of a cloud. Waltmann has argued that Ely Parker's:

commonly underestimated contributions to Grant's Peace Policy stemmed from a conviction that frontier tribes had more to lose by resisting than by accepting socio-economic change. And, in part, his resignation on July 24, 1871, showed the inherent difficulties of advancing such a program when most reformers were less concerned about the Indians' dignity and self-determination than their submissiveness and social conformity. (Waltmann1979:123)

Ely Parker saw his role as Commissioner as a chance to bring conciliation and accord between Indians and whites and a chance to ease Indian tribes towards the "civilised" condition. Within office he made early moves towards allotment of land to individuals within certain tribes, attempted to garner support for the idea of making Indian Territory self-governing and encouraged a new role for religious bodies, especially the Quakers, in the administration of Indian affairs. He preferred to avoid the need to subdue tribes militarily through ensuring that they received adequate provisions, but on the other hand, he was prepared to discipline Indian groups by withholding rations. As Waltmann has remarked, "Much of the time Parker's administration was indistinguishable from that of a paternalistic, though stern, white official". (Waltmann1979:129) Ely Parker's downfall as Commissioner came in 1870 with accusations of fraud and improvidence which were investigated by the House Committee on Appropriations. His reputation was tarnished but he was eventually acquitted of the charges with only supplementary references having been made to "errors of judgement". (quoted in Waltmann 1979:131) During his life, Ely Parker made and lost more than one

small fortune but towards the end of it he was forced to give up business altogether and work as a supply clerk for the New York City Police Department until his death in 1895. (Armstrong, 1978)

Lewis Henry Morgan's connections with Ely S. Parker and with the Iroquois, began within a fraternal association. Aged 24, in 1842, a qualified attorney unable to begin practice because of the business depression as a result of the Panic of 1837, Morgan joined a literary club, "The Order of the Gordian Knot", organised at Cayuga Academy, Cayuga County, New York to honour Greek culture. Around 1843, after a chance meeting with Parker's great-uncle Ely in an Albany bookshop, Morgan initiated his new Indian friend into the fraternity. Morgan's relationship with Ely caused him to change the group's organisation and character. (Parker 1919e:80) In August, 1845, Morgan persuaded Henry Rowe Schoolcraft (1793-1864), later to become another pioneer American ethnologist, to come to Aurora and lecture the society on the significance of Indian culture. Morgan then encouraged the group's four hundred-odd members to change its name first to the "Cayugas" and finally to "The Order of the Iroquois" and to model the fraternity as closely as possible on the ancient Iroquois League. The group organised chapters elsewhere in western New York and as far east as Utica and survived for approximately six years. (White1959:3) Ely Parker became an honorary elected member and also lectured the Grand Order on Indian life. As Morgan wrote in his journal:

As we hoped at that time to found a permanent order, with a charitable as well as literary basis, we connected with it the idea of protecting, so far as it lay in our power, the remainder of the Iroquois living in

this State; and particularly the band of Senecas at Tonawanda who then and since the year 1838 had been beset and hunted by the Ogden Land Company⁷, to despoil them of their remaining lands. (quoted in White 1957:261)

Morgan became the organisation's "Supreme Chieftain" and dominant spirit, with the club "warrior" name of "Skenandoah", also the name of an ancient Iroquois chief. Members attended meeting in full Indian regalia, with chaplets of eagle feathers, "Indian" tunics, scarlet leggings and decorated moccasins. (Resek 1960:24) Morgan made up the club's rules, ceremonies and regulations, including the club's elaborate initiation ceremony known as "InIndianation". The club's minutes, in typically ornate "Indian" language, described how an initiate:

was led to the sacred spot by Skenandoah [L.H. Morgan]. After having gone through the regular ceremonies some of the bold and daring warriors sallied forth bringing back with them the produce of the White man's cornfield which was roasted by the glowing coals of the Council fire...After having chanted the war song and danced the war dance each warrior returned to his wigwam to enjoy the exquisites of somnolency". (quoted in Trautman 1987:42)

Clearly, as most Morgan scholars have concluded, for most of the club's young male members, the organisation's Indian affiliation was simply a motif and its main purpose was decidedly social. However, for Morgan, the fraternity marked the genesis of an interest in Indian culture which was to eventually make him famous. As he wrote 1859, "whatever interest I have since taken in Indian studies was awakened through my connection with this

⁷ Morgan detailed the Ogden Land Company's attempts to defraud the Seneca in: [Morgan, L.H. (1851) The League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nee or Iroquois 1975 Secaucus, N.J.:The Citadel Press: page 33].

Indian fraternity". (quoted in White 1959:4) Something of Morgan's own objectives for Indian research can be seen in the "Indian" aims of the organisation's constitution which stipulated that it was:

for the purpose of preserving all that remains to us of the Indians, their history, manners and customs, their government, mythology and literature; of creating and encouraging a kindlier feeling towards the Red Man, founded upon a truer knowledge of the virtues and blemishes of the Indian character; or rearing an institution which shall eventually cast the broad shield of its protection and mantle of its benevolence over these declining races; of searching out, gathering and preserving the pioneer history of our state; and finally of promoting our own intellectual and moral improvement. (quoted in Resek 1960:39)

Parker's biography of Ely credited the organisation with helping the Seneca defend their land against white encroachment and described how Morgan travelled with Ely to Washington to defend the Tonawanda Seneca's right to their land. Parker notes how this meant that Morgan became "widely hailed as a champion of the Iroquois" and further stated that "The society did much to place Ely's brother Nick and his sister Carrie in the State Normal school in Albany and finally led Morgan with [Ely] to write "The League of the Iroquois", a book that has become a classic wherever Indian books are known". (Parker 1919e:81) Morgan's understanding of Iroquois culture was spurred by his adoption on October 31, 1847, into the Seneca Hawk Clan. He was given a name which translates as "One lying across", or "Bridging the Gap". Parker stated that Morgan's Indian name, "referred to him as a bridge over the differences that lay between the Indian and the white man". (Parker 1919e:82) The same year, Morgan began publishing articles on the

Iroquois in the American Whig Review and began collecting for the New York State (Cabinet) Museum. Parker wrote: "His constant companion was Ely Parker and his collecting headquarters was at the Parker house". (Parker 1919e:86) He described how the whole Parker extended family helped Morgan compile information on the Iroquois with Ely acting as interpreter, stating that "His [Morgan's] principal informants were William and Elizabeth Parker, the parents of his collaborator, Ely Parker". (1919e:87)⁸

Thus the career of one of the most famous anthropologists of the nineteenth century began with a chance meeting with an educated Seneca and their association with a local fraternity. As Fenton has remarked: "Who would have guessed that out of the Greek revival in upstate New York at the mid-nineteenth century would have come the science of anthropology?". (Fenton 1962:ii) Morgan is customarily credited with creating American ethnology. Fenton, one of the leading Iroquois anthropologists of the twentieth century has stated: "To say that Morgan was the most important social scientist in nineteenth century America is an understatement". (Fenton 1962:viii) On publication Morgan's 1851 text on ancient Iroquois social and political structure, The League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nee, or Iroquois, quickly became a classic. Major John Wesley Powell, Chief of the Bureau of American Ethnology, described it as the "first scientific account of an Indian tribe ever given to the world" and as late as 1922, Alexander Goldenweiser, also a respected Iroquois anthropologist, commented that "the best

⁸ A fuller account of Ely S. Parker's collaboration with Morgan can be found in: [Elizabeth Tooker, "Ely S. Parker, Seneca, ca. 1828-1895" in Liberty, M (1978) Ed. American Indian Intellectuals Proceedings of the American Ethnological Society, New York: West Publishing Co]. Morgan's correspondence with Newton Parker gives some sense of Morgan's close relationship to the Parker family and of how advice and material culture was transferred between them [L.H. Morgan to Newton Parker 19th December, 1849, 4th November, 1851, Parker Archive BEHS].

general treatise on the Iroquois still remains Lewis H. Morgan's The League of the Iroquois". (quoted in White 1959:5)⁹

Morgan dedicated his 1851 text to "Ely S. Parker, Ha-sa-no-an-da, an educated Seneca Indian" and described the text as "the fruit of our joint researches" noting that Ely Parker's "intelligence and accurate knowledge of the institutions of his forefathers, have made his friendly services a peculiar privilege". (Morgan 1951:xi) Caroline G. Parker, Ely's sister, modelled traditional Seneca costume in one of the text's photographic plates. Around 1850, Morgan was commissioned by the Regents of the University of the State of New York to create a collection of Iroquois material culture for the State Museum in Albany. He amassed a large collection and supplemented many of the objects with extensive information on their use and significance within Iroquois society. Morgan held that material culture was a significant addition to ethnographic knowledge and stated in The League that "The fabrics of a people unlock their social history. They speak a language which is silent, but yet more eloquent than the printed page". (Morgan 1851:351) As Parker noted in his biography of Ely, "Many of the choicest heirlooms of the Iroquois were procured for the State Museum of New York by Ely Parker and turned over to Morgan". (Parker 1919e:88). It would seem that Ely, in his role as interpreter and go-between facilitated most of Morgan's understanding of Iroquois kinship and ancient political and social structure. ¹⁰ Morgan made only a limited number of

⁹ David Oberweiser has written an interesting article recording Morgan's close relationship to the Iroquois and his championing of Iroquois rights. [Oberweiser, D. (1979) "The Indian Education of Lewis Henry Morgan" Indian Historian Winter :23-28].

¹⁰ Letters between Ely Parker and Morgan have been published as appendices to: ["Tonawanda Longhouse Ceremonies: Ninety Years After Lewis Henry Morgan" by Fenton, William N. (1941)

trips to the reservation, but in the mid-nineteenth century the very idea of "fieldwork" as a means of writing about "primitive" peoples was a fairly new concept.

Because his understanding of Iroquois history, society and politics was a result of his close research partnership with Ely Parker and the Parker extended family and associates, his anthropology therefore tended to characterise the Seneca as representative Iroquois and the Iroquois as representative of all Native Americans. As Fenton has argued, "...as the result of intensive collaboration with Parker, Morgan viewed the Iroquois through Seneca eyes, just as he incorporated the Iroquois 'into his world view as the first Americans' ". (Fenton 1965:251) It is possible to argue that in fact the ancient Iroquois League was primarily a ritualistic rather than political social organization as Morgan was led to understand. However, contemporary Iroquois scholars such as Fenton still hold to Morgan's understanding of the League as an ancient political institution. Fenton concedes:

Short on history, but long on social organization and the mechanics of a kinship state, the *League* grasped the concept of a whole culture. Its approach was functional and comparative and not historical.

Though not entirely free of the ideas of savagism and primitivism, from which his predecessors never escaped, Morgan sought to describe the Iroquois in their own terms and fairly succeeded. (Fenton 1962:xv,xviii)

Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 128 Smithsonian Institution, Anthropological Papers, 15:139-165]. They reveal how much Morgan relied upon Ely as his collaborator in the production of The League of the Iroquois, a text which formed the basis of much of his later conclusions on human development in Ancient Society. Ely also points out, in these letters, the fact that he could not remember the exact details and significance of certain Iroquois festivals etc. For a review of the ethnographic information Morgan received from Ely see the article cited above.

Morgan's views on Indians were symptomatic of his time, combining paternalism with respect for them as noble examples of a previous stage of human development. The opening sentence of Morgan's League expressed the original motive for his production of the text: "To encourage a kindlier feeling towards the Indian, founded upon a truer knowledge of his civil and domestic institutions, and of his capabilities for future elevation". (Morgan 1851:ix) However, he was convinced that an Indian "residue" was unreclaimable and that with their decline what was distinctively Indian would vanish:

A portion indeed of the Indian family is destined eventually to be reclaimed and raised to citizenship among ourselves. But this can only be accomplished by their adoption of agricultural pursuits and the diffusion of knowledge among them. When this change is affected among them, they will cease to be Indians. A different destiny awaits the residue. At no distant day the war shout of the Red Man will fall away into eternal silence, upon the shores of the distant Pacific. Industry will have taken her abode in the seclusions of the forest, the church will rise upon the ruins of the council house, the railway pursue the distant trail, the plowshare turn the sod of the hunting ground; and the pursuits of peace having diffused themselves over the whole republic; one universal and continuous hum of industry will rise from ocean to ocean. (quoted in Stern 1931:50)

Morgan found the Iroquois a democratic society where blood relationships provided the fundamental scheme of government, stating "It would be difficult to describe any political society in which there was less oppression and discontent, more of individual independence and boundless freedom". (quoted in Resek 1960:43) He held that the ancient Iroquois form of government offered the

same opportunities for individual freedom and personal dignity as that of the ancient Greeks.

From 1850 until the summer of 1857 Morgan abandoned his interest in Indian ethnology and devoted himself to his professional life as an attorney and businessman. Yet from the date of his meeting with Ely Parker, Morgan retained a concern for Indian welfare. An example was the letter he wrote to President Lincoln with practical ideas on how to solve the "Indian problem" in response to Lincoln's annual message delivered to congress in 1862. In his message, the President had discussed "difficulties with the eastern Indians over the progress of the Civil War" and called for reform of Indian administration. Morgan's letter to the President severely criticised the existing state of Indian affairs, describing it as "...a total failure, a failure so complete as to be disgraceful to the government". He made a systematic set of suggestions to improve conditions for Indians within the United States, which included the return of the Indian Bureau from its position within the Department of the Interior to the War Department, strictures to end fraud and exploitation and the creation of two self-governing Indian states within the Union where Indians could develop their own farming economy.

Morgan's expressed aim was to encourage an attempt "to save a portion of the Indian family" and he argued that they had the potential to become "a prosperous pastoral people".¹¹ He

¹¹ Morgan later tried to bring his views on reform of Indian policy to a wider audience in The Nation: [Morgan, L.H. "Hue and Cry Against the Indians"; "Factory System for Indian Reservations" Vol.23 (1876); "The Indian Question in 1878", Vol.27 (1878).

concluded his letter to the president with a testimony to Indian intelligence :

A more fatal mistake was never made than to suppose the Indian deficient in brains. He is as sound headed as any species of man on the earth. His notions of the objects and ends of life are different from ours. This is the principal fact we have occasion to recognize, and we must deal with him accordingly. (Kosok 1951:34-40)

Ideas about kinship formulated through his earlier study of the Iroquois led Morgan to extend those ideas in his huge 1871 publication, Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family. In investigating human kinship systems and amassing a vast record to substantiate his conclusions on the topic, Morgan became one of the very earliest pioneers in that field. As Alexander White has remarked, "he virtually created the science of kinship". (White 1959:10) In May 1859, Morgan had set out from Rochester on an extended field-trip west to Kansas and Nebraska to research Indian kinship and discovered that many other Indian groups shared kinship systems similar to the type he had found within the Seneca Iroquois. In Systems, Morgan described the aboriginal use of what he termed the "classificatory" system of kinship and social organisation. The Indian "classificatory" system, as opposed to the "descriptive" system within the Aryan-Semitic historical sphere, called collateral and lineal kin by the same name. The former denoted general types of social standing and the latter described only true, genetic relationships. In "primitive" classificatory systems, just prior in social evolution to the classificatory system Morgan found within the Seneca, generally all male relatives in a person's parental generation were called by the same term as a

person's genetic father; all female relatives in the parental generation were called mother; own generation relatives were all classed brothers and sisters and all relatives of the next generation were considered a person's sons and daughters. The Iroquois system of naming kin was, in Morgan's analysis, further evolved because among the Iroquois, a person would call his genetic mother and all her classificatory sisters "mother" but, unlike earlier systems, would call all classificatory brothers by some other term, equivalent to "uncle".

All this lead Morgan to propose an original ancient "consanguine family", where all brothers as a group shared sexual relations with all sisters as a group and to further characterise the earliest societies as "promiscuous hordes" within which no marriage customs were practised at all. In doing so, Morgan assumed, erroneously, that kinship naming always denoted true, genetic, blood relations. Nonetheless, his conclusions allowed him later to contrast "primitive" societies organised around kinship relations with modern societies who were organised around property relations. He also used his research to argue for Asiatic as opposed to indigenous origins for the American Indian, an issue of considerable debate in the mid-nineteenth century. Morgan held that once a classificatory system of family relationships was formed by a group, it was transmitted "in the streams of the blood". He discovered other "customs of the blood" such as sleeping naked at night which, because he found them to be universal among "primitive" peoples, he argued were passed through blood from generation to generation. These phenomena allowed Morgan to

infer a common ancestry for the American Indian, which he argued could be traced to the Asian continent.¹²

In 1877, Morgan published his magnum opus, Ancient Society, or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery Through Barbarism to Civilization. It remains his best known and most influential work, although it was in essence an extension and development of his earlier theories. Within it, Morgan presented a complete theory of social evolution from the beginning of time. He isolated a series of successive stages through which mankind the world over progressed - lower, middle and upper savagery; lower, middle and upper barbarism; and civilisation - ancient and modern. Each "ethnic period" was characterised by indicators of mental and moral development. This was a rejection of the contemporary Danish archaeological classification which posited a Stone, Bronze and Iron Age.¹³ Morgan considered American Indians examples of the "Middle Status of Barbarism" who had a considerable amount of catching up to do "in the race of progress":

They [American aborigines] commenced their career on the American continent in savagery; and, although possessed of inferior mental endowments, the body of them had emerged from savagery; and attained to the Lower Status of barbarism; whilst a portion of them,

¹² In Systems, Morgan came to puzzling conclusions on the results of Indian-white intermarriage. It is difficult to reconcile his views at this time with his respect for the mixed-blood Parker family. He wrote: "The Indian and European are at opposite poles in their physiological conditions. In the former there is very little animal passion, while with the latter it is superabundant. A pure-blooded Indian has very little animal passion, but in the half-blood it is sensibly augmented; and when the second generation is reached with a cross giving three quarters white blood, it becomes excessive and tends to indiscriminate licentiousness" [quoted in Stern, B.J. (1931) Lewis Henry Morgan: Social Evolutionist New York: Russell & Russell page 71].

¹³ Although Morgan rigidly applied these "ethnic periods" in Ancient Society in 1887 he stated that they were in fact "provisional" and had in fact completed his subdivisions of human development just a few months before sending his manuscript to the Smithsonian for publication [quoted in Stern, B.J. (1931) Lewis Henry Morgan: Social Evolutionist New York: Russell & Russell page 139].

the Village Indians of North and South America, had risen to the Middle Status...Considering the absence of all connection with the most advanced portion of the human family in the Eastern hemisphere, their progress in unaided self-development from the savage state must be accounted remarkable. While the Asiatic and European were waiting patiently for the boon of iron tools, the American Indian was drawing near to the possession of bronze, which stands next to iron in the order of time. During this period of arrested progress in the Eastern hemisphere, the American aborigines advanced themselves, not to the status in which they were found, but sufficiently near to reach it while the former were passing through the last period of barbarism, and the first four thousand years of civilization. It gives us a measure of the length of time they had fallen behind the Aryan family in the race of progress: namely the duration of the Later Period of barbarism, to which the years of civilization must be added. (Morgan 1877:12,40)

Morgan believed that knowledge could be somehow somatically stored and transmitted from generation to generation and that this knowledge translated to human progress. Ancient Society's opening pages stated that, "Mankind commenced their course at the bottom of the scale and worked their way up from savagery to civilisation through the slow accumulation of experiential knowledge" and stated that the text would demonstrate "the rudeness of the early condition of mankind and the gradual evolution of their mental and moral powers through experience". (Morgan 1877:3-4) Yet Morgan's ethnocentric criteria for judging Native Americans on the linear scale of social evolution accompanied a concern and responsibility for their future. When Ancient Society was published, Morgan wrote to President Hayes advising the setting up of a Department of Indian Affairs, because, as he told the President:

We are responsible to them [Indians] before mankind. We have overlooked the fact that the principal Indian tribes have passed, by natural development, out of the condition of savages into that of barbarians. In relative progress they are now precisely where our own ancestors were when by domestication of animals, they passed from a lower into a higher condition of barbarism, though still two ethnical periods below civilization...We wonder that our Indians cannot civilize, but how could they any more than our remote ancestors, jump ethnical periods. They have the brains and skulls of barbarians and must grow towards civilization, as all mankind have done who attained to civilization by a progressive experience. (quoted in Stern 1931:57)

According to Morgan's evolutionary schema, the next stage towards which Indians would advance would be the "pastoral" and he therefore urged the President to encourage Indians to begin to rear cattle and become ranchers. Although Morgan accepted that God or "the Supreme Intelligence" had originally created man, he also argued that mankind had a single, common origin and had developed in parallel the world over:

The history of the human race is one in source, one in experience and one in progress...Inventions and discoveries show...the unity of origin of mankind, the similarity of human wants in the same stage of advancement, and the uniformity of the operations of the human mind in similar conditions of society. (Morgan 1877:vi)

This theory at least denied the innate degeneracy or sinfulness of "savage" peoples commonly held at that time, although it did characterise them as inferior to the "civilised" societies such as white nineteenth century America. In Morgan's schema, the condition of civilisation was characterised by the development of a phonetic alphabet and the beginnings of commerce. He argued in

his conclusion to Ancient Society that the "marvelous fact" of the development of civilisation began with the Semitic and Aryan family types:

In strictness but two families, the Semitic and the Aryan accomplished the work [of attaining civilization] through unassisted self-development. The Aryan family represents the central stream of human progress because it produced the highest type of mankind, and because it has proved its intrinsic superiority by gradually assuming the control of the earth. (Morgan 1877:562)

Morgan held that both human intelligence and morality progressed geometrically through time, arguing that through the accumulation of human experiential knowledge, a "gradual enlargement of the brain" came about. (Morgan 1877:589) Morgan, more than any other thinker up until his time, formed the basis for a materialist interpretation of human societies and their development. After Karl Marx' death, Frederick Engels used Marx' notes on Morgan's Ancient Society as a springboard for The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. (Engels 1884) Engels argued in the Preface to the first edition, "Morgan, in his own way had discovered afresh in America the materialistic conception of history discovered by Marx... and in his comparison of barbarism and civilization it had led him, in the main points, to the same conclusions as Marx". He argued that it had been Marx' intention, "to present the results of Morgan's researches in the light of the conclusions of his own - within certain limits may I say our - materialistic conception of history, and thus to make clear their full significance. (Engels 1884:1,71) Thus, a "Yankee Republican" served as a source for a socialist classic, which in turn, because it seems to offer a transcultural explanation of sexual subordination,

has recently become popular with feminist anthropologists. All this is somewhat ironic given that anthropology was only one avenue of professional success for Morgan. He was elected Republican assemblyman for Rochester in 1861 and success as a lawyer and businessman brought him a small fortune by 1866, which enabled him to devote himself fully to scholarship. According to Parker, at the time of his death on 17th December 1881 he was worth \$100,000. (Parker a 1940:14)¹⁴

As I have detailed, Morgan through Ely Parker, successfully interpreted Indian society and specifically Iroquois society to the dominant culture, in a new and positive way. Later, Arthur Parker used Morgan's validation and explanation of Iroquois and Indian culture to provide "scientific" support for his own acculturated position within that dominant culture. In fact, Parker saw his own professional career as an extension and development of Morgan's research and even argued that he was a relative of the famous pioneer anthropologist as the examination of Parker's papers and speeches referring to Morgan discussed below will show.

In 1919, Parker delivered the presentation speech at the unveiling of the Morgan Tablet by the New York State Archaeological Association. His speech attempted to communicate something of the "human Morgan". Parker made the tenuous claim that he had

¹⁴ For further discussion of Marx' and Engels' manipulation and use of Morgan's research see: [Resek, C. (1960) Lewis Henry Morgan: American Scholar Chicago: The University of Chicago Press; Trautman, T. R. (1987) Lewis Henry Morgan and The Invention of Kinship Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press; Bloch, M. (1983) Marxism and Anthropology: The History of a Relationship Oxford: Clarendon Press]. For a discussion of Morgan's connection to contemporary feminism see Sayers (Ed.) (1987). Twentieth century feminist connections to Morgan, are in a sense appropriate, given the fact that Morgan held progressive views on the position of women in society. Upon his death in he 1881 bequeathed a slice of his fortune to the development of American female education in Rochester, New York. As the scholars referred to above highlight, Morgan and Engels' lasting contribution to feminism lies primarily with the fact that they both served to place the family, politically, within social history and make the institution an object of historical enquiry.

"more or less of a right to pose as a relative of Lewis Henry Morgan" because Morgan became the "brother" of his great-grandfather through adoption into the Seneca Hawk clan. He argued that since among the Seneca, "all brothers of a grandfather are grandfathers, so all great-grandfathers brothers are great-grandfathers. Now who is it who will deny that I am Lewis Henry Morgan's great-great-grandson!". He described the close personal connection between his family and Morgan, the hospitality Morgan had received at his great-grandmother's table and Morgan's gift to her of her first set of china dishes. Even though Parker found Morgan to be a brilliant and gifted thinker, he did, however, acknowledge that Morgan had made mistakes. He took particular issue with Morgan's characterisation in Systems of Consanguinity of primal society as a "promiscuous horde". He argued that Morgan "made mistakes in his deductions as to the purport of the Classificatory System [sic] of consanguinity and asserted permiscuity [sic] as the order of primal society, whatever all that means. I am glad that he did make mistakes so that the disputing doctors and even my humble self may share the glory of discovering some facts he did not know". (Parker 1919c:23-26)

In November 1928, Parker delivered a speech before the Rochester Labor Forum, entitled "Lewis Henry Morgan". Here he compared Morgan (his relative!) to Copernicus, Galileo, Edison and Columbus describing him as one of those who had "overcome the inertia of tradition" to present the "overwhelming advantages of their discoveries". He told an heroic tale of his great-uncle's attempts to save the Iroquois from unlawful removal West and of how this quest and brought him into contact with Morgan at the

Cayuga Academy, New York. Parker valued the way Morgan's work had disseminated a broader and more complex understanding of Native American culture, given Indians a position within a developmental scale which included all mankind and highlighted characteristics and accomplishments which differed between tribes. Parker held that Morgan's publication of The League of the Iroquois in 1851 had proven that Indians "were indeed organized and had rigid social laws" and were "far from being anarchistic hoardes [sic] without complex government, or ...groups under the despotic rule of ferocious chiefs". He credited Morgan with championing the Iroquois against removal and protecting the forced sale of their land to a local land company and described Morgan's later text, Ancient Society, as a "marvelous work" and noted that although Morgan had been criticised for his "theory that promiscuity in sex life was an original condition", he concluded that "in the main Morgan was right". Parker argued in 1928 that; "The world knows this and reads 'Ancient Society' in almost every language. So popular is this work that cheap editions have been printed for the use of the worker". Parker reviewed Morgan's professional and personal contributions to American society, his election to the National Academy of Science in 1875 and his presidency of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1879. In his view, Morgan was " 'A man's man' who was interested in the cause of education for women, and \$85,000 of his estate was willed to the women's college of Rochester". Morgan had begun the new science anthropology and become, in Parker's opinion "the bridge or the chain that bridged the gap between the two races". Parker testified to the significance of Morgan's memory in his own life, describing how, spurred by

Morgan's example, his life's work had become a continuation of Morgan's research. He concluded his speech before the Forum by saying:

Morgan died on December 17, 1881. This was the year that I was born. The closest friend of Morgan among the Indian people was my great uncle Gen. Ely S. Parker who introduced Morgan to the fascination of Indian history. *The influence of Morgan and my great uncle have been with me since childhood and their example has been a tradition that has spurred me to carry on where they left off.* I placed a wreath on Morgan's tomb under the auspices of the Morgan Chapter 10 years ago, I assisted in designing his memorial tablet and unveiled it on the occasion of his 100th anniversary at Wells College, and now I feel honored indeed in speaking before a group of his admirers on this 110th anniversary of his birth. (1928 Parker Papers, UR, Emphasis added)

In 1935, Parker produced an eight page discussion of "Iroquois Studies Since Morgan's Investigations" for the Russian Academy of Science which was never published. Here, Parker reiterated that his work was a continuation of Morgan's overall research project and argued that anthropology had proven that progressive change was integral to aboriginal cultures. He gave another laudatory overview of Morgan's contribution to science and stated that Morgan's description of Iroquois social structure "could scarcely have been improved". However, he noted where other research and in particular his own, had advanced knowledge of Iroquois origins and pre-history through archaeology. Parker was at pains to point out that the Iroquois were "an agricultural people of long standing...a sedentary people living in fixed villages". He pointed out that contrary to the beliefs of "the Iroquois conservative", in fact, "culture patterns, social traits and language, far from being

inalterable [sic] are in a continual state of flux with aboriginal peoples, notwithstanding strong taboos against innovation. With the Iroquois there is every evidence of a continual process of change even in their physical type". ("Iroquois Studies Since Morgan's Investigations" September 1935 Parker Papers, UR) On 22nd January, 1940, Parker delivered a paper before the Rochester Philosophical Society entitled "Lewis Henry Morgan, Social Philosopher", which was subsequently published by the Rochester Museum of Arts & Sciences. It was delivered at the home of one of Lewis Henry Morgan's ancestors. He described Morgan as a prescient and exemplary scholar who had struggled between scientific and religious orthodoxies: "It was an unhappy conflict of mind, torn between two ideals". He described once more how Morgan's relationship with an "Indian youth", presumably Ely Parker, who joined him as a student at Cayuga Academy, New York had inspired him towards research on Indian society. Acting as guide and interpreter, his Indian friend introduced him to the reservation and "a social system of which Morgan had never dreamed". Parker stated that, "this experience had much to do with Morgan's later fame, and, indeed, it brought about a series of conclusions, based upon an incomplete digest of facts, which has had profound world repercussions. It changed the philosophy of Marx and Engels, and produced a book [Ancient Society] that is now one of the bibles of the socialistic world". However, according to Parker, it was Morgan's League of the Iroquois which had provided Morgan with "a place in Rochester's circles of choice minds". the significance of this text lay for Parker in its expression of, "The idea that the red man, regarded everywhere as simple savages, possessed a complex social system, a philosophy of life, a

government of laws, and a system of moral control...". (Parker 1940a:10-15)

Although here in 1940 Parker still retained his respect and admiration for Morgan and his anthropology, his paper reveals that by this date he had modified his opinion of Morgan somewhat. In this paper, Parker quoted extensively from Stern, Morgan's earliest biographer, and concurred with Stern's argument that a general scheme of social evolution was unsustainable. By 1940, Parker argued that; "The cultural and social history of a people are better explained and understood in the light of its historical relations and cultural contacts. Morgan's scheme must be revised if we are to understand the march of culture, for there has been no uniform advance in the aspects of culture". Parker not only completely dismissed Morgan's thesis that mankind was at first promiscuous but also the idea that the family was unique to the latter stages of human development. He was also concerned to disassociate his intellectual hero from socialist thinking and remarked that although the concluding sections of Ancient Society on property and democracy, "sound like the expressions of a new deal Socialist", in fact, "Morgan knew nothing of socialism as a political bund" (Parker 1940a:4 Emphasis in original). Parker concluded by testifying to the lasting significance of Morgan's contribution to science and characteristically avoided making any searching critical conclusions, instead emphasising Morgan's commitment to democracy. He wrote of Ancient Society:

Whether its theses are sound or whether its conclusions are universally valid does not concern the sociologist so much as what grew out of Morgan's exploratory thinking. Each Utopia has hailed

Morgan's expression as prophetic of their own desires, but it may be that the democracy which he extolled, with its universal education, indeed does '...foreshadow the next higher plane of society to which experience, intelligence and knowledge are steadily tending'. (Parker 1940a:5)

Ely Parker and Lewis Henry Morgan provided Parker with examples of ways in which "Indianness" and Indian culture could have a positive and enabling role within the dominant culture. Parker's choice of a museum career and his associated work in ethnology, archaeology and anthropology offered him the opportunity to display the Indian and Iroquois past using Morgan's social evolutionary framework. Arthur Parker's success within the dominant culture as assimilated Indian and his many and various connections to Iroquois culture were an extension and development of the achievements of his great-uncle, Ely.

PARKER AND AMERICAN MUSEUMS

Parker's museum career spanned over forty years, from humble beginnings in 1903 as assistant fieldworker on museum-sponsored archaeological surveys, to the distinguished position from 1924 of Director of the Rochester Museum, New York, a position he held until retirement in 1945. During this time, museums underwent considerable change, from being the loci of the anthropological discipline to being social and community institutions centrally concerned with popular education and leisure. Parker was to be integral to, and a dynamic force within, this transformation. He became the first president of the Society for American Archaeology, was for many years elected president of the New York State Archaeological Society, served as president of the New York Historical Society and for over twelve years was the vice-president of the American Association of Museums. When Parker received the Rochester Civic Medal in 1946, the Director of the Dallas Historical Society added his voice to the many testimonies to Parker's achievements, writing; "just as truly as the modern high school is a monument to Horace Mann, so the modern museum is the creation of Arthur C. Parker". (Parker Papers Folders 8, 9 NYSM) This chapter will discuss Parker's choice of a museum career; museum collection in this period; and Parker's Indian identity in relation to the representation of the Indian within the context of the museum. I will detail Parker's contribution to progressive change within American museums but will argue that his museum work allowed him to display the narrative of social evolution well into the twentieth century, long after the approach had suffered serious attack within anthropology and that discipline

had become university-based. I will show how the museum acted as a centre for the re-presentation of the Indian within a specific chronotope and how the manipulation of time within the context of the museum enabled Parker to succeed as assimilated Indian and professional.

Parker's connection to museums began with archaeology. As a young man at White Plains High School, New York he had often visited the American Museum of Natural History in New York City and through time struck up a friendship with one of its curators, Frederick Ward Putnam. Aside from his curatorships, Putnam was also Professor of American Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard. Parker graduated from high school in 1897 and in 1900, aged 19, he entered Dickinson Seminary in Williamsport, Pennsylvania to study for the ministry. One 1902 letter between Parker and Putnam reveals that Putnam helped him financially with his educational expenses and gave him advice on a proposed archaeological publication. (Parker Papers 1:1 NYSM) Parker did not finish the course at Dickinson, and instead developed his interest in archaeology and left the institution early in 1903. In a museum publication in 1939, he described this period of his life as "the years of the sinking in of ideas, of the molding of a career which was much tintured by philosophical as well as scientific thought. But, for a while philosophical considerations swept me from my future course. I investigated philosophy and religion and soon began to wonder why the pursuit of pure truth should not be enough, with all labels and departmentalized names stripped away". (Parker 1939h:99) According to his successor in 1945 at the Rochester Municipal Museum, W. Stephen Thomas,

around this period Parker "carried out various studies" under Putnam and also worked as a reporter for the *New York Sun*. (Thomas 1955a:2-6) In the summers of 1903 and 1904 Parker worked as a field assistant to one of Putnam's students, Mark Raymond Harrington. Harrington (who eventually became Parker's brother-in-law) was conducting an archaeological survey at Cattaraugus Reservation for the Peabody Museum of Archaeology at Harvard. At Cattaraugus, Parker was able to resume old friendships, visit relatives and facilitate Harrington's fieldwork. (Parker 1923d:Introduction) Around this time, Parker was living in New York City and visiting the New York salon of a white couple, Frank and Harriet Maxwell Converse, whom he had known since childhood. Hertzberg has described the salon as a place where "Indians and friends of Indians gathered". (Hertzberg 1978:131) It was a social meeting-place for Putnam's disciples, men who were later to become well-known anthropologists, including Harrington, Alanson R. Skinner and Frank G. Speck. Joseph Keppler, cartoonist for *Puck* and the artist and teacher John W. Fenton also attended.¹ Years earlier, Parker's great-uncle Ely S. Parker had also been a visitor. Mrs Converse had been made an adopted honorary chief of the Senecas of Newton Longhouse at Cattaraugus in recognition of her work on behalf of the Iroquois. (Hertzberg 1979:130) She also collected Iroquois folklore and used it as the basis for romantic poetry which she contributed to newspapers and journals. The tone of Parker's relationship to the Converses can be seen in the ironized "Indian" language of the

¹ John Fenton was the father of William N. Fenton, who in the 1930s, was employed as anthropologist and community worker on Tonawanda Reservation where Parker was involved in two work-relief schemes. William Fenton has many connections to Parker and republished Parker's major anthropological texts in 1968 as [Fenton, W.N. Parker on the Iroquois Syracuse, New York: SyracuseUniversity Press].

following excerpt from a letter he wrote to them while still at Dickinson, "Beauty, beauty everywhere, but where, Oh, where is the Red Man who ownes [*sic*] it? and who are these userpers [*sic*] I see? I have scratched these few signs on the birch bark to let the GREAT CHIEF know that I am still on the warpath and not scalped by the pale-faces as yet". (Parker to Harriet Converse 30th January 1900 P2:1 Keppler Collection, MAIL) Upon Mrs Converse's death in 1903, Parker and Keppler became her literary executors and Keppler took over her position as Seneca chief. In 1908 Parker edited "Myths and Legends of the New York State Iroquois, By Harriet Maxwell Converse (Ya-ie-wa-noh)," New York State Museum Bulletin 125. (Parker 1908b)

The early 1900s were a crucial transitional period in the development of the anthropological discipline in the United States. The old museum-based focus of anthropology was giving way to an incipient professionalization of the discipline within the university. Anthropology's emphasis upon evolutionary stages which could be compared within the museum was being replaced by a new concern with the concept of culture based within the university. Although the museum was to remain the primary locus for anthropology until the 1920s, in 1904, the university-trained professional anthropologist was replacing the self-taught fieldworker. The best exemplars of the older type were Lewis Henry Morgan, J.N.B. Hewitt, James Mooney and Frank Cushing.² As Fenton notes;

² For discussions of the life and work of early "armchair" ethnologists, see for example: [Green, J., (1975) Ed. Cushing at Zuni: The Correspondence and Journals of Frank Hamilton Cushing 1879-1884 Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press; Moses, L.G. (1984) The Indian Man: A Biography of James Mooney Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

American anthropology in 1901 was turning the corner from the Museum period of converted naturalists represented by Putnam, from the romantic view of the Indian's literature and music, epitomised by Mrs Converse, to folklore, to the rigorous training of ethnologists in the universities, a tradition that Boas brought from Germany.

Putnam was indeed a converted naturalist of the old school. In fact until 1875 and his appointment as Curator of the first major American anthropological museum, the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard, he was primarily a zoologist who specialised in ichthyology. (Dexter 1966:316) Putnam had taught and practiced anthropology for years before Harvard awarded him a bachelor's degree, studied under the renowned Swiss geologist Louis Agassiz in the 1850s, corresponded with Morgan and had led the rebellion in the mid-1860s by Agassiz' students against their mentor's resistance to Darwinian evolution. (Hinsley 1985:49) Yet by the 1890s Putnam was himself aware of the growing need for professionalization within anthropology and its connected disciplines. In 1891, he had offered a three-year research course based at the Peabody Museum, and in 1894, his student George Dorsey received the first American doctorate in archaeology.

In 1904, with the help of Putnam, Parker secured a temporary post as an ethnographic fieldworker for the New York State Library and State Museum. His task was to procure for the State of New York, "all possible information concerning the history, customs, ceremonies, festivals, songs, traditions, etc..of the tribes constituting the Iroquois Confederacy" and collect artefacts "indicative of the manner and life and habits of the Indian people".

Parker's Indian descent helped him get the job. The New York Commissioner of Education appealed to the Iroquois to welcome "a young man of Indian descent". (Andrew S. Draper, Commissioner of Education, 10th November, 1904, To the Indian People of the State of New York, Parker Papers, NYSM) No doubt Parker was enthusiastic about working for the museum which held Lewis Henry Morgan's famous Iroquois collection and the fact that his job was to collect information and artefacts from the same Iroquois reservations where Morgan had conducted his fieldwork in the mid 1800s. 1905 and 1906 were to be productive years for Parker as anthropologist. In accordance with the State Commissioner's wishes, he began to gain the confidence of the Iroquois longhouse leaders and was allowed access to hitherto obscure secret medicine societies at the Cattaraugus reservation. Parker's marriage in April 1904 to Beulah Tahamont, an full-blood Abnaki, now facilitated his ethnographic research.³ With assistance from his wife, he "discovered" and reported on the rites of the Seneca Little Water Medicine Society and False Face Company and collected associated artefacts. (Parker 1909c:162) He began his work creating a translation of the "Code" of the Iroquois prophet Handsome Lake and detailed a great deal of general information on tribal life. However, Parker's correspondence at this time discussed his problems gaining access to information on the reservations and his difficulties overcoming his "outsider" status. He wrote to a white museum colleague:

³ Parker's first wife, Beulah Tahamont, was the daughter of Chief Elijah Tahamont of the Abnaki Nation of Canada, ancient enemies of the Iroquois. Beulah Tahamont studied at Sabrevois College in Montreal. The marriage produced two children, Melvil A. and Bertha A. Parker [A.C. Parker, "A Brief History of the Parker Family" Parker Papers, BEHS]. Mrs Parker had benefited, as had Parker, from an association with Harriet Maxwell Converse. Converse used her influence to secure a public school education for the then Beulah Dark Cloud and her sister, Bessie [Keppler Collection, MAIL].

It takes a long time for the Indians to give their confidence to anyone and for some time, although they accepted my statements and gave me preveleges [sic], I was conscious of a certain reserve on their part. The trouble was the fact that I was brought up under mission influence and the "pagans" are always more or less suspicious of such a person's motives. I have therefore, sought in every way to remove all obstacles that would cause the people to withhold information from me. I was much gratified, therefore, when the council of chiefs assured me through their chairman that after watching my movements and noting my methods they would give me their complete confidence in all matters and give me a place that only Mrs Converse had enjoyed. My work immediately became much easier and I am admitted to secret ceremonies that I was formerly barred from and this with the full knowledge that I am taking notes for publication... I am just beginning to appreciate my people myself. (quoted in Fenton 1968:12-13)

It is perhaps ironic that Parker should have had to work so hard to achieve the confidence of his forefather's people, a confidence which the white woman Mrs Converse had held for many years. Whatever difficulties he encountered, some time around this period Parker was adopted into the Seneca Bear Clan and given one of the "free" names within the clan set. Fenton has commented that clan adoption happens to most ethnologists who work among the Iroquois and that the name, *Gawasowaneh*, meaning "Big Snakesnake", was ceremonial and bore no personal reference to Parker. He describes the name as "a typical adult male's name of distinction". (Fenton 1968:13) Although on occasion in later years Parker was to make much of his Indian descent and use his clan name within his publications, he rarely made explicit reference to fact of his adoption. Adoption was necessary to Parker's integration with the Iroquois, because Seneca Iroquois Indian

status is reckoned through the mother's line and Parker's mother was white. In a sense, Parker's status as Indian was both affirmed and denied through adoption in that prior to it he had already considered himself "Indian". His adoption therefore, was symptomatic of his ambiguous and ambivalent status within Indian and white cultures.

Parker was paid by the Museum according to the quality of his collected information and artefacts and reimbursed for their value when he presented receipts. He was careful about securing a good price on the museum's behalf for artefacts on the reservations; he wrote about putting in a "by-the-way" with the Indians with regard to some brooches strategically at around seed-buying time, with the implication that at this time he would be able to negotiate a keener price. (Parker to Keppler, 16 April 1905, Fol. P2 No.10 [3] Keppler Collection, MAIL) In one four month period Parker collected remains which he valued for the State at \$10,000. Although it would appear that Parker had a small amount to live on during this period, the pleasure he took in his work outweighed any hardship. His letters to Keppler, which he habitually signed with his Indian name, revealed a kind of grateful excitement about entering Indian work. He wrote; "I am exuberant in my work - It thrills me.." and "I am enthusiastic over my work- and it seems to me a sin to secure a salary for becoming educated". (Parker to Keppler Fol.2 No. 9 [3] and 25 February 1905 Fol. P2 No.6; Keppler Collection, MAIL) In this period, Parker was acquiring an education which would lead to professional status within the white world. He was also gaining an education about the Iroquois which satisfied his personal need to retain an "Indian" association. He

approached his work salvaging the Iroquois past with both enthusiasm and a sense of gravity. He wrote to Keppler in 1905; "A friend of mine here is providing a phonograph and I hope to make records of a few permitted things. The sacred I will not profane upon a cylinder of wax, that putty substitute for a man's brain and fit emblem of many men's minds!". (Parker to Keppler 27 March 1905 Fol. 2 No. 9 Keppler Collection, MAIL)

Promotion came in 1906, when Parker was offered the new position of archaeologist within the Science Division of the State Museum on a temporary basis, pending the result of a civil service examination. With direction and recommendation from Putnam, Parker did extremely well in the examination. However, he expressed fears to his friend Keppler that, "the quarter-blood Indian...may not come up to the mark and capture the...prize". (Parker to Keppler Fol. P2 No.21 Keppler Collection, MAIL) This rare allusion to his own race and descent status makes clear that the issue of race had some bearing upon how Parker perceived himself within the profession. His salary was now \$900 a year and he was expected to supplement this with an income from his publications. He wrote that year, "It is my wish to infuse the New York State Museum with a purpose and make its archaeological department at least more than a museum of curiosities". (quoted in Zeller 1989:106) Parker was to work for the New York State Museum at Albany as archaeologist for eighteen years from 1906 to 1924 during which he wrote the texts which are now considered his most valuable anthropological contributions. These included Maize and Other Food Plants (1909), The Code of Handsome Lake (1913), The Archaeological History of New York (1922) and Seneca

Myths and Folktales (1923). (Fenton 1968; Parker 1922a; Parker 1923d) One of his earliest jobs as salaried archaeologist was the excavation in the summer of 1906 of an Iroquois village and burial site at Chautauqua County, New York. His report was later published as a New York State Museum Bulletin. (Parker 1907) He was obviously excited by his findings at Chautauqua; in a letter to Keppler he wrote; "I know of no other systematic exploration in N.Y. that has yielded the treasure this expedition has and I hope to profit in reputation by it". (Parker to Keppler 9 July 1906, Keppler Collection, MAIL)

Parker's entry into museum work in 1906 coincided with the first steps towards professionalization by museum workers with the founding of the American Association of Museums. Eventually Parker was to serve for several years as the AAM's vice-president, publish in its journal and regularly attend conferences. (Zeller 1987:52) However, in accepting the post as archaeologist within the State Museum, Parker had effectively closed off the avenue of a structured academic career within the developing field of anthropology. In 1904, the young anthropologist Frank Speck had taken Parker to meet Franz Boas who was at this time curator at the American Museum of Natural History, New York. Boas encouraged Parker to enrol at the university of Columbia to study anthropology. Instead Parker chose to continue his informal education with Putnam and become a professional archaeologist.⁴ Boas had offered Parker the opportunity to become part of the first group of young, university-trained professional anthropologists,

⁴ It is possible that Boas' personality influenced Parker's decision to some extent. In 1953, he described Boas as "awesome" among other museum men he met at the AMNH who were "obliging" and "friendly" [Parker (1953) "Where Questions Are Answered", Museum Service, December:163].

but Parker chose instead to pursue archaeology and work within museums. Boas left the AMNH the following year but continued his work as a Professor in the Department of Anthropology at Columbia University until his death in 1942, during which time he trained some of the central figures in twentieth century American anthropology, including Alfred Kroeber, Alexander Goldenweiser, Clark Wissler, Robert Lowie, Edward Sapir, Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, Ruth Bunzel and Paul Radin. (Stocking 1973:81) Of the group of young anthropologists who had visited Converse's salon, only Speck and Harrington decided to study under Boas within the Department of Anthropology at Columbia University. Speck subsequently went on to become Professor of Anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania. (Fenton 1968:9-10) Parker's decision not to enrol for a PhD at Columbia meant that he would not achieve a doctorate in anthropology early in his career. This fact hampered all his subsequent professional relationships and was central to his professional identity. As Fenton notes, "The decision to turn his back on the doctorate in anthropology would haunt his professional career, for it was an achievement he very much coveted and envied in others, allowing himself to be called "Doctor" Parker for years before Union College sanctioned the long usage with an honorary degree in 1940". (Fenton 1968:10)

Why then, given that Parker had the institutional contacts and ability to pursue an academic career within anthropology, did he choose focus his professional development to the confines of the museum? Hertzberg has given various possible reasons why Parker may have made this choice, including an argument that the academic route to professional status was simply too long and

arduous for Parker, given that he was "always in somewhat of a hurry" and "needed to get ahead quickly with marriage and a career" and the fact that he "could not know for sure in the early 1900's that anthropology had decisively entered a new professionalized phase". (Hertzberg 1979:54) Whatever the case, it is possible to argue that archaeology, Putnam and the museum had much to offer a young Seneca of mixed descent that the structured study of anthropology within the university under Boas did not. Putnam was a disciple of Lewis Henry Morgan and although Parker was never formally his student, Putnam became a significant professional influence. As Parker admitted to Putnam in 1907, "the character of my work has been the result of carrying out the methods which you have taught and which I have gleaned from your papers and addresses and from the advice and criticism which you gave me in New York". (Parker to Putnam Vol.1, 1:1 Parker Papers, UR)

Archaeology and ethnographic collection within the museum, fitted well with the material representation of social evolution according to Morgan's schema. Morgan was connected to Parker's family and to the Iroquois. Morgan's Indian collaborator had been Ely S. Parker, Arthur Parker's great-uncle and the Iroquois had been a focus for Morgan's fieldwork. As Parker wrote in 1919, "The Parker home was in a measure the spot where a new American science was born. The family has ever felt responsible for recording the fame of its race". (Parker 1919e:89) Yet Morgan was irrelevant even to Boas' attack on cultural evolution. Instead Boas focused his attack on evolutionary ideas on Morgan's British contemporary, Edward B. Tylor. Boas' theoretical approach did

not lend itself to direct application to Indian reform and did not significantly impact upon a concern central to Parker, Indian assimilation into the dominant culture. Although Boas rejected the innate inferiority of any one culture or race, this in itself did not facilitate Indian assimilation. Rather, a pluralistic and relativistic approach to culture complicated the issue. Whereas Morgan's evolutionary analysis marked out clear stages of human development through which it was possible to pass in one generation, Boas' work served to reinforce the significance of culture as the ultimate determinant of individual personality and could not be used to argue for rapid and easy Indian assimilative change. Acculturation, defined as the exchange and interaction between Western and native cultures, was not central to Boas' anthropology. As Herskovits notes:

the consistent contrast he drew in his writing between 'primitive' nonliterate, and historic societies, suggests that he never resolved for himself the question of values involved in comparing these types of civilisations, certainly not to any degree approaching the clarity of his resolution of the question of racial differences in endowment. (quoted in Hertzberg 1979:55)

Cultural evolution in its focus upon change from one developmental stage to another could directly inform political and social attitudes to the Indian and to Indian integration within the dominant culture. Thus as Hertzberg notes:

In this period it was not the apostle of cultural relativism or his students who sought to improve public attitudes towards Indians or to reform Indian policy, but rather these tasks were undertaken by the cultural evolutionists whose views Boas opposed. (Hertzberg 1979:55)

Had Parker chosen to study anthropology under Boas at Columbia, he would have been forced to question cultural evolution, therefore Morgan and perhaps most significantly, the status within white culture of "civilised" Indians such as himself.

It is worthwhile detailing the circumstances which led to the divide between the interests of the museum and of anthropology in order to contextualize Parker's decision to align himself with Putnam and the museum as opposed to the university and Boas. Boas was to realise the limitations of the museum and its collections in anthropological exegesis and this shift heralded the decline of museum anthropology in the twentieth century. However, Boas' early career had been firmly grounded within American museums. Putnam not only facilitated Parker's museum career but also that of Boas. In 1891, when Boas was employed within the Department of Psychology at Clark University, Putnam appointed him his chief assistant and head of the physical anthropology and ethnology section of the anthropology division of the World's Columbian Exposition at Chicago. Putnam was Chief of the Fair's "Department M", of Ethnology and Archaeology.

Even though the initial volume of American Anthropologist appeared in 1888, it was in 1893 at the Fair that anthropology as both a science and a name was introduced to the American public. Putnam ensured that the building which housed exhibits was called the "Anthropological Building" and expressly directed that "Anthropology" should be the term used, as opposed to "Education" or "Liberal Arts". Most of Boas' work at the Fair entailed organising fieldwork and when the Exposition was over he

worked for nine months packing, transporting and arranging the collections in the new Field Columbian Museum, created, with Putnam as a catalyst, after its close.

The Fair had its own conflict over the representation of the Indian. Putnam intended the Fair's ethnographic exhibits to represent "the stages of the development of man on the American continent...spread out as an open book from which all could read". He envisaged the collection growing in importance and significance through time as "the present American tribes are absorbed by the peoples of the several republics, an absorption which is taking place quite rapidly". The exhibits of Department "M" were strictly "scientific" and discrete from the depiction of Indians by the Interior Department's Indian Bureau. As Putnam said at the time, "...the great object of our Department...is to illustrate the Indian in his primitive condition. The Government proposes to show the Indian on his road to civilisation". (quoted in Dexter 1966:316-327) However, one political appointee of the Fair, Emma Sickles, described its Indian representation as "one of the darkest conspiracies ever conceived against the Indian race". The *New York Times* of 8th October, 1893 quoted her argument that:

...every effort has been used to make the Indian exhibit mislead the American people. It has been used to work up sentiment against the Indian by showing that he is either savage or can be educated only by Government agencies. Every means was used to keep the self-civilised Indians out of the Fair. The Indian agents and their backers knew well that if the civilized Indians got a representation in the Fair the public would wake up to the capabilities of the Indians for

self-government and realize that all they needed was to be left alone. (quoted in Dexter 1966:327)

Putnam's work at the Fair was an attempt to display materially the Indian as an example of the "primitive" stage of human development. He had Indians from British Columbia transported to the Fair as living exhibits. When the Canadian Pacific Railroad refused to transport "exhibit" peoples for free, Putnam wrote to the passenger agent, "I understood from Mr Webber that they would be returned free like other exhibits, as they were exhibits in every sense of the term". (quoted in Dexter 1966:327) Yet Putnam was ever ready to defend what he felt were the Indian's best interests. He helped Navajo "exhibits" secure payment for their appearance at the Fair when the Colorado Board withheld their promised payment. A full-blood Apache, known only as Antonio, was in charge of the Navajos brought to the Fair. He had been brought up by whites after being captured by the military in 1877 and Putnam employed him as an assistant. Putnam intervened in Antonio's favour when he was accused of improper conduct with certain of the female Navajo female "exhibits". (Dexter 1966:327-330)

In 1896, at the same time that Boas became affiliated with Columbia College, Putnam further facilitated his career by appointing him curator in charge of ethnology and somatology at the American Museum of Natural History where he met with Parker. Thus, although Boas was to lose faith in the usefulness of the museum method of anthropology by 1907, in his early professional development it was extremely important. Boas' earliest theoretical statements on specifically anthropological issues were rooted in discussion of museum classification and it

was within the museum that he encountered the earliest resistance to his re-orientation of anthropology. (Jacknis 1985:75)

By the first decade of the twentieth century Boas was advocating emphasis upon artefacts' meaning rather than their external form and this approach demanded change in the way exhibits were customarily displayed. Eventually, conflict over the way artefacts should be displayed and what has been described as "a bitter dispute over the subordination of the Museum's research to public entertainment" culminated in 1905 in Boas' resignation. (Stocking 1973:84) By 1907, Boas was explicit about what he felt were the limitations of the museum method of anthropology. He wrote:

the psychological as well as the historical relations of cultures, which are the only objects of anthropological inquiry, can not be expressed by any arrangement based on so small a portion of the manifestation of ethnic life as is presented by specimens. (Boas 1907:928)

This marked a fundamental divide between the interests of the museum and that of the anthropological discipline which henceforth developed primarily within the university. Parker's museum career shows that he did not share Boas' concern over the limitations of the museum method or his reticence to allow ethnographic collection to become entertainingly accessible to the public. Although Boas was to direct the development of anthropology in the succeeding decades, Parker was to be at the forefront of a gradual movement towards greater awareness of "the public" and of community issues within the museum world.

Today the history of the collection of material culture within museums has become the focus of a new kind of scholarly attention. Across disciplines, there is a concern over the capacity of museum displays to shape public interpretations of the "other". (Harris 1990; Weil 1983; Karp & Kreamer 1992; Karp & Lavine 1991) Clifford has described the way in which all collections universally mark off a selective domain that is not "other" and how they embody hierarchies of value and exclusion. He argues that collection and display are crucial processes in Western identity formation and that in the West "collecting has long been a strategy for the deployment of a possessive self, culture, and authenticity". (Clifford 1988:218) He details the Western distinction between fetishism, as a negative, deviant and/or "savage" improper fixation on single objects, and collection, an edifying, rule-governed, possessive and "proper" relation with objects. He uses Baudrillard to argue that gathered artefacts function within a developing capitalist "system of objects" which creates a system of value and maintains their meaningful deployment and circulation. Given this, "collected objects create a structured environment that substitutes its own temporality for the "real time" of historical and productive process". Clifford argues that:

The collector discovers, acquires, salvages objects. The objective world is given, not produced, and thus historical relations of power in the work of acquisition are occulted. The *making* of meaning in museum classification and display is mystified as adequate *representation*.. The time and order of the collection erase the concrete social labor of its making. (Clifford 1988:220)

Evolutionism dominated the display of exotic artefacts from the end of the nineteenth century and they were arranged so as to tell a

story of human development. As Clifford notes, "The value of exotic objects was their ability to testify to the concrete reality of an earlier stage of human Culture, a common past confirming Europe's triumphant present". Although Boas and the development of relativist anthropology brought a new emphasis on placing objects in specific lived contexts:

The "cultures" thus represented were either arranged in a modified evolutionary series or dispersed in synchronous "ethnographic presents". The latter were times neither of antiquity nor of the twentieth century but rather representing the "authentic" context of the collected objects, often just prior to their collection or display. Both collector and salvage ethnographer could claim to be the last to rescue "the real thing".

Collecting - at least in the West, where time is generally thought to be linear and irreversible - implies a rescue of phenomena from inevitable historical decay or loss. The collection contains what "deserves" to be kept, remembered, and treasured. Artifacts and customs are saved out of time. (Clifford 1988:228,231)

As Stocking has argued elsewhere; "Museums, in short, are institutions in which the forces of historical inertia (or "cultural lag") are profoundly, perhaps inescapably, implicated". (Stocking 1985:4) Museums are places where power, appropriation (the making of a thing private property), space, time, meaning and wealth coalesce. Parker engaged in the process which Clifford describes above, the presentation of the Indian past as a stage over which American "civilisation" had triumphed. In the early twentieth century the museum operated as a site of regeneration of American society , a place where American status was fixed by comparison with other races and animals from across the globe, where the "civilised" present could draw strength and direction

from an appropriated "primitive" past. Indeed Haraway has claimed Theodore Roosevelt as the "patron saint of the museum and its task of regeneration of a miscellaneous, incoherent urban public threatened with genetic and social decadence, threatened with the prolific bodies of new immigrants, threatened with the failure of manhood". (Haraway 1985:22) Like the African animals Carl Akeley (1864-1926) shot on safari and stuffed for the AMNH in carefully constructed dioramas which Haraway describes, the Indian dioramas which Parker would produce for the State and Rochester Municipal museums froze the Indian in a single pose forever . Like the taxidermic re-presentation of excellent specimens of African wildlife in dioramas, Parker's Indians were noble specimens caught forever close to the moment of first encounter with the dominant culture.

Change in the way scholars approach museum material culture has been spurred by the movement, in particular since the late 1960s, to repatriate native cultural property. The New York State Museum became the centre of controversy in 1970 when the Iroquois Onondaga Indians, with support from other radical Indian groups, demanded the return of the Iroquois wampum belts. These had been "secured" for the museum in 1898 by the State Librarian and Mrs Converse, whose connection to Parker has been detailed above. It is perhaps a symptom of the post-colonial condition that, were the belts to be returned, their most likely home would be the Seneca-Iroquois National Museum. Today, the museum plays a role in both Indian and "American" identity formation and serve for both as a repository for symbols of the idea of culture.

At the State Museum, Parker encountered difficulties in continuing his fieldwork contact with the Iroquois and conflict because of his persistent use of the statutory title "State Archaeologist", an aggrandisement of his job title which the State Commissioner called to his immediate superior John M. Clarke's attention. Clarke, State Geologist and State Palaeontologist, required that Parker switch his efforts from ethnographic collection *to* archaeological excavation. Clarke felt that excavation was more likely to supply the museum with an extensive range of spectacular exhibits for a proposed new museum site. Although Parker's excavation in 1906 of a site at Ripley was extremely successful, Clarke was never entirely satisfied. He rejected the skeletons which Parker excavated from the site, complained that the whole exercise was too expensive and argued that buying from amateur collectors would have been a more cost-efficient way of securing exhibit material for the Museum. Yet Parker kept up his fieldwork through making roundabout justifications for further ethnological forays to the Seneca and also to the Six Nations Reserve in Canada. (Fenton 1968:21) According to Fenton, Parker's report on the Ripley site excavation "made his reputation as an archaeologist" and remains "a landmark in the history of American archaeology since it represents one of the first attempts to describe the complete excavation of a large site and then interpret the results as the description of a local culture". (Fenton 1968:17) The Introduction to Parker's Ripley report stressed the importance of ethnological and archaeological fieldwork and argued that the State museum's collections must be more than what Morgan first thought they would become, simply "a memento to the red race". (Parker 1907:461) Rather, the Iroquois past should be reconstructed using

ethnological and archaeological fieldwork before it was too late, because the Iroquois were fast becoming "anglicized". Parker wrote;

Among these modern people of the ancient Five Nations one must conduct his researches in ethnology, folklore and philology. It is late, far too near the hour when a new epoch will dawn and there will be no more red men as such. Yet in the short time that remains it is our purpose to save at least a part of the tattered fringe of the ancient fabric that was, and from this small part learn something of its entirety. It will be apparent that as far as collecting ethnological material from the Indians themselves is concerned, there is little to be obtained, except slowly and in small quantities. (Parker 1907:466)

The Iroquois were, to use Parker's terms, "amalgamating" with the dominant culture, some were already "ultramodern" and therefore there was an urgent need to salvage the material culture of their past. (Parker 1907:467)

At several points in his professional career, Parker used Indian titles to charm significant and powerful people. In 1908, Clarke allowed official funds to be used when Parker organised a naming ceremony for him as representative of the State, justified by the fact that the State now held the prized Iroquois Confederacy wampum belts. Clarke was given the name Ho-sen-na-geh-teh, which Parker told Clarke meant "He carries the name" or "The name bearer". Of course, awarding Indian names through adoption, was a long-established custom among many tribes and served as a useful public-relations exercise between Whites and Native Americans. Those whites in receipt of Iroquois names were no doubt flattered, but Parker must have known that they were

primarily ceremonial and were not representative of any essential characteristic of the person given the name. Emberley talks about Indian names operating as "mythic primes" whose exchange value exceeds their use "in the narrative economy of historical truth". She makes the point that these names operate within "the currency of Nature" and circulate "within a metaphysical opposition between Culture and Nature". (Emberley 1990:37) Parker is here clearly operating within the kind of economy of naming which Emberley describes; he attempted to adopt a name, "State Archaeologist", which he did not deserve, whilst simultaneously "giving away" clan and ceremonial names to powerful Whites within a separate system of exchange. He himself possessed an Indian name as the result of his adoption in his early twenties into the Seneca Bear clan.

However much he used his Indian connections to flatter his museum superiors it is nonetheless clear that Parker made valid and lasting contributions to the archaeology of New York State during this period. (Bender & Curtin 1990; Sullivan [Unpublished paper] 1991:9) These included an extensive amount of collection and recording and numerous publications. He helped to publicise the discipline and argued that only trained professionals be allowed to do excavation. (Bender & Curtin 1990:10) His work culminated in 1935 in his election as the first president of the Society for American Archaeology and he was co-founder with E. Gordon Lee and Alvin H. Dewey of the New York State Archaeological Association. Perhaps more significantly for my purposes, he adopted views on methodology and professionalism which were extremely progressive for the time. According to the recent History

of American Archaeology, Parker was an early practitioner of the Direct Historical Approach, whose principles dictate that it is possible to reconstruct past cultures by working back into prehistoric time. (Willey and Sabloff 1974:114) According to Sullivan, this approach is still used today in Iroquoian archaeology "in that the goal of much research is to link the ethnographic accounts with the archaeology". (Sullivan [Unpublished paper] 1991:6) Although Parker's archaeological approach to interpretation is not considered particularly original for the time, the thinking behind his 1923 work "Method in Archaeology" which stressed the Boasian ideals of attention to context and problem orientation, is considered progressive.

For Parker, the object of archaeology was to further understanding of all aspects of the human species and set his archaeology and anthropology within the framework of social evolution. As Bender and Curtin have remarked in a recent discussion on Hudson valley pre-history:

Parker saw professional archaeology as a field defined by empirical observation, specialized training, responsible (ie. moral or ethical) activities, and well-defined relevant subject matter requiring academic expertise for interpretation. He maintained that humans have an unquenchable curiosity about why our species has done what it has done, about cultural origins, proclivities, and directions. The result of professional data collection and interpretation would be for citizens and scholars to see the story of human life and culture unfold. He asserted that archaeologists had the responsibility to tell this story carefully. (Bender & Curtin 1990:11)

Parker had a lasting impact on New York archaeology and his "Indian" identity did not limit his work or hinder his enthusiasm

for excavation. Indeed, it seems clear he had no qualms about disturbing the sanctity of Indian graves in order to secure "good" collections for the museum. Zeller quotes several letters from Parker to white associates where he apparently displayed a particular insensitivity to the mechanics of archaeological excavation of Indian remains. In one such letter Parker wrote of digging up "50 good Indians", and in another, "We have been digging up old Indians for the last six weeks and are having great luck. We find lots of 'em too. Rate of ten a week. They are good injuns too, for you know that they say the only good Indian is a dead one". (quoted in Zeller 1989: Footnote 14) It may be that Parker was ironizing an activity over which he felt some qualms although in an appendix to his later book, A Manual for History Museums, Parker gave blithely listed a set of directions; "How to Excavate an Indian Site". Here, Parker adopted an entirely "scientific" tone to dwell upon the intricacies of the archaeological excavation of Native American graves. He gave details about useful tools and suitable chemicals to use in order to transport graves to the museum for study, noting that "Bones, if dry, may be injected with amberoid". (Parker 1935b:180, 182) Parker argued that what mattered was the preservation of "the record... for the interpretation of the trained expert". (Parker 1935b:175) He positioned himself throughout the text, as he did selectively in other professional contexts, as "white" intellectual. He argued that one of the greatest "moral crimes" perpetuated against Native Americans was not the interference with the remains of their dead, but rather, the destruction of the record of their material past. He wrote:

One of the greatest moral crimes we have perpetrated against the native Indian of our continent, is the ruthlessness with which we have blotted out the story of his racial history by destroying ancient village sites and graves .

Although he referred to "the invisible empire of the dead", any reverence for it was effaced by an imperative to reconstruct the "American" ethnographic past. (Parker 1935b:181) Although his archaeology was particularly concerned to present the Iroquois as exemplars of "racial genius", his general aim was to demonstrate Indian evolutionary change through time. Both aspects can be seen in one 1927 article "The Amazing Iroquois". Here Parker presented ancient Iroquois as noble, freedom-loving and warlike, as patriotic proto-Americans enthused with "moral energy". In conclusion, he discussed contemporary Iroquois, some of whom understood that "assimilation is but an economic measure, and that for Indians to seek economic separation is suicide". (Parker 1927d:108) Parker's two-volume, The Archaeological History of New York was published in 1920 as Bulletins 237 and 238 of the State Museum. The text consolidated Parker's reputation as a professional anthropologist and in the same year following its publication the University of Rochester conferred on Parker an honorary Master of Arts. Its intellectual orientation owed a great deal to Morgan's evolutionary analysis of human development. As Parker wrote in his introduction: "Morgan's work was ethnological rather than archaeological, but as the two sciences are interrelated and coordinated, Morgan must be recognized as the father of New York archaeological science". (Parker 1920e:8)

At the State Museum between 1908 and 1916 Parker presented the narrative of cultural evolution using a series of six Iroquois life groups or dioramas "authentically" characteristic of the aboriginal past.. These were three-dimensional life-size replicas, or casts, of Indian figures set against various traditional backgrounds. Although Clarke was concerned about the expense, Parker pointed out to him that the main concern should be "Ethnological Accuracy", then "Natural Consistency" and lastly "Artistic Harmony". He employed Indians from New York and Canada to carefully reproduce the clothing and artefacts of the Iroquois past . He used sculptors and painters to create mannequins for each specific tribe; for the Seneca tribe he sought out models "whose figures and facial characteristics conform best to the Seneca type". He travelled to the Ontario Six Nations reservation to find "good Oneida types" since he felt that the Oneida of New York State were "too few and too white, though they may serve as body models". The life cast's wigs also received particular attention. He sent the manufacturers drawings and returned wigs that he felt were not appropriate. (Parker to Muller & Sons 3rd Oct.1911, Parker to Kasper Mayer 6th April and 4th December 1909, Parker to Letha Kenedy 21st January 1909; Parker to Clarke 13th June 1909 and 23rd April 1910; Parker Papers, NYSM) The backgrounds constructed were based on artists' impressions of actual archaeological sites. The life groups were vivid, mimetic illustrations of the stages described by cultural evolutionary theory. Parker wrote to Clarke informing him that for one group, fabric would be used instead of deerskins for aboriginal dress, "The idea is to show the evolution of the costume after the European period. This will give us room for beadworking so characteristic of the

Indians of the Colonial period". (Parker to Clarke 5th November 1905, 18 July 1906, Parker Papers, NYSM)

The State Museum life models were popular among other museum professionals, including the Illinois State Museum director, who asked Parker to create seven or eight life-group figures and an appropriate habitat setting for \$2,500. (Zeller 1990:111) This began the many instances in Parker's career where he would give advice to museum planners and representatives from other states and abroad and exchange collections with European institutions. Parker was likely to have got the life group idea from the systematic and synoptic exhibits and the Northwest Coast Indian life groups installed under Boas' direction at the American Museum of Natural History. One of the earliest uses of the phenomenon of the ethnological life-group was at the Chicago World's Fair of 1893 again under Boas' direction. The life group in itself was an interesting application of certain Boasian ideas, even though as been shown, Parker remained aloof from the Boasian anthropological approach. Yet he was particularly attracted to the life-group and developed it as his own. What attracted Parker to the life-group was not its synoptic nature or what it implied about culture, but its sensory appeal to the public, its ability to "free the imagination" in a way shelves of artefacts could not. (Parker 1916i:78-82) For the same reason he preferred dramatic lighting for his life groups within a darkened hall with painted panoramic backgrounds, whereas Boas' AMNH groups were designed to be seen from all sides.⁵ Zeller notes that Parker's life groups or

⁵ Boas resisted the movement within museums towards the use of mannequins which were particularly realistic. He objected to "the ghastly impression such as we notice in wax-figures" and to displays which showed figures in arrested motion: [quoted in Jacknis, I., in Stocking, G.W. Jr (1985) Ed., Objects and

dioramas "were laid out more like a film script than a scholarly monograph" so as to attract the museum visitor using lighting and dramatic poses and encourage the viewer to "come into an emotional contact" with the exhibit. (Zeller 1989:110) Parker's idea was to make education within the museum enjoyable, given that people went to museums "not to *consult* but to be *interested* without effort or fatigue" . The life group was much more appealing to the museum visitor psychologically than artefacts presented within cases in rows. It was "the most effective method of staging and of interesting and teaching the public". (Parker 1918c:81-84) As Parker wrote in 1918 "There is a psychological value in getting people to talk about the exhibit. It means their minds are impressed by the facts we have desired to teach. The subject dominates their thinking while their attention is held by the exhibit. The imagination is busy and without being aware of it, they are being instructed". (Parker 1916c:81-84) Much later in 1943, he reiterated these ideas arguing that:

People want to be entertained by exhibits, sights and sounds. They want sensory stimulation. They want to be thrilled by what they experience in a museum, not merely bored by long labels and crowded cases. People want to painlessly absorb stimulating knowledge, a knowledge that makes them talk about it...They want a feeling of personal contact. (quoted in Zeller 1987:47)

These ideas were extremely progressive in the context of the museum. Psychologists at Yale repeated many of the ideas Parker practised in the first decades of the twentieth century in the 1930s and advocated their implementation. (Robinson 1933) Parker had a

democratic, interactive attitude to the museum as a social phenomenon. He wished to create exhibits which would be comparative and synoptic in arrangement but which would also be extremely attractive to the public visitor. However, he did not seem to envisage the exhibits he created having any educational role specifically for Indians. Rather, they served as a vivid representation to the dominant culture of Indian society at a particular stage in human evolution.

Frustrated by Clarke's conservatism and the lack of scope for the development of his ideas at the State Museum, Parker resigned on 1st December, 1924 before he was officially offered the museum position for which he is best remembered, the Directorship of the Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences (RMSC) which he took in May 1925. Although Parker had "many painful regrets" about leaving the State Museum, he told friends that "the new field of service seems to present such large opportunities for museum extension that I cannot refuse the appointment". (quoted in Zeller 1987:44) Rochester was indeed to be the forum within which Parker really developed his museum ideas. Yet even though he took on the job with a great deal of enthusiasm he encountered many difficulties. The museum had a low budget, the building was in a poor physical location and did not receive a great many visitors. Parker was to completely turn this around and create in the RMSC a thriving community building whilst also consolidating his status within the museum profession. Upon gaining control, he decided that the fields of interest of the museum should be anthropology, biology, culture history and industrial arts of the Genesee region of Rochester, a comparable four-field division to

the one he advocated but never managed to achieve within the State Museum. (Thomas 1955b:25) At Rochester, Parker was able to apply his ideas about museums as instruments of social progress throughout the institution. He continued his focus on ethnographic collection and his use of dramatic life groups and period settings, this time within a general project to display Rochester's history from pre-history to the present. He also set up a structured training programme for his employees and organised in 1926, an informal quarterly museum publication, The Museologist, which today serves primarily as a record of his museum philosophy. In large part, as he stated in 1949, his project at Rochester, as perhaps in life, was "to complete the work commenced a century ago by another Rochesterian, Lewis Henry Morgan". (1949a:50)

His ideas on the role of the museum within American society received their fullest explanation in his 1935 text, A Manual for History Museums. According to Thomas this book intended by Parker as a compendium, became "The bible of the profession". (Thomas 1955b:25) Parker dedicated it to his friend Mark Harrington, then Curator of the South West Museum describing him as the man "who lured the author into the world of museum work". His foreword quoted Dixon Ryan Fox, a graduate of Parker's old alumni, Union College, Schenectady, New York, which described the museum as a "wonderworld". Parker liked the idea of the museum as a kind of secret world, a special and visually seductive place; "Museums that attract visitors and financial support must discover the simple principles that every good showman uses". (Parker 1935b:xii) Museums must also appeal to all ages and the greatest spectrum of society. Parker stressed the

importance of publicity and described museum work as "a new career..open to those who can and will master it". (Parker 1935b:viii) The museum was "the coming center of modern thought" which was "performing a mighty task for the community". (Parker 1935b:156,160) The sequential evolutionary ideas of Morgan reverberated within the text, with key themes being repeated: progress, ascent and levels/steps of evolution bound up within history: "Progress depends upon clear knowledge of the past, for we cannot step upward save from a lower level and a knowledge of all the lower levels from which we have ascended more safely charts the course of the future ". (Parker 1935:xii) The museum was an institution of "national welfare" and "social purpose" which had a central role in usefully filling the increasing leisure hours of the modern American "race". Parker's text revealed that he saw the museum as having a role not only in terms of education but also in terms of entertainment:

If in the past we have been teaching the race how to achieve vocations, we must now teach it how to develop avocations as the means of employing idle hours for self development and recreation.

If the museum of history will play this part in the scheme of national welfare, it will provide the means for a happier, more contented citizenship. (Parker 1935b:xv)

Museums should be "concerned with the formation of correct *ideas* through a logical presentation of *sequential history*". (1935b:4 Emphasis in original) He cited Darwin as the progenitor of "the motivation for natural history museums". (Parker 1935b:4) He argued that with the advent of Darwin's ideas the previous focus for museums of showing "the marvels of God's creation" were

surpassed and should be replaced by the illustration of "similarity existing between forms of life". Thus museums had the opportunity to take on the mantle of "science", "natural science rather than natural history". (Parker 1935b:4) This opportunity marked the opening up of a "magnificent panorama" which gave scientists "just cause for a glorious devotion". He made a strong plea for a Darwinian single purpose within the museum world, which should centre upon "order, sequence and lucidity". (Parker 1935b:4) The role of the museum was to visualise the narrative of cultural evolution; "Ideally our community museum might well devise synoptic exhibits outlining the rise of civilization". (Parker 1935b:6) In fact, the museum was the apotheosis of the civilised condition and the preserve of the "evolved" races alone. Parker quoted one S. Frank Markham:

...where the museum movement is at its best, there civilization has reached its highest limits. No backward race has ever yet evolved a museum, and the more progressive races vie with one another in the extent and value of their collections. (Parker 1935b:7)

Parker questioned the role of the museum "relics"; asking a question which used Morgan's terms and which seemed to envisage an extension of Morgan's research; "Do they [relics] indicate human advancement in mental capacity, or do they show only the logical outgrowth of the human mind over a long period? (Parker 1935b:8) The museum was a progressive institution which could bring popular "enlightenment" through telling the cultural evolutionary "story" using "logic, sequence and appropriateness". (Parker 1935b:16) Material culture was in itself secondary to the central cultural evolutionary message. Parker argued that "Objects, after all, are secondary. Ideas are primary" and within the museum

"The objects shown are merely tools in the visualization of ideas". (Parker 1935b:26,54) At Rochester Parker's expressed aim was to show "typical utensils [*sic*] and implements of each stage of our historical development, thereby writing a record of the cultural progress that will bear comparison with the better types of ethnological exhibits". (Parker quoted in Zeller 1989:114) Years later, in 1950, he held to the same premise that, "museums of history are institutions having as a purpose a revisualization of the past by means of objects illustrating and interpreting the cultural history of a people or an area". (Parker 1950b :7)

Parker stressed the museum's potential as institution which could encourage good citizenship and the need for the museum to appeal to a broad audience. Because of this, he argued that museum displays should deal with the everyday and small details of the past and have an emotional appeal.⁶ Parker's generalised museum blueprint stressed a) the community b) artists c) craftsmen d) hobbyists e) children f) schools, churches, clubs g) "conducting classes in local history, citizenship, social relations" and h) sponsorship of historical pageants etc.. He associated the museum with productivity in leisure, and with health, citizenship, education and democracy. Parker stressed the universal, democratic nature of the museum's educational potential as a "teaching institution" in that the museum should be "open to all without any inquiry as to scholarship". The museum's "challenge of service" was to be reborn as "a factor of tremendous power in education". He used words such as "dynamic" and evocative phrases such as "turbines

⁶ Parker did refer to the research role of the museum as an national institution in A Manual for History Museums. He listed forty-three possible topics for research papers which are amusing in their banality - e.g.. "When the tomato first came to town" and "Old wallpaper from our pioneer homes". [Parker, A.C.P. (1935) A Manual For History Museums New York: Columbia University Press page152].

of generative power" to talk up the potential significance of museums within American society. Parker argued in 1935 that, "In the changing order of human progress the museum, as an institution, looms large as an important factor". (Parker 1935b:5)

Parker saw the museum as having a social mission to provide "helpful service to every class of citizen" and he devoted a chapter within his text to "The Challenge of Service". John Cotton Dana (1856-1929) and George Brown Goode (1851-1896) were, according to Stephen Thomas, the primary influences upon Parker in terms of museum philosophy and it is worth looking at their work briefly to highlight their influence on Parker's museum philosophy. (Interview 24 March 1992) Brown Goode was a museum man who had begun his career as an exhibit specialist at world's fairs and expositions, one of which was the Chicago World's Fair of 1893. He had studied natural sciences as a young man under Louis Agassiz at Harvard and by 1879 had control of the National Museum at the Smithsonian Institution. Parker described Brown Goode's 1897 work, The Principles of Museum Administration as; "a document marking the culmination of the old museum theory which has given direction and plan to the new (Parker 1935b:Bibliography). Some of Brown Goode's approach to museum administration were replicated in Parker's text with a similar stress upon "enlightenment and education of the masses" and upon system and classification within "a museum of cultural history". (Brown Goode quoted in Alexander 1983:297) Goode also shared Parker's exactitude in terms of what he expected from his museum personnel with a resultant emphasis upon training. Later Parker was to characterise museum work as "evangelism"

and advise his staff that, "if they hope to become wealthy they might better seek positions in the commercial world but if they sought to emulate the missionary interested in constructive good for society, the museum is a good institution to stay in for the enjoyment of poverty". (Parker 1939i Museum Service 12:6 and Parker The Museologist 13 1938:10) This ideal of disinterested service, of professional work as a vocation was part of a general trend of the Progressive movement where developing professionalization, accompanied a stress upon moral idealism. (Burnham 1992) John Cotton Dana, the other major influence upon Parker's museum philosophy, worked primarily within American libraries and to a lesser extent in museums. Dana was more forceful than Goode in his calls for reform of the library system and shared Parker's fear over what would happen if reforming steps were not taken in American community institutions going so far as to say that poor libraries actually injured communities. (Johnson 1937:68) Like Parker, Dana believed that the primary importance of the library lay in its contribution to the social order, that the library should have a regional emphasis and have commercial applications. Parker shared this belief in the museum's potential to ensure the continuity of democratic principles; as he put it; "History is the gun-sight of a safe future". (Parker 1935b:328)

For Parker, the museum held the responsibility of being the community's tangible manifestation of national and regional history. In a 1935 essay entitled "The Small History Museum" he saw the functions of the history museum as being to collect, preserve, exhibit, illustrate and educate. (Parker 1935c:189) Parker placed primary emphasis upon collections as "the way a society

express(es) its ideals". His essay discussed the results of a survey which he had undertaken which showed that historic house museums did significantly better in terms of visitor appeal than conventional history museums. He concluded that this was because historic house museums presented their collections "in logical sequences and provides a setting that stimulates the imagination and provides information deemed of value to the visitor". He stressed the significance of "an atmosphere of recreation" and the individual finding out facts for himself and gaining pleasure from the process. He reiterated his call for change within museums, a change which would incorporate innovation and the aesthetics of interactive display, failing which he feared "the museum will relapse into decay". (Parker 1935c:195) This stress from Parker, upon order and sequence, upon history being presented as a unified narrative coupled with an overall stress upon the educative responsibility of the museum as a public institution is indicative not only of the progressive ideals of the time, but of Parker's reverence for cultural evolution. The urge to present history as a unified, structured whole reflects the influence of Morgan and Morgan's analysis of human history . Parker described the museum collections' purpose as being "to illustrate some pertinent fact in its proper place in the classification scheme". (Parker 1935c:194) His texts reverberate with a closed idea of the "correct" within museum presentation with collections "arranged in as correct order as the books upon its library shelves". The juxtaposition of historic collections and the catalogue of the library is an excellent example of Parker's evolutionary approach (elsewhere he compared the job of the "museist" as analogous to that of the "meticulous physicist or chemist"). (Parker 1935e:328) Thus labels and labelling were of

the highest significance for Parker (Parker 1935e:xii). This influence is more marked in an earlier essay "The History Museum - An Opportunity". Here Parker again reiterates his wish for history to act as "inspiration", history being "the spirit of human experience, aspiration and experience". (Parker1934b:326) Parker made explicit commitment to the racial evolution of the Morgan school; "we are here because our forebears willed us from dim savagery to our present state of physique and external culture". (Parker1935b:326) Here Parker conflates Morgan's concepts of savagery, barbarism and civilisation with an emphasis upon corresponding physical characteristics which aren't found in Morgan's Ancient Society (1877). This 1934 essay makes an overt plea for Darwin's ideas to be transposed onto any of the larger museums (the AMNH, the Field Museum of Natural History, the British Natural History Museum) in order to bring "success and enlightenment". Parker wrote of his commitment to these evolutionary ideas: "The theory of the unfolding of natural forces resulting in growth and change has given mankind a new inspiration and a new understanding of God's way in the universe". (Parker1934b:327)

He repeated themes of "sorting", "classification", "objectivity" and "logic" which he considered necessary to the museum's duty to "unfold the story of what it all means to life and living today". (Parker 1934b:328) Parker's proselytising for the introduction and institutionalisation of, by then somewhat dated ideas of evolution, is here interestingly coupled with one of Parker's few textual references to God (this text has several such references). Parker saw the museum as a patriotic catalyst, a place of community

inspiration whose role should be to instruct the common weal of "our national drama and its lesson to humanity". (Parker 1934b:331) It can be argued that Parker sought out the museum context as opposed to that of the university because the museum was a much easier vehicle within which to spread his particular democratic/reform orientated ideas and to couple them with the concepts of his intellectual mentor, Morgan, then fading in intellectual currency.

Parker saw the museum as acting as a societal buffer, a pressure valve, helping to alleviate the problems of modernity, rather in the way Frederick Law Olmsted advocated large public parks as necessary institutions of democratic recreation to alleviate urban stress. (Fein 1972) Where Olmsted had advocated nature as an antidote to the problems of explosive urban growth in the nineteenth century (the first major public park in the United States was New York's Central Park, which was designed by Olmsted in collaboration with Calvert Vaux in 1858), Parker saw potential for history to act in a similar way. History well presented within the museum could become "one of the cultural centers of an economic world in which there is more leisure than ever before". (Parker 1935c:193) He wrote:

In this day when confusion reigns, when there is little real thinking, when the purposes of groups are so often at odds and when the deeper meaning of America is so little understood, museums of history have a unique opportunity of enlightening and inspiring citizens to a renewed devotion to the common good. (Parker 1935c :160)

This reform-orientated vision for museums is reflected in Parker's use of the term "museum movement", thus positioning museums as part of some larger syncretic drive towards democratic national reform. Therefore a primary concern for Parker was to raise national awareness of the museum's potential for social reform. However, he also saw the museum within the industrial impetus of the time. At Rochester he attempted to develop business potential within the museum, describing its visitors as "museum consumers" and the institution itself as "a combination of a mail order and direct sales establishment". He used the language of the machine-age by arguing that museums could "stimualte [*sic*] business as well as education by providing the tools of clearer thinking and clearer judgements". Ironically, a month before the stock market crash of 1929, he had written "Museums Stand For Commerce" which argued without result for the development of a commercial department within the museum. (quoted in Zeller 1989:119)

Another Indian figure within the museum world in the early twentieth century deserves comparison with Parker. Ishi, a California Yahi Indian who had never come into contact with whites, was discovered on 29th August 1911 in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada. His home became the Museum of Anthropology of the University of California where he was taken in the same year by the anthropologist Alfred Kroeber. In a sense, Kroeber followed the academic path to the status of professional anthropologist which Parker did not. He was the most prominent disciple of Boas in the period, having achieved the first doctoral degree in anthropology in 1901 from Columbia. At the museum, Ishi became

a celebrity and bore the brunt of full media attention. Among other offers to capitalise on Ishi was one vaudeville impresario who offered to "take over" both Kroeber and Ishi and bill them as an "educational" act. Kroeber arranged for Ishi to become the museum assistant janitor at a salary of \$25 a month and live in the museum demonstrating traditional crafts. Ishi spent the rest of his life there among those he called *saltu*, the white race. He died on 25 March, 1916 from tuberculosis. Kroeber's (benign) treatment of Ishi as an example of a "primitive" culture was symptomatic of the way Boasian anthropological theory saw the Indian as at a distant remove from the "civilised" state. Whereas Morgan's ideas allowed for the possibility of relatively rapid Indian assimilation, the culture concept, although it decried racism, led instead to a stress upon an almost insurmountable difference between the "primitive" and "civilised" conditions. Kroeber told a magazine reporter in 1912; "Ishi has as good a head as the average American; but he is unspeakably ignorant...He has lived in the stone age, as has so often been said". For Kroeber, Ishi was not inferior to white America, simply a product of a "primitive" past. There was "an almost inconceivable difference in education, in opportunity, in a past of many centuries of achievement on which the present can build. Ishi himself is no nearer the 'missing link' or any other antecedent form of human life than we are; but in what his environment, his associates, and his puny native civilization have made him he represents a stage through which our ancestors passed thousands of years ago". (quoted in Hoxie 1984:142) Similarly, for Theodora Kroeber, who published Ishi In Two Worlds: A Biography of the Last Wild Indian in North America in 1961 just after her husband's death, Ishi was a fascinating messenger from

the anthropological past. She described how, "The years of Ishi's total disconnection from history were most of the years of his life: a long interlude of stillness. The senses strain to understand what must have been the waking and the sleeping of that time; and if Ishi could not light up for us its traumas and tragedies, he could and did describe and reenact for us, something of its day-to-day living".⁷ (Kroeber 1961:99)

As an assimilated mixed-blood Indian Parker's success within the museum world was in defiance of contemporary anthropological theory. Like Ishi, he too "lived" within the auspices of the museum but from a vastly different position. Where Ishi's Indian status marked him as "primitive" and placed him as a kind of exhibit within the temporality of the museum, Parker used his "Indianness" to develop the ethnographic collection of his museums and achieve professional status within that context. In fact, in 1929, Parker and another museum professional advised the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society on how to organise their own "living exhibit" for the Letchworth State Park, New York. The park as "outdoor museum" was to include a Seneca Indian village flanked by a "typical Iroquois stockade". A bark house was to be constructed which would house "an Indian custodian and family who will live there under aboriginal conditions and cultivate the garden which is to contain the typical Indian food plants". Parker assured the Society that he could "secure a competent man, well versed in this sort of thing, for about \$50 a week". (Parker

⁷ Theodora Kroeber's book is an interesting record, although it does attempt to fully encompass Ishi's subjectivity. The Ishi she presents textually is very much a noble savage who never seriously contradicts white values. For an analysis of Ishi and his "timeless" representation in the early twentieth century see: [Vizenor, G. (1992) "Ishi Bares His Chest: Tribal Simulations and Survivance" in Lippard, Lucy R. Ed., Partial Recall London:New Press].

1929h:76) Rather than being assigned the position of "primitive" other, Parker was involved in its construction and representation within American museums.

We have seen how Parker did not study anthropology under Boas but chose instead to create his own professional niche, best described by his own neologism, "museologist". As a professional within the context of the museum Parker operated within another time, a temporality which concerned itself with the re-presentation of America's primitive past. Within the forum of the museum, an institution which was constructed as the crystallisation and apotheosis of the civilised condition, the site where America interpreted its history through the collection and display of a timeless and primitive "other", Parker achieved success as a professional and intellectual within the white world, reaffirmed his position as assimilated Indian through the display of social evolutionary schema, and developed his connection to contemporary Indian culture. The museum, not the university, allowed Parker as assimilated Indian, to be both intellectual, professional and Indian authority, allowed him to interpret Indian history so that it fitted with the triumphant optimism of early twentieth century modernity. The museum was a centre within American society where Parker could fully integrate, as assimilated Indian, as intellectual and as professional because the context of the museum created a specific chronotope. Within the museum, realities of Indian-white history and contemporary Indian accommodation and resistance to civilisation were elided. Instead the Indian was re-presented as "primitive" archetype and his evolution through time towards the condition of civilisation

charted. Within the museum, the Indian was recontextualized in a separate history, a separate time. Parker engaged in the constructed spectacle of cultural evolutionary museum display, where the colonised other was reproduced as both contained and ahistorical.

PARKER AND THE SOCIETY OF AMERICAN INDIANS

In 1911, whilst employed as an archaeologist at the State Museum, Parker took up a role which allowed him to engage as an "Indian" within Indian politics and to mediate between white and Indian cultures. A leadership role within the Society of American Indians (SAI) allowed him to construct a specific "Indian" identity and to work towards the realisation of his vision of a fully integrated role for the Indian within the dominant culture. In comparison, within the context of the museum Parker's Indian descent was useful but always secondary to his role as archaeologist and ethnographer. The Society of American Indians was the first modern national group which claimed to represent Native Americans. It voiced Indian demands for reform, defined Indian responsibility for change, and articulated the conditions the Society considered necessary for full Indian integration. At 29, Parker was one of the youngest prominent Indians within the group and, as Hertzberg notes, "Of all the leaders of the Society, his commitment seems to have been deepest". (Hertzberg 1971:57) The effort and enthusiasm which he devoted to the Society can be related to the fact that the organisation appeared to offer him a resolution of his conflicting identities, as Seneca, as Iroquois, as Indian and as middle-class "American" professional.

The following account of Parker's involvement in the SAI must necessarily owe much to the excellent scholarship of the late Hazel Hertzberg, particularly her 1971 publication The Search For An American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements. Hertzberg has placed Parker and the SAI within an historical survey of "pan-Indian movements", characterising the organisation

as the precursor to the city-based fraternal "pan-Indianism" of the 1920s and the religious "pan-Indianism" of the contemporary Native American Church and the peyote faith. Hertzberg's analysis centres upon the viability of the concept of "pan-Indianism" and presents Parker as integral to a "pan-Indian movement". Although I will refer to many of the same archival sources which Hertzberg cites in her text, I will develop differing and separate conclusions on both Parker and the SAI. I will show that the SAI movement was "pan-Indian" only in the sense that it expressed an aspiration for, and the notion of the political union of all Indians. However, at no time did the SAI achieve the kind of interaction which involved all Indians and/or all tribes or their representatives. I will show how within the SAI, Parker contributed to the construction of a definition of Indian status. The SAI defined, through its membership restrictions, who could be considered authentically "Indian", according to degree of Indian blood. Membership in the Society, allowed Parker to assert a type of Indian identity which his white ancestry denied him within his Iroquois tribe. It also provided him with an organisational base from which to mediate between Indian and white cultures and in particular to attempt to influence the direction of governmental Indian reform.

Prior to joining the SAI, Parker had revealed his uncertainty concerning his right to assert an Indian identity. In 1911, just before the founding of the SAI, he replied to a letter which required his photograph and "native name, if any, proportion of Indian blood, where graduated, and any other facts of interest" to illustrate "Indians of distinction" at the Universal Races Congress in London:

If I can find a suitable photograph, I shall be glad to send you one, though perhaps it may be best not to use it. At heart I am very much an Indian though in reality I am but a "quarter blood". However, though my Scotch-English ancestry is worthy of some boast I value more the greater royalty that comes down to me from my Indian fathers. Possibly I talk, think and write Indian so much and allow my "full-blooded" Indian heart to beat so strongly at times that the public gets the impression that I am more of an Indian by blood than a view of my ancestral tree will warrant.

After these confessions if you still wish the photograph you may have it. (quoted in Hertzberg 1979 :61)

Parker did not here disclose his Indian name, "Gawasowaneh", which he often used in private personal correspondence. This was perhaps because he did not wish to reveal the fact that he was an adopted Seneca Iroquois. When writing to the wife of a "full-blooded" Sioux he was hesitant about his Indian status and the validity of his Indian name. Although Parker is unlikely to have been aware of the fact, many of the educated Indians he was to join in membership of the SAI, were also of only partially Indian descent and in some cases they occupied as ambivalent an "Indian" position as his own in terms of their relationship to specific tribes.

A desire to be perceived publicly as "Indian" accompanied Parker's self-appointed role as political representative, mediator and broker between white and Indian cultures. He was repeatedly called upon as an Indian authority, as a source of accurate information on Indian life and in particular as a mediator between the reservations and public bodies including the media and state and federal institutions. His written responses were in the main measured and pro-Indian, speaking with the voice of a concerned professional

and usually laying blame at the feet of federal and state agencies. Parker devoted much time and energy responding to letters from uneducated Indians, often dictated or written through an interpreter. He brought many individual cases to the attention of the Indian Bureau, which itself was to become a fundamentally divisive influence within the SAI, and generally spoke on behalf of fellow Indians who were ill-equipped to deal with various injustices. In a sense, he acted as an Indian political representative to white authorities. The SAI offered Parker, not only the opportunity to consolidate his own "Indian" identity, but also a larger platform and greater scope to air the grievances of and shape reform pertaining to those he considered his constituency, unassimilated reservation Indians.

Although not one of the original six educated Indians who gathered in April 1911 at Columbus, Ohio, to form the Temporary Executive Committee of what was originally named the American Indian Association, Parker became one of the most, if not the most, influential members of the Society of American Indians. He was, as Hertzberg puts it "the man most important in the development of the Society of American Indians". (Hertzberg 1971:48) Hertzberg has described Parker's role within the SAI as that of "peacemaker among the warring factions which beset the Society almost from the beginning". (Hertzberg 1971:55) She finds that in his roles as editor of the SAI Journal and as SAI secretary-treasurer, he acted very much as would a chief, or sachem of the Iroquois confederacy and argues that he fitted well with William Fenton's description of the "Iroquois personality". Today, the concept of one universal group personality has been brought into question, but Hertzberg's

basic points that Parker saw the SAI as a forum for the expression of differing views within an intertribal framework and that he was intolerant of any smaller analogous organizations seem accurate.

Parker was aware that involvement in the Society could serve to alienate him from the Iroquois, who were at this point central to his research and professional development. In 1911, he wrote to Rosa B. La Flesche who worked in the SAI office:

Like you I occupy a peculiar position among my own tribe. My father is a citizen and a leader in great movements for patriotic work near N.Y. City. I am a citizen and without any tribal interests. In working for Indian betterment I expect no profit from it. I can only incur criticism, suspicion and unjust remarks. The Senecas of a certain class will think that I am working to make citizens of them and this they have protested for 60 years. They wish to remain as they are, and today the percentage of adult illiteracy in New York among the Indians is greater than in Oklahoma. In a movement of this kind I am injuring myself in a field which must be my life's work. (Parker to Rosa B. La Flesche, 27 November 1911, Parker Papers, NYSM)

The Society offered Parker the opportunity to continue and build upon what he saw as his duty to work as an Indian public servant. Here was a chance to continue the fight against injustice on the reservations and an opportunity to influence governmental Indian reform with the support of an organisation which claimed to speak for the American Indian. This new Society was arguably the most significant of organised groups which developed in the Progressive era based on an assumed common Indian interest and identity as distinct from tribal interests and identities. Yet, although an important development within Indian history, the SAI achieved little. It was, as Hertzberg has characterised it, "a reform organization which could not produce reforms". (Hertzberg

1971:134) Nonetheless, the organization and Parker's essential contribution to it, marks a significant period in Indian history when an attempt was made to form an effective intertribal unity for the benefit of the Indian through accommodation to the dominant culture.

However, Indian cultural diversity has always operated against the sustained unanimity of a intertribal response to white colonisation. The two prior pan-Indian movements to which Parker made most reference during the period of his engagement with the SAI are outlined below. In the 1780s, a Mohawk war chief of the Iroquois Confederacy, Joseph Brant (Thayendaneja) attempted to organise a political and military confederacy among the tribes of the Northwest in order to stop American expansion. Brant's attempt to unite Indian nations as "all of one mind - one heart", holding Indian land as common property failed because he was unable to persuade the tribes to unite. Another attempt to create a pan-Indian movement came at the beginning of the nineteenth century when two brothers of mixed Shawnee-Creek parentage; Tecumseh and his brother Elskwatawa, the "Shawnee Prophet", lead a pan-Indian campaign for an Indian renaissance. Tecumseh was in large part the political and legal negotiator and his brother provided the religious underpinning of the movement. Together they urged their followers to expel Anglo-Americans from tribal territories, a movement which they held would be facilitated by a return to pre-contact conditions through supernatural means. Indian nationalism would lead to the restoration of Indian territory. The brothers condemned drunkenness, any Indian dealings with the Americans, including intermarriage, and urged a return to certain old Indian

customs. Tecumseh held to the doctrine of common Indian ownership of land, arguing that no individual or group could alienate title to land held in common by all Indians of a region. Tecumseh and the "Shawnee Prophet" considered the British friends and the Americans the enemies of all Indians. However, despite Tecumseh's eloquence and political and legal acumen, (Tecumseh addressed Indian councils from Wisconsin to the Gulf of Mexico) the attempt to create a pan-Indian confederacy failed. A battle at Tippecanoe Creek in 1811, dealt a fatal blow to the movement. An American army marched on the pan-Indian settlement at Prophetstown, and the Prophet's medicine failed to prevent severe Indian casualties. Soon after Tecumseh joined British forces and died in the War of 1812. Thus American military force ended this early attempt to bring together Indian tribes to resist American expansion.

In common with other attempts to form an effective intertribal response throughout history, the SAI was to flounder over the difficulties of sustained intertribal cohesion. Its immediate precursors were the Indian defence organizations; the Indian Rights Association, founded in Philadelphia in 1882 and the Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian which began its annual meetings in the following year. Their main concern was to safeguard certain Indian rights within the larger scheme of Indian integration into the dominant society through civilisation and Christianity. They supported the Dawes Act of 1887 which they saw as a way of liberating Indians from the debilitating conditions on the reservations, but argued for its fair implementation. They fought against obvious unjust treatment of Indians (the sale of

alcohol on reservations, white encroachment on to Indian land) and for fair payment of allotment monies and annuities and for enforcement of treaties and agreements. However, these were white-run organisations and at least for the first few decades of their existence they placed no particular value on traditional Indian heritage, institutions or culture. These early white missionary-influenced Indian reform groups wanted Indian culture to "vanish" seamlessly into white culture. Europeans could contribute to the melting pot which would create the new amalgam, the "American". However an Indian contribution was neither envisaged or sought after. It is worth noting that in Israel Zangwill's play, where the melting pot concept is commonly held to have originated, there is no reference to the Native American. Zangwill wrote, "America is God's Crucible, the great Melting-Pot where all the races of *Europe* are melting and reforming!...God is making the American". (Zangwill 1908: 1 Emphasis added) The Indian culture was, as it were, to evaporate in complete union with the dominant white culture.

In contrast, the new group of educated Indians reaching maturity at the beginning of the twentieth century who founded the SAI, did not intend to "vanish" seamlessly into the dominant culture and thus lose the best of Indian tradition and culture. Central to the Society was a belief in a non-vanishing Indian "race" which could constructively contribute to American democracy and progress. They sought to be somehow both Indians and modern Americans by selectively adopting what they considered the best of white civilisation and Christianity. They strongly held to varieties of American individualism and self-help, for groups and individuals.

From this came a common opposition to government paternalism and to the Indian Bureau and a desire to create an Indian leadership for "the Indian race". At points they referred to the immigrant experience as a model of successful integration into white society. Social science and evolution provided another set of ideas about Indian status and potential within American society. As Hertzberg notes; "The idea of race was both important and quite ill-defined, sometimes being equated with "nationality", sometimes with "culture", and sometimes with biology. Educated Indians saw themselves as a race". (Hertzberg 1971:22) The idea of evolutionary stages which owed so much to Morgan, had considerable impact on their thinking although certain sociological ideas also had an impact on the SAI. In particular: the idea of the social survey, where information was gathered in a scientific manner as a basis for social policy; the importance of a defined status so that the individual and the group had a clearly delineated relationship to the rest of society and the social settlement idea in which more "fortunate" members of society helped the less "fortunate" through localised and organised activities for the development of skills and knowledge needed for full participation in national life. A further set of ideas came from the law. In the early twentieth century a small group of Indian lawyers argued for Indian equality before the law.

With the failure of the Dawes Act to stimulate Indian assimilation, a new band of educated Indians rallied behind the SAI and attempted to reform Indian policy and provide "race leadership". The Society was similar to other reform organisations of the period and in common with them operated along principles which

advocated self-help and self-reliance, believed in education as a path to opportunity, government intervention on behalf of the underprivileged or under-represented and was patriotic and upheld melting-pot thinking. Its founding conference proceedings described how "The thinking Indian, therefore, asks that he be treated as an American and that a just opportunity be given whereby the race as a whole may develop and demonstrate its capacity for enlightenment and progress ... as an American people in America ". (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:25)

The Indian race was itself envisaged as a kind of Indian melting pot in which the tribes would pool their best characteristics. The SAI had a gradualist evolutionary perspective where inevitable change within the race was heralded and pioneered by an educated Indian elite. The Society, like Parker, valued the Indian past but never fully resolved the distinction between Indian tribal identity, some kind of pan-Indian "race consciousness" and identity within the dominant culture. The delegates at the founding conference promoted a sense of pride in being Indian and foregrounded the idea of an intertribal Indian "race". This fitted into an understanding of social evolutionary ideas where the Indian "race" was progressing through successive evolutionary stages to the status of "civilisation".

It seems likely that the desire to forge Indian identity around a central binding faith in an Indian "race" and a lack of emphasis upon tribal identities, was symptomatic of the group's individual and general problematic Indian status in that few of the Society's earliest members were Indian "full-bloods". For most, their "success" within white culture had in many instances alienated

them from their respective tribes. It is possible to argue that aside from the Society's ostensible purpose to facilitate Indian integration into white culture, the group had a secondary aim and function, to create a role for an educated Indian elite within Indian culture. The SAI's founding members included: Dr. Charles Alexander Eastman, Dr. Carlos Montezuma, Thomas L. Sloan, Charles E. Daganett, Laura Cornelius and Henry Standing Bear. All were educated professionals and most like Parker, used both Indian and "American" names. Dr Charles Alexander Eastman (Ohiyesa) had achieved fame because of his work as an author and speaker on Indian life. Although Eastman referred to himself as "full-blooded" and was considered a full-blood Santee Sioux by other members of the SAI, he did in fact have a white ancestor on his mother's side.¹ Charles E. Daganett was a Peoria from Oklahoma. As Hertzberg notes, "...his degree of Indian blood is uncertain, Carlisle school records list him as 'half' and he is elsewhere referred to as 'quarter' ". (Hertzberg 1971:42) In 1911 he held the highest position of any Indian in the Indian Bureau, that of Supervisor of Employment. This necessarily put in him a complex position in terms of his highest loyalty; his high rank within the Bureau made him the focus of Indian hopes for advancement within it, but also placed him liable to attack as one employed to work against "the race". In contrast, Montezuma or "Wassaja" [Apache name meaning "beckoning"], can be viewed as the strongest force within the SAI operating against the Indian

¹ For the details of Eastman's ancestry see: [Eastman, Dr. C.A. (1902) Indian Boyhood, New York: McClure, Philips & Company, page 5]. Eastman's works also include: [(1911) The Soul of the Indian, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company; (1914) Indian Scout Talks Boston; Little, Brown & Company; (1916) From the Deep Woods to Civilization Boston: Little, Brown & Company; (1918) Indian Heroes and Great Chieftains Boston: Little Brown & Company]. For a discussion of Eastman and his wife Elaine, see: [Oandasan, W. (1983) "A Cross-Disciplinary Note on Charles Eastman (Santee Sioux)" American Indian Culture and Research Journal 7:2:75-78.

Bureau. Montezuma was strongly influenced by the thinking of General Pratt the founder of the Carlisle Indian School, and maintained an antipathy to both the reservation and to the Indian Bureau, believing in public education and instant assimilation. Like Eastman, another first-generation "American", he was a relatively famous Indian figure. Though full-blooded, Montezuma had been adopted into white culture at the age of four, had attended white public schools and was in 1911 married to a white woman. Although Montezuma helped found the SAI, he spent much of the rest of his life attacking its lack of explicit opposition to the Bureau. (Iverson 1981:415-426) The Reverend Sherman Coolidge was a "full-blood" Arapaho, who in 1911 was in charge of the Indian Protestant Episcopal mission field for western Oklahoma. He had been adopted into a white family aged seven, had attended eastern public schools and also married a white woman. According to Hertzberg, he seldom used his Indian name, apparently meaning "Runs Mysteriously on Ice", although in private correspondence with Parker he often signed himself "Arapaho". Thomas L. Sloan was a one-sixteenth Omaha and a well-known Indian lawyer. Henry Roe Cloud was a "full-blood" Winnebago who was prominent in Indian affairs, particularly Indian educational reform. (Crum 1988:171-184) As an adolescent he had been taken under the wing of white reservation missionaries, Dr and Mrs Walter Roe. Several of the early members of the Society: Eastman, Daganett, Montezuma and Roe Cloud, were, like Parker, Freemasons.

One *New York Tribune* article entitled, "Looking For an Indian Booker T. Washington to Lead Their People" gave a useful

overview of the many of the educated Indians involved in the inception of the SAI. It provided short synopses of each founding member and a sense of how they were viewed at the time. (Du Puy 1911:3) The article described the reservation as a hindrance to Indian "race progress" and noted how those educated Indians forced to return to the reservation are disadvantaged; "the reservation does not offer the opportunity for the use of that education that is to be found by the white man". It listed the professional successes of Thomas L. Sloan, Indian Congressional committee representative; the Reverend Frank Wright, preacher; Dr Carlos Montezuma, Instructor in the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Chicago; Charles E. Daganett, government Supervisor of Indian Employment; Laura Cornelius, scholar and social worker and the ethnologist Frank La Flesche. It discussed the "great powwow" planned for Columbus, Ohio to "discuss race needs and point the way to race progress". The newspaper noted that "These Indians have refuted the time-worn theory of an intelligence developed through many generations of mental activity". 1911 was a critical time:

the psychological moment, the leaders say, when the Indian race may be taken in hand and moulded into men of the best sort. Yet, undirected, the same good material may degenerate indefinitely. These educated Indians may become drones upon the reservations, and their awakened intelligences may lead them into trouble.

Given this, the Indian race therefore required a "Moses" - "the race is crying aloud for a Booker T. Washington to direct its destinies". Although not listed in this group of possible "Booker T. Washingtons" of the Indian race, Parker was at least as Hertzberg

describes him "The man most important in the development of the Society of American Indians...". (Hertzberg 1971:49) In 1911, Parker became organising Secretary of the SAI and was to serve in this position until 1915, when he became President. His leadership within the SAI coincided with his most productive period of anthropological publication whilst he was employed as archaeologist at the New York State Museum. His influence ensured that the SAI styled itself very much as an off-reservation reform group which published a journal, edited by Parker, held conferences with associated papers, issued proceedings and met at universities as opposed to on reservations. Parker distributed the Society Journal to both reservations and libraries. These two respectively Indian and white registers symbolised Parker's vision of the Society as a mediating organisation between white institutions and the mass of the Indian populace.

The founding Conference of the Society met on 12 October, 1911 - Columbus Day. Prior to attending, Parker expressed his enthusiasm and something of how momentous and significant he felt the occasion was to his friend Keppler, "The Indian convention comes off in October and I am making great efforts to go. It is there our people are speaking for themselves. Manitou help us". (Parker to Keppler 23 September, 1911 Fol. P.2 No.36, Keppler Collection, MAIL) In the next year Parker would routinely refer to the first conference as "an epoch making event". (*The Times* Sept. 12 1912 Parker Scrapbook NYSM) In another 1911 letter he wrote, "We are really dealing with a great situation. The things we do as a society are bound to become historic. Those who are best able to lead should be left free to work and not troubled by forces

without or within". (Parker to Emma Johnson, 20 November, 1911 Parker Papers, NYSM) On 6th October, 1911, he wrote again to Keppler; "Dr Draper [State Commissioner and Parker's superior] will probably send me as a representative of the State Education Department if I am not too radical in my criticism of the Lake Mohonkists. However I have always felt that they were a bewhiskered lot of meddlers who wanted something to fuss over and who, without knowing much about the subject, got suddenly concerned on the conference occasion as to what "we shall do with the copper skin". And then proceeded to forget to do anything". (Parker to Keppler 6th October 1911 Fol. P.2 No.38, Keppler Collection, MAIL) At the Conference there was much talk of "a new day" in Indian Affairs and its working sessions reflected the concerns of the Society's leadership: education, industry , legal and political issues.

Parker opened the sessions on education with a paper entitled, "The Philosophy of Indian Education". It contained a mixture of ideas which owed much to social evolution and Morgan, as did his work within the state's museums. The paper also made use of social science, the melting pot concept and the concept of culture:

When the white race sought to teach its culture to the Indian, and when the Indian endeavoured to acquire it, both races discovered that there was some fundamental difference that prevented immediate success. The fault lay in the chasm that separates one stage of ethnic culture from another, it lay in a difference of mental texture, in a difference of hereditary influence and in a difference of environment. The fault did not lie in a difference in capacity. In the earlier days no one seemed to recognise these facts. The white race thus regarded the Indian as inferior and accounted for his failures on that score. Here is [sic] made a serious mistake, for

the relative position of any race as a higher or lower human group is not measured by their present cultural attainment, but by their capacity for advancement when placed in a favorable environment.

Civilisation is a matter of evolution. It is not bred overnight or even in a century. It comes to a race by a well-balanced development of its mental and moral capacities. No race may acquire the culture of another until every incident of that other's environment is made theirs. (Parker 1912a:68)

He went on to detail the position of educated Indians within American society, arguing that there was little hope for their success until "the peculiar elements of the culture of the Indian began to disintegrate", writing:

He who is in advance is alone, unprotected and despised. For very existence he falls back into the group, knowing of things beyond, yet not daring to speak....

With the gradual acculturation of the Indian, and with a changed environment wherein he is dependent for his life necessities upon the commodities of the white man, the field of educational effort has become greatly enlarged. There is not now the impassable gulf between the educated Indian and one who has not received such advantages, for in a general way the external surroundings and necessities of each are the same. With the majority of Indian tribes there is not now the suspicion that the educated Indian is a sort of white man who may betray his people. With this changed condition there is a possibility of greater success than formerly. (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:62)

From the above, we can see that for Parker, the educated Indian was at a remove from contemporary reservation life and that he had assumed an almost philanthropic duty to aid his fellow Indians to the attainment of the civilised condition. He continued, praising Indian schools for their "elaborate system of practical manual

training" and called for a new commitment to Indian adult education. Parker argued that Indian education could be best served by the setting up of reservation "social betterment stations" which would complement missionary Indian education. Although the Society placed a strong emphasis on Indian self-help, its only practical application of the idea of social betterment stations was to come in 1915, when it gave support to a Community Centre at Fort Duchesne, Utah with very limited success. Parker's "betterment station" idea can be compared to the urban settlement houses set up in the 1880s and 1890s by old stock Americans such as Jane Addams in Chicago, Robert A. Woods in Boston and Lillian Ward in New York. Firmly middle-class, their idea was to alleviate the misery suffered by the city poor, educate immigrants about "traditional" American values and generally attempt to stem the effects of American materialism. Parker argued that like the immigrant, the Indian must assimilate, learn "the necessary things of hygiene and industry" but retain something of what was best about his traditional culture. Indian education "should not...make the Indian a white man, but simply a man normal to his environment".

Hundreds of Indians have attained honorable positions and are as other Americans, yet they retain their individuality as Indians and in reality are the only Indians who can appreciate the true dignity and value of their race, and they alone are able to speak for it...

No nation can afford to permit any person or body of people within it to exist in a condition at variance with the ideals of that nation. Every element perforce must become assimilated. I do not mean by this that the Indian should surrender things and passively allow himself, like clay, to be pressed into a white man's mold. I do not mean, by assimilation, that his love of the great esthetic ideals should be supplanted entirely

by commercial greed or that his mind should become sordid with the conventional ideas of white civilization, for it is by no means established that the existing form of civilization is susceptible of no further improvement, nor that the white man as a type is the ultimate model. I do mean, however, that the Indian should accustom himself to the culture that engulfs him and to the force that directs it, that he should become a factor of it, and that once a factor of it he should use his revitalized influence and more advantageous position in asserting and developing the great ideals of his race for the good of the greater race, which means all mankind. (quoted in Hertzberg 1971: 63)

Parker made no reference to his paper or its reception in a later letter discussing the founding conference. He was more concerned that he had carried his resolution "asking Congress to ask the president to appoint a commission to codify U.S. Indian law and determine the exact status rights etc.. of every Indian tribe". Indian legal status was important to the educated Indians of the Society in that it affected both their position within their respective tribes and their position within the wider culture. The call for a governmental review of Indian legal status was an issue to which most members of the SAI could subscribe given that it did not demand any explicit position to be taken over the Dawes Act or its implementation and therefore did not raise conflict between members and the tribes to which they had allegiance. A bill similar to Parker's resolution was put to the House of Representatives by the Indian Congressman Charles D. Carter on 19 January 1912. It called for a presidential commission of three men to review the legal status of the Indian. It had no significant impact. During conference sessions, Parker spoke against the tribal inheritance system within New York although he did not spell out that it had

excluded him from tribal membership. Parker therefore expressed concern over Indian status within the wider American political structure and concern over Indian status in terms of specifically tribal politics.² His personal letter expressed his satisfaction over the Society's name in that "This removes it from the category of "Indian associations" and stamps its membership as Indian only though we have white American 'associates'". The Conference had agreed upon three types of Society membership: actives, Indian associates, and associates. Actives could vote and hold office, were of "Indian blood" and resident in the United States; Indian associates were from other parts of the Americas outside the United States and could only vote on issues which related to their own tribal interests. Associates were those of "non-Indian blood" and were not eligible to vote. Membership provided the basis of the Society's finances which were never enough to implement the self-help programmes which its membership deemed necessary to Indian integration into white culture. Parker gave his synopsis of the Columbus Conference to Keppler, expressing pleasure over the respectable showing made by fellow educated Indians and his enthusiasm for what he felt was a symbolic beginning to a new direction in Indian development:

I had a very pleasurable time and met some splendid Indians. How proud I was to be in such company...

I believe the movement is destined to be a great one - an historic one and as marking an epoch in Indian history. I came away with renewed and confirmed

² Fenton, however, has argued that the longhouse Seneca Iroquois actually practised double descent; "lineage and clan names descend in the maternal line, as do succession to office, and property; assumed English surnames, and those that are translations into English of Indian personal names "Burning, Steeprock" etc.." - descend in the paternal line and are used for enrolment; while given names, often of Biblical origin, are a later distinction". [Fenton, W.N. (1978) "'Aboriginally Yours', Jesse J. Cornplanter, Hah-Yonh-Wonh-Ish, The Snipe Seneca, 1889-1957" in Liberty, M. Ed. American Indian Intellectuals 1976 Proceedings of the American Ethnological Society, St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Company]

respect for American Indian brain power. The Indians at Columbus were most truly a superior class of men and women and "above the average of 'pale invaders' I heard one visitor say. Headquarters were at the most exclusive hotel, in the city and every Indian had money to burn and used it as cultured people would. Columbus was discovered this time by the Indians and the town was surprised. There is a general suspicion of the Government using its Indian employees as tools to throttle the rest of the Indians and Government employees were excluded from office holding in the society. (Parker to Keppler 5th November 1911 Fol. P2 No.39, Keppler Collection , MAIL)

The Columbus Conference benefited from considerable national and local white support, with the local Mayor, President of the Chamber of Commerce and State University President all delivering addresses. The Indian Rights Association wrote to Parker, "We feel that your movement is one of the most hopeful signs of the times; that it is the natural outgrowth of the work that has been done by others, such as our Association, the Boston Indian Citizenship Committee, and so on". (Matthew Sniffen to Parker, 5 Dec., 1911, Parker Papers, NYSM) Representatives from churches, the Indian Rights Association and the Improved Order of Red Men (IORM) attended the conference, with the IORM hosting a dinner in honour of the SAI delegates. At this occasion the IORM and the Ohio Daughters of Pocahontas made a donation to the Society after visiting a local Indian mound where the group sang "America". The patriotic theme was central to the occasion and each guest was presented with a small silk souvenir American flag. ("Columbus Red Men Entertain Indians", Parker Scrapbook, SEDA) At the Conference itself Parker was elected to the SAI Executive Committee whose task was to monitor Indian legislation and liaise with the Indian office "for the welfare of the Indians to

the best of their ability". (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:72) Parker wrote an article about the conference for the New York Times which appeared 12 September, 1912, under the title, "Great Council of Modern Redskins: Archaeologist A.C. Parker, of Indian Blood, Describes Men Going To Columbus". Parker described the conference as evidence that the Indian was not "vanishing". He wrote:

Last year Columbus was taken by storm by these patriotic redskins - these university bred Americans, "of the older families". Did they call themselves "the new Indian?" Not a bit of it. They proclaimed their Indian ancestry as the highest honor of which an American could boast, and said; "We are not the new Indian; we are the same old Indian, with the same love of nature and the big open, only we have adjusted ourselves to modern environment". (Parker Scrapbook, SEDA)x

He went so far as to make the preposterous claim that "Indians were the most wealthy people in America per capita". Parker's article, however, made no reference to the internal conflicts which had beset the Ohio Conference or the fact that delegates could not even agree to form a permanent organization. ("Fails in Purpose: Braves Disagree", Parker Scrapbook, SEDA) Concern over the government's relationship with the Society existed from the outset. One article which appeared in the Columbus *Sunday Dispatch* of October 15, 1911 detailed delegates' claims that the government was opposed to the Columbus gathering and was "secretly opposed to the work of the [SAI] congress, and that it will try to elect a reactionary ticket". ("Government Opposed to the Indian Congress; So Say Delegates Who Charge That Several Prominent Redskins Feared To Attend: Uncle Sam is Scolded", Parker Scrapbook, SEDA) Delegates could not agree on permanent officers or upon

a constitution. A central issue of debate was the desire by members such as Laura Cornelius that the Society remain outside of government control. Cornelius threatened to withdraw from the executive committee over the election as secretary of Charles Daganett, federal supervisor of Indian employment. Eastman was accused of dominating the proceedings because of his opposition to Thomas L. Sloan who was apparently siding with pro-government delegates. ("Indian Conference Splits on Politics; Government Party in the Saddle" October 17, 1911 and "Indians Prove Most Adept at Playing Politics; His Connection With Government Bars Charles E. Daganett From Presidency" 17 October 1911, Parker Scrapbook, SEDA) Eastman tabled a motion to prohibit any Indian who was a government employee holding office. It seems that this internal dissent resulted in Parker replacing Daganett as secretary-treasurer when the Society headquarters opened in Washington, D.C. in January 1912 and the SAI Constitution was finally produced.

The 1912 Constitution under Article II detailed the Society's role and "Objects":

First.- To devise and put into effect measures, and to co-operate in promoting and encouraging all other efforts, which aim to advance the American Indian in enlightenment, in material, cultural and spiritual progress and development.

Second.- To provide through an open conference the means for a free public discussion of all subjects dealing with the welfare and betterment of the American Indian.

Third.- To present in a correct light the history of the American Indian by carefully preserving the records

of his culture, and to emulate his distinguishing virtues and qualities.

Fourth.- To urge the granting of citizenship upon the American Indian and its acceptance by him, and to secure his rights and privileges as a citizen.

Fifth.- To investigate the legal and other wrongs of the American Indian in order to have equality and justice done to him.

Sixth.- To oppose any movement or measure which is detrimental to the best interests of the American Indian.

Seventh.- To apply the energies of the Society rigidly to the solution of general problems and to the conservation of universal interests, and not to permit them to be used to promote personal or private gain or to serve private ambition. (Parker Papers NYSM)

The aim of full Indian citizenship was a particularly fraught aspect of the SAI platform. It meant that the SAI was committed not only to achieving reform which would make Indian citizenship available, but available on terms which would satisfy their intended intertribal constituency. In the event, until 1924 a significant number of Indians would not have the right to vote and those who did would remain reticent or unprepared to vote for fear of losing their property rights. The SAI's Indian citizenship objective was symptomatic of both their optimism and political naiveté. However, one idea around which the SAI could achieve some kind of consensus was that of a national American Indian Day to be sponsored by the Society. This originated with and was promoted by Parker that year. The idea took off and survives today. It was symptomatic of how Parker wanted to re-present the Indian to the dominant culture in that it was designed to associate

the Indian with the great outdoors, represent a glorious Indian past and bring together Indians and whites in patriotic celebration. The publicity generated would educate whites about Indians and reflect well on the Society. American Indian Day was conceived primarily as a spectacle for the benefit of non-Indians and as such was not envisaged as an intertribal day of celebration on the reservations. Parker wrote to his friend Keppler:

I am always coming to you with visions of great Indian things. Here is another. In this America of celebrations why should there not be an American Indian Day as a nation-wide holiday (official or otherwise), devoted to the study or recital of Indian lore? Picnics, parades, Indian games, music, ceremonies, dramas, speeches, orations, recitals of history, exercises by schools, clubs, societies, and outdoor lovers - see the scheme? Every red-blooded American, whether just born or just imported from the cradle to dotage, would yell long and loud for American Indian Day. The attention which the red man would command would help him enormously. It should be in June - say the 22nd since then nature has brought the year to perfection and it is the moon of the first fruits. This proposed holiday falls in the first outdoor month, to which no holiday has yet been given. I believe a go can be made of the idea. (Parker to Keppler, 4th June, 1912, Keppler Papers, MAIL, Emphasis in original)

For Parker, an Indian Day was an acceptable alternative to the image of the "show-Indian" within wild west shows. These began in 1883 with Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show and its popular success spawned many similar shows. Educated Indians in the main viewed these shows with distaste, primarily because they presented the Indian as unassimilated and savage and also because they presented the Plains tribes as an Indian model. Parker preferred the picture of educated Indians which resulted from the

1911 conference, that is, the image of Indians who were seemingly indistinguishable from other American middle-class professionals. Parker preferred to think of Indian identity as an inner quality. Therefore, like the majority of SAI members, he dressed as any middle-class American professional would, presenting an assimilated image which contradicted the "primitive" associations of the "Show-Indian". Some years before his death in 1955, he wrote on the back of a photograph taken at the Six Nations Reserve at Brantford, Ontario, "Dressed in Sioux costume at 500th anniversary of the founding of the League of the Iroquois. Indians to be recognized as such must 'play' Indian!". (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:57) Traditional Iroquois dress differed significantly from that of the Plains Sioux, the image which has remained the most identifiable as Indian by whites.

Within the Society "Indianness" as an inner quality assumed central significance in that degrees of "Indian blood" dictated membership status. It defined who was and who was not an Indian and therefore who could and who could not be an active member of the Society. The organisation's letterhead stated clearly that active members were "persons of Indian blood only". The active core of the Society, what was described in early letters to members as "a representative government", was the exclusive preserve of those designated as "Indian". With the development of its constitution in 1912 came categories of membership: "juniors" of "Indian blood" under 21 and "honorary members" who were "persons of distinguished attainment whom the society may elect". "Persons of American Indian blood who are resident in the United States but who are not on any tribal role, and who have less than

one-sixteenth Indian blood" were limited to "Associate" membership. These membership by-laws were designed to maintain Indian control over the organisation and to limit non-white influence. This meant full active membership was available solely to U.S. Indians on tribal rolls and any Indian who had more than one-sixteenth "Indian blood". Nevertheless, the secondary categories allowed for SAI supporters whose Indian descent was fanciful or unrecorded. The constitution, when finally agreed upon, stipulated that the conference floor was to be for "active members and for authorized tribal delegates of Indian blood", although others could speak "on motion" or at special occasions. The SAI was to remain an all-Indian organization and from its inception membership, like Indian assimilation itself, was to be on an individual as opposed to tribal basis. In 1912 the Society had approximately one hundred "active" and one hundred "associate" members. One noteworthy "associate" member was the African-American intellectual W.E.B. DuBois. In 1909 he had helped form the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and directed its campaign for legal and political recognition of black rights as director of research and editor of its journal Crisis. However, his lack of Indian blood and "associate" status ensured that his actual contribution to Society affairs was negligible.

The significance of "Indian blood" had preoccupied Parker for some time. Without referring to his own mixed descent, he had discussed Indian "half-breeds" at some length in a 1911 article, "Albanian Working for Betterment of Indians; State Archaeologist Parker Tells of the Aims of the Society of Which He is Secretary-Treasurer". (*Argus* 14 June 1911, Parker Scrapbook, NYSM) He

described the SAI as a vehicle to express "the thoughts and ideals of the race" which required, "a large membership of white Americans to stand as staunch supporters through which the active membership can interpret the needs of the race to the American public". Parker was quoted under a subtitle "The Heart of the Half Breed", decrying the prejudice against Indian mixed bloods and the way the "movie half-breed is always presented as a moral degenerate". He stated that Wild West Indian shows were "degrading, demoralizing and degenerating" and argued that instead every effort should be made to lead the Indian "through the paths of education and Christianity to self-supporting and independent American citizenship". Here Parker argued that, in one sense, inferiority was unrelated to descent or intermarriage:

All notions that the mixed blood is necessarily inferior are wrong. It is not the racial combination or the national blood of either parent that produces depraved offspring. It is the diseased and immoral white man or woman uniting with a diseased and immoral Indian man or woman that produces inferior progeny.

He extended his argument and bemoaned the use of phrases such as "the ignorant full blood", "the restricted full-blood", and "the non-progressive full-blood" which operated "to belittle the capacity of the Indian of unmixed lineage". He argued that this practice was:

...manifestly unfair and leads to much injustice. The Native Indian was not originally the object of pity, nor did his blood relegate him to abjection. If full bloods can be found who are mentally capable, then this should be a demonstration that white blood is not necessary to produce genius or competence. Inherited conservatism or conservation [sic] fostered by one's family does not mean inferiority or lack of capacity. Indeed, such an Indian may be a far better man than

the half-educated mixed blood, who is neither Indian in the sympathies [sic] nor "white" in his attainments. It is not a question of the degree of blood but the question of individual competence that should count in determining civic or social status. Some quarter bloods are far more incompetent than some full bloods.

However, he concluded, contradicting to some extent certain of his earlier remarks, "It is the environment that determines his [man's] conservatism or progress, and not his racial blood". Whilst some SAI delegates, such as Eastman, argued that anti-Indian prejudice was negligible, Parker's opinions above corresponded to sentiments expressed in speeches by the majority of SAI delegates. Most were sensitive about prejudice within American society against Indians and Indian blood.

The second annual Society conference was again held at Columbus, Ohio from 2nd-7th October, 1912. On this occasion Parker intervened to ensure that the Society remained under Indian control and that "associate" members did not take over the right to speak. As he put it "this is the Indian's Congress, and we are the senators and the delegates entitled to the floor, and we are reserving for ourselves the right to speak. I wish it distinctly understood that this floor and this meeting is for papers on the Indian question by persons of Indian blood". Parker later gave a conference speech which emphasised the need to reach out to whites arguing, "the Indian does not need to be taught as much as the white race needs to be awakened to our needs". He was clearly aware of the importance of changing white attitudes toward the Indian and his speech stressed to the Society its need to retain its accommodationist approach. He argued that the organisation's

worth did not stem from its "ability to kick" but told SAI members; "If we would win recognition, when we complain of a wrong we should at the same time offer a sane suggestion for a better condition, if possible, to replace it...I believe in the long run fair play and a square deal will come if the American people are once awakened, but we cannot get a square deal unless we tell them how to give it to us and then work to get it". (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:91) This marriage of Indian and white understanding was represented by the SAI symbol - the American Eagle, which was agreed upon at the conference. Although held to be universally used among Indian tribes, it was also similar to the American national emblem. Therefore it connoted both Indian unity and a wider Indian group patriotism to the United States. Parker wrote to the SAI membership in 1912 stressing intertribal unity; "we shall be able to do great good by hanging together and working for the good of the whole race. The tribal lines are taken away in this - we are all Indian brothers fighting together for freedom and justice". (Parker to Albert Hensley 2 April, 1912, Parker Papers, NYSM)

It was at this conference that Parker formed two fraternities within the Society; the "Loyal Order of Tecumseh" and the "Descendants of the American Aborigines". The first was intended as a fraternity where "associate" SAI members of less than one-sixteenth Indian "blood" and "active" SAI member could mix and perform ritual. Each of the first members could swear in a further "four members and only four" and any four members could unite and form a new local council of the group. Parker wrote to the first members:

It is advisable to ask people of remote Indian ancestry who come into the Society and wish to advance their social standing thereby by registering in the new

patriotic order, the Loyal Order of Tecumseh, to which a fee of at least \$10 will be given. This will enable us to create a sustaining fund with which we may do as seems best. There are, as you probably know, hundreds of people whose Indian blood is from one-sixteenth to one two hundred fifty six who are extremely anxious to have it recognised. Many of these people are well educated and cultured people and would find the \$10 a comparatively small amount in comparison with the good that would be theirs from wearing our colors. (Parker to S. J. Nori, 8th November, 1912 Parker Papers, NYSM)

The second SAI sub-organisation was, like the first, "especially designed to bring together those of more remote Indian ancestry" and seems to have been analogous to the Sons of the American Revolution fraternity. We know from Parker's use of tribal Indian adoption ceremonies to charm his white professional superiors within the context of the museum, that he was aware that certain whites placed value on symbols of their association with Indians. His experience within American Freemasonry gave him an understanding of the benefits of fraternal association. In a sense, the SAI was about constituting "Indianness" in the early twentieth century and it seems that Parker sought to capitalise on that "inner quality" as essentially noble and "American" and bring it to public attention almost as a commodity. The next year he was to write to William DuBois about the Descendants of the American Aborigines:

if you can show by any satisfactory record that you have an Indian ancestor you are eligible to admission in this Society as an Indian Associate and eligible to full membership in the Order of Tecumseh or Descendants of the American Aborigines. This latter society is a new one and especially designed to bring together those of remote Indian ancestry. We believe that to be able to display the colors of this society

gives one a better right to boast American descent than even the Cincinnati Order of Washington's time. We antedate everything". (Parker to William DuBois, 28 February 1913 Parker Papers, NYSM)

There is no evidence that either of these inner-groups ever came to anything, or that DuBois took up the opportunity "to boast American descent" within them, nonetheless they are evidence of an attempt by Parker to associate the idea of being in some sense "Indian" with respectability and patriotism within the wider American society. These fraternities also offered a much-needed opportunity for the Society to broaden its constituency and increase its revenues. At this time Parker was acutely aware of the need to extend the Society's influence and increase its funds. Months prior to the conference he had written to Keppler, "This is a critical time in Indian history, I believe...Wish some big man who has benefited much from this red man's America would endow us. Am trying for it". (Parker to Keppler 24th January 1912 Fol. P2 No.41, Keppler Collection, MAIL) We have seen that, within the SAI, Parker strove to keep the organization "Indian" but at the same time created contexts for the adoption of significant non-Indians. However, Parker was against any conflation of Indian issues with the "black cause". His private correspondence shows that he was against congressional financial support for transportation so that Indian students could study at predominantly black institutions such as Hampton. Nonetheless he considered Indian education an important issue and supported an SAI drive to set up an independent Indian junior college. The first issue of the Society Journal appeared in 1912, with Parker as editor-general. It affirmed the Society's commitment to develop "race leaders". "These leaders

will not come from those so merged in American life that they have forgotten they are Indians or from those so 'bound by lack of education' or 'reservation environment' that their vision is narrow, but from the small company of Indians of broad vision". Throughout Parker's editorship Indian education remained a primary theme of the Journal and its first issue announced an annual essay contest for Indian school students. In 1912 the topic was "Why the Indian student should have as good an education as the white student". Parker as editor-general echoed the concern of many other educated Indians of the period in highlighting the importance of education in the development of the Indian "race". The issue was to come up at almost every SAI conference discussion irrespective of the actual topic.

By the 1913 annual Society conference in Denver, membership numbers were peaking, with over two hundred Society "actives". A larger minority of reservation Indians were participating in Society affairs and the Society's membership profile had shifted west, with Oklahoma, Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska and New York having the largest membership figures. (Hertzberg 1971:11) At the 1913 conference Parker was re-elected as secretary but failed to stop a movement to widen "active" membership. The Journal noted how "the Society at this conference found itself organized and crystallized firmly enough to open the floor discussions to its entire membership". At this point Parker was particularly pleased with what he saw as a balanced debate within the Society Journal. He wrote to Keppler, "The Quarterly Journal seems a successful issue. ...It affords a medium for all shades of Indian thought. There are old timers and Christians but no maudlin sickish religious talk. If

there's any it has to be philosophic". (Parker to Keppler 17th March, 1913 Fol. P2 No.45, Keppler Collection, MAIL) Parker incurred the displeasure of his old friend Frank Speck, now anthropologist at the University of Pennsylvania at the winter Society meeting which followed the conference. The executive committee's winter session was a particularly grand affair; as the Journal noted, "The aim of the committee was to hold a banquet that might be regarded as equal to any in polite society...The entire evening affair was a brilliant one. The ladies were tastefully gowned in evening dress, and the gentlemen carefully groomed in full accord with polite society. The red men from farm or college met on an equal basis with the white friend from town and college, and upon a higher basis of friendship and good citizenship than ever before in the history of America". (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:119) Privately, to Keppler Parker wrote, "Our Philadelphia banquet was a unique success and a splendid political stroke. It gave those who formerly criticized us for irreligion a chance to say in long speeches all they wanted to. It was a formal evening affair, our banquet - and every seat was taken". (Parker to Keppler 26th February 1914 Fol. P2 No.47, Keppler Collection, MAIL) A mix-up meant that Speck could not deliver his banquet speech, on the topic "The Ethnologist and the Indian" alongside the other addresses from important whites and Indians. Speck was not pleased with the Society, given that in his view, "native virtues" and Indian language should not be lost to "misdirected educational enthusiasm". His ideas would eventually be reflected in the legislative reform of the New Deal period with its concern to salvage traditional traits. Although Speck attended, he later

returned his banquet tickets to Parker and expressed his dissatisfaction with the direction of events:

I am very sorry to say that I was greatly disappointed in the conference of the Society last Saturday. We had expected to hear from Indians in favor of a constructive Indian policy of some kind, not from white politicians in a vein of narrow professional or religious enthusiasm, altogether too disparaging to the Indians. Consequently, I hope you will excuse me for not responding when you called upon me at a rather inopportune time, to say the least.

Parker's reply revealed his statesmanlike approach to debate within the Society:

I regret that you were disappointed in the results of the Conference at the Academy and can see why you feel this way. The great mistake and the great disappointment to me comes from the fact that you did not read your paper. There were certain people there who needed education along the lines which you have been writing, and notwithstanding the fact that twenty or a dozen people rise and voice their sentiments, it is not to be thought for a moment that they voice the sentiments of our council. The inviting of these men whom you term the white politicians and whom you say speak "in a vein of narrow professional or religious enthusiasm" was one of the strokes by which we sought to do away with the antagonism of these men to certain of our policies. We had previously attacked theirs in the open and gave them a chance to get back at us. (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:120)

By the time of the 1914 fourth conference, held at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, the Society had begun its decline. The Journal bemoaned the fact that appeals for funds and help were now largely ignored. Finance, policy and organisational details now took up a disproportionate amount of Society time. As Parker wrote in correspondence, there was now "less discussion of Indian

affairs as a whole than in previous years". (Parker to G. Seymour, 22nd April, 1916 Parker Papers, NYSM) He chose not to attend the Madison conference, but a few days later, along with several other prominent Society members did attend the Lake Mohonk conference where "the peyote menace" was the most prominent point of discussion. His reply to news of his re-election in absentia showed that he was tiring of shouldering so much Society responsibility:

It is an honor that I did not anticipate to have been called again to serve in the capacity of general secretary. The work during the past year has been extremely arduous and required practically all of my time. With such heavy responsibility and only slight response and encouragement from the vast body of the membership, I almost felt that my administration was not to the liking of the Society. Mr. Daganett, myself and a few others, including of course, our good president, have shared very largely in the financial responsibilities. My personal feeling was that if matters went entirely smooth and I appeared at Madison with the encouraging report, the Society would not have risen to the crisis as they did do in my absence. It was for the purpose of making our membership feel that each individual had his own responsibilities that I remained away, hoping thereby to test the strength. (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:127)

The peyote issue had now become a major source of dissent among Society members. Parker, in keeping with several other prominent members and in contrast with several others, disapproved of Indian use of the drug which in the 1920s was to become central to a new form of intertribal religious fraternity. On 10th December, 1914 Parker was part of an SAI delegation which met with President Wilson to present a memorial on Indian affairs. Although the Journal gave the occasion and its accompanying banquet a very

positive write up, it had no impact in terms of its main aim to stimulate fundamental Indian legislative reform. Yet Parker was enthused by the event, writing to Keppler, "I wish you might have been in Washington at our meeting with Mr Wilson and the Indian banquet. The big and great Indians of the land were there and every one was a red man sure!". (Parker to Keppler 16th December, 1914 Fol. P2 No.51, Keppler Collection, MAIL)

Despite the gloom that pervaded the 1914 conference, Parker retained his optimism about the Society's potential for reform and continued his efforts to extend its membership. In a letter urging attendance at the 1915 conference he wrote, "Each year our conferences are becoming more and more a potent factor in shaping public policy and in achieving the high aims of the progressive Indians of the country. (Parker to Rev. Ernest H. Abbott Aug. 1915, Parker Papers, SEDA) Calling upon one Reverend N.S. Elderkin to deliver a sermon at the forthcoming 1915 SAI conference, he outlined the conference theme, "Responsibility for the Red Man". He was concerned to make clear that progress for the Indian depended upon individual Indian self-help rather than "the securing of rights". He wrote:

...our aim is to show or rather to discuss the various elements of human responsibility and the relations demonstrated responsibility bears to the success of an individual or a race. I have suggested the subject responsibility as the theme of the conference to avoid the constantly used term "Indian Rights". Our Society is not preliminarily [sic] struggling for the securing of rights but it is working for the development of responsibility on the part of the individual members of the race, believing that when the race does become responsible to all the various civic, social and moral requirements of the country the Indian problem will

cease to be. (30th April, 1915 Parker to Rev. N.S. Elderkin, Parker Archives, RMSC)

The Quarterly Journal during 1915 carried a lengthy discussion which can be attributed to Parker, of reform within Indian vocational and industrial education. In essence, he argued for the application of progressive ideas to Indian education. Parker shared the progressive belief that society could be engineered and that educational institutions and the community needed to be brought closer together. He argued for a full liberal education to be made available to promising Indian students in order to develop "race leadership" from "highly cultivated intellects". Like DuBois, the guiding progressive spirit behind the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Parker believed that the elite should govern within any given group. Parker's wish to foster "highly cultivated intellects" to lead the Indian "race" can be compared to DuBois' concern in this period to foster a Black "talented tenth" to lead the movement to Black civil equality. (DuBois in Franklin 1965:282)

The fifth annual SAI conference was held at Lawrence, Kansas in September 1915 and was marred by serious factional disputes over three main issues. The most divisive concerned the Indian Bureau, the second the peyote faith and the third the Society's response to specific complaints from tribes and sub-tribal groups. It was on this occasion that Carlos Montezuma delivered the address which later became his polemical pamphlet "Let My People Go". This was a scathing attack on the Indian Bureau and a call for its immediate abolition. Parker was elected national secretary. On October 15, 1915 Parker wrote to an "associate" SAI member

Edgar A. Allen, Superintendent of the Chilocco Indian School to congratulate Allen on his paper delivered at another conference in San Francisco. At this point, Parker still believed in the ultimate utility for Indians of the Indian Bureau but told Allen that his ideas "should be seriously considered by the Indian Department". In his letter he re-iterated ideas he put forward in 1911:

I believe very sincerely that individuals connected by legal technicalities with an Indian tribe or whose degree of Indian blood is so attenuated as to make them white persons to all intents and purposes, should not be officially carried on Indian rolls, as Indians, but I would not say that by right of descent they should have no part in the heritage of their fathers.

He argued that such individuals "are Indian only because they come under certain property supervision and perhaps in some degree a personal supervision by the Indian Bureau". "It is my opinion", he wrote, "that the Indian School and Reservation authorities should have seen and should now see that the educational, social and economic barriers to complete amalgamation are broken down as rapidly as possible". He advocated that reservation Indians "of less than one half degree of Indian blood" should no longer be officially designated Indian, should lose their "special protection and restrictions" and that this would facilitate "a speedy solution of the [Indian] problem, or at least a reduction of the number of units constituting it". He was at pains to correct Allen's conference assertion that "any percentage of native blood constitutes Indianhood" and to make clear that SAI "active" membership required a proven level of Indian blood. Parker argued that SAI "associate" membership simply allowed "descendants of Indians" to "claim it, not for any special privilege

that may be thereby gained, but as a matter of pride in racial origin".

He argued that not only those with up to one half Indian blood, but even "a large number of full-bloods" should be allowed to "enter the class of competency", i.e. be given the status of citizens. For Parker, Indian blood had no bearing on a person's ability to achieve what he termed "competency", rather it was the Indian Bureau's support of the old, ignorant, sick and physically disabled on the reservations that was at the heart of the Indian "problem". His overarching desire to develop Indian "race competence" prompted him to see the Indian Bureau as a factor which helped retard Indian "racial" development. His solution to the Indian "problem" owed more to eugenics than it did to the progressive ideal of social welfare and social service:

The real problem in the matter of protection and supervision perhaps consists of the old and ignorant classes on all the reservations and to this might be added the sick and physically disabled. I sometimes think that the Indian Bureau through its endeavours to give protection has so protected some classes of individuals that they and their progeny are physically unfit now or at any time to be anything but public charges. In normal citizenship the diseased and unfit die off as they naturally should in any healthy human community [sic]. Just to what extent the children of such individuals will inherit the diseases and thought ways of their parents is a serious matter for consideration. (Parker to Allen October 15th 1915, Parker Papers, UR)

In separate correspondence in May of the same year he had similarly bemoaned "wilful non-competence among certain Indian tribes". (Parker to Miss Caroline Andrus, 14th May, 1915, Parker

Archives RMSC) It would seem that frustration over the limited success of the SAI had served to harden Parker's view of non-assimilating Indians on the reservation. For Parker in 1915, Indian "wilful non-competence" was a racial aberration which should not be encouraged or subsidised by the Indian Bureau. Effectively, Parker was pushing for a reduction of what the SAI considered its constituency and seeking to exclude not only those with little Indian blood but also those with greater degrees of Indian blood who would not or could not, assimilate. Perhaps because he could sense the future decline of the Society, the following year he changed the name of the organisation's journal to The American Indian Magazine, and gave it a front cover which read "A JOURNAL OF RACE IDEALS Edited by Arthur C. Parker". (Emphasis in original). In a later issue he noted that the new name could "enlarge our sphere of usefulness. A Journal of a particular Society appears too clannish many times to the general reader". (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:139) The change of name was an attempt to broaden the journal's readership and to some extent separate its concerns from those of the Society, its sponsor. Parker wrote an article for the first issue in its new format entitled "The Editor's Viewpoint: The Functions of the Society of American Indians". Here he made an urgent call for unity and tolerance, writing:

...there will be men and women of Indian blood who need guidance and inspiration whether the Indian Bureau is abolished or not, or whether political corruption exists or not.

Let the rumblings heard at Lawrence serve as a warning. Ambition for self elevation will prove fatal. Insistence on a certain political policy not general in its application will be fatal. Desire to promote actions

for or against anyone or any organization for motives of revenge will be fatal. To turn the Society into an organization for voicing complaints will be fatal...*A confused notion of the Society and an attempt to use it for purposes for which it is not by its very nature intended will bring destruction, no matter how valuable and how pressing the desired reforms may be* [Emphasis in original].

He specifically printed a range of conflicting viewpoints in the same issue, including Montezuma's "Let My People Go". As an activity which all could support and develop, he promoted the American Indian Day, writing, "heretofore Indians have considered only tribe and reservation. To them the tribe was mankind and the tribal area the world. Today there is a growing consciousness of race existence. The Sioux is no longer a mere Sioux, or the Ojibway a mere Ojibway, the Iroquois a mere Iroquois. ..now with a coming race-consciousness the American Indian seeks to go even further and say, 'I am not a red man only, I am an American in the truest sense, and a brother man to all human kind' ". (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:140-1) Montezuma published the first edition of his own rival publication, Wassaja also in 1916. Within it, he took the opportunity to describe American Indian Day as "a farce and worst kind of fad. It will not help the Indians, but the Indians will be used as tools for interested parties. To the Indian it is a laughing mockery because he does not enjoy freedom, but is a ward and is handicapped by the Indian Bureau". He was scathingly sarcastic over what he saw as the Lawrence Conference's pointless, continual and irrelevant "meeting and discussing". Parker subsequently replied in the American Indian Magazine with remarkable restraint, "Dr Montezuma has a splendid sense of humor and luckily for the rest of us we have also". (quoted in

Hertzberg 1971:142) Although Parker was working tirelessly to retain SAI group cohesion, the task was becoming increasingly thankless and exacting.

The sixth annual conference in 1916 met at Cedar Rapids, Iowa. The group picture revealed a paltry twenty-six members, including associates. Debate over the Indian Bureau and peyote had by now become bitter and extreme, spurring age-old tribal enmities. In what Hertzberg has described as a "rather chilling situation" of internal conflict Parker was elected president. America was moving closer to war in Europe and the national progressive domestic reform dynamic was beginning to ebb. In many ways, the Society's problems mirrored the turbulence within American society. Parker took public and primary responsibility for the Society at the point when factional dispute was leading inexorably to its decline. As Hertzberg notes, he "Characteristically ..moved in several directions at once". (Hertzberg 1971:155) In terms of the Society's aim to secure legislative change, his sole act as president seems to have been a letter to Congress decrying Indian "segregation" and urging the end of tribes as "social, commercial and political entities". He repeated SAI demands for fundamental Indian reform and was, in essence, ignored.

He published "Problems of Race Assimilation in America, With Special Reference to the American Indian" in the Society magazine. This is discussed in depth in the succeeding chapter which deals with his approaches to Indian assimilation and how they change over time. Let it suffice here to note that the article represents a summation of the complexities of his position and of

his aims within the SAI. Parker's confused self-identification, as "Indian" and as "American" within the article, his concern to separate Indian affairs from the Negro experience, his identification of the "cost" to the individual of the assimilative process and expressed belief in the melting pot concept all contributed to the article's essential plea for the conditions to exist in the United States which would allow full individual Indian integration with the dominant culture.

In an attempt to salvage SAI unity, Parker dropped Montezuma and his supporter, Dennison Wheelock as contributing editors to the Magazine and created a new "Board of Managers" for the publication which was partly white. Thus for the first time, the SAI was not solely Indian-run. Parker had by now realised the limits to what the Society could achieve, writing to Coolidge "...Certainly we have demonstrated that it is impossible for us to have a legal division to correct by force or by law reservation abuses. We can only hope to expose the abuse". Even were "large sums of money" to be available, "under the present system of organization I doubt that we could have succeeded. We are too open, too free and our members have the power to wreck us if they set out to do it". (Parker to S. Coolidge 7th March, 1917 Parker Papers, NYSM) Parker planned to continue the Magazine independently of the Society, which was no longer able to support it financially. He wrote of the new publication, "As for policy I would not condemn the best in the old life or shut the pages from the picturesque. I would fight cleanly and in the open the various enemies and show just why they are trying to protect or to destroy their pet aversions or perversion...The Society could go on out or otherwise. It is an

"unfinished experiment" indeed and it has been too optimistic and trustful of dangerous elements". He told Coolidge that conflict within the Society had made him ill and wrote of his utter dejection to the then Society secretary;

I almost feel that I ought to give up...the presidency of the SAI. I am constrained to hold on however by the fact that we are under fire and because a new society, The Grand Council of AM Indians has formed in Washington.

Several fights are doing us no good but tending toward destruction. The first is the fear of government employees who are Indians, the second is the consciousness of some of the membership of religious affiliations, and the third is the secret opposition of the government. We must be broader than politics, above suspicion of the treachery of our Indian brothers and sisters in the service of the government and Christian without being in the least sectarian. Some of our most able Indians, in the clergy or otherwise, are hurting us by spreading the dissension that springs from suspicion. (Parker to G. Bonnin 12 March, 1917 Parker Papers, NYSM)

The 1917 Society conference was originally scheduled for Oklahoma City, and was not to be held within a university. This was perhaps an attempt to attract new membership or bring old members back to the fold who had objected to the fact that the Society did not specifically encourage association with the reservations, a fact symbolised by university settings for conferences. However, in the event the conference was "postponed" ostensibly because of the war but more probably because the Society's officers feared defeat or embarrassing factionalism. At this point, Parker had departed from his original belief that the Society could function as a unified representative Indian government. On 2nd October, 1917, Parker wrote to

Coolidge, "Our best interests would be served by holding conferences every three years and by spending our money in propaganda work through a vigorous magazine calling our people to loyal co-operation with the better things in this country. It has been demonstrated that certain malcontents and peyote-drug defending lawyers prevent a real fraternal bond within our organization. We who are heart and soul of the real Indian stripe without ulterior motives have borne a heavy burden". (Parker to S. Coolidge 2nd October, 1917 Parker Papers, NYSM) In the same year, Parker married his second wife, Anna T. Cook, who was white.³ Parker now began to give less time and energy to Society work, pressed for comprehensive Indian citizenship, and for the first time came out explicitly against the Indian Bureau. In January, 1918, he addressed "Friends of the Indian" in Philadelphia: "We shall never get anywhere until we break the grip of the Indian Department in its repressing hold upon the lives and the development of the Indians...If we can do nothing else let us say that the Bureau shall be limited to be a Department of Indian Disbursements charged with paying out that which treaties, contracts and Congress order". Congress should immediately make "all Indians within the United States of America...citizens or candidate citizens of the land". (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:173)

Parker's interest in Iroquois tribal sovereignty increased as the potential for intertribal unity within the Society declined. Soon he

³ In 1917, Parker remarried. His first marriage to Beulah Tahamont Parker ended in divorce and Beulah Parker died, leaving Parker two children, a boy and a girl. He married his second wife, Anna T. Cook, who was white in 1917. In 1931, Anna C. Parker was adopted into the Seneca Wolf Clan and took on the ceremonial name "Ye-wah-not", meaning "Resting Voice". [Anna C. Parker Adoption Certificate, Parker Papers, UR] In 1952, three years before his death Parker dedicated his children's book, Red Jacket, Last of the Seneca to his daughter by his second marriage; "To Martha Anne Parker who roamed the Red Jacket Trail and drank from the bubbling spring at Canoga". [Parker, A.C.P. (1952) Red Jacket: Last of the Seneca New York: McGraw Hill Book Company Inc. page vi]

would contribute to Indian politics in a completely separate context, as a representative of the Education Department for the New York State Indian Commission. He wrote the Onondaga Iroquois' own declaration of war against "The Austrian and the German Empires" and urged the Seneca Iroquois to do something similar. He wrote to Seneca leader Walter Kennedy that a declaration would "establish your independent right to act as a Nation and not as a ward-bound tribe that had no powers of a Nation. The Senecas have lost none of their sovereignty since 1812 and a war declaration would serve to emphasis your status. The fighters would then enter the U.S. Army the same as now". (Parker to Walter Kennedy 5th August, 1918, Parker Papers, NYSM)

Although president, Parker did not attend the 1918 Society conference held at Pierre, South Dakota. Less than thirty active members attended and Charles Eastman took over as president. Parker was offered the chance to continue as Magazine editor but an editorial board would now have veto powers. While Parker hesitated over a decision on this, the new SAI vice-president took over the position. Parker's defeat was a victory for the more radical elements within the organisation. Montezuma was very pleased by the new developments and described the new Society officers as the "most loyal of the Indian race" in his publication, Wassaja. The Society now had one sole point of consensus, the demand to abolish the Indian Bureau, an impractical goal which in itself could not have improved conditions on the reservations. However this issue, along with peyote, had served to alienate a significant slice of Society membership. As Hertzberg has noted,

from this point on the Society would have "a different tone, more romantic, less rational; at once committed to instant solutions but at the same time less confident of the country's capacity to offer any solutions; more sentimental about Indian life and less closely in touch with it". (Hertzberg 1971:178) Bureau abolition was an extension of nineteenth century thinking and in keeping with the aim of rapid full assimilation envisaged by the Dawes Act of 1887. But this was 1918 and the limitations of that ideology and of the Dawes Act practically implemented were evident. The Society's new full commitment to Bureau abolition was symptomatic of the gap between it and its Indian and white constituencies.

Parker's experience within the Society had irredeemably damaged his faith in the workability of intertribal Indian political action. His desire had been to be part of the vanguard of a new group of Indian middle-class professionals achieving full integration within the dominant culture. His seven years as a prominent Society leader had demonstrated that Indian self-help in this form would not achieve this, that tribal concerns militated against any sustained concerted action. It had shown that the diversity of the terms upon which even the select group of Society members wished to achieve integration meant that "race leadership" on their terms was neither wanted nor understood by Indians nor desired by the dominant society. Henceforth Parker would use his "Indian" identity and/or Iroquois identity selectively in specific contexts to serve his own agenda, to succeed within the white world. In a sense, this had always been his vision within the SAI, that is, for "Indianness" to become or remain an inner quality which had currency within the white world, which could give special purchase to a fully

integrated position within the dominant culture. Parker now held that the Indian "race" was not yet capable of meeting the conditions necessary to full integration. He replied to an offer in 1919 to resume contact with the Society:

From the time of the Lawrence conference until I withdrew my active participation I had less and less time to give [to the Society]. To me it was a tragedy for I saw what we all had hoped for slipping through our fingers. Rather than give a half hearted service it seemed better to withdraw entirely. I am quite sure that this has been highly pleasing to nearly all the Indians who are interested in the Society's work. I am convinced that our educated Indians as a class as well as the Indians of lesser development have no appreciation of the value of adhering to a definite set of principles and in associating every action they take with an individual principle.

...You may be sure that I watch with great interest the progress of the Society, for to my mind it forms a test of the qualities of the race. (Parker to T. Moffett, July 1919, Parker Papers, NYSM)

With a number of the older founding members, Parker now took a back seat as part of the Society's advisory board. Hertzberg has stated that "The new officers set about transforming the Society into a political pressure group with patronage interests". (Hertzberg 1971:188) A significant part of the new dynamic was to campaign for an Indian as Indian commissioner. By 1920, the Society's vice-president for education was writing to Parker for ideas on a nominee, someone who could gel well with an expected Republican presidency. He wrote, "The Jews had their Moses; the negroes their Booker T. Washington...I believe it is now time to have a real Indian leader for the next Commissioner of Indian Affairs". Parker replied stating, that "under the present

circumstances the position of commissioner is one with so many difficulties that no one intimately acquainted with the work would care much to take it up". (James Irving to Parker 14 January, 1920: Parker to James Irving 22 January, 1920 Parker Papers, NYSM) By late 1920, the Society had effectively become another lobbying group to Congress and Parker resigned from its advisory board in the autumn of that year. His Indian concerns now centred fully around the New York Iroquois and he took on the presidency of the New York Indian Welfare Society. As Hertzberg notes, "The Welfare Society was set up very much along the lines of the old SAI, with a distinguished white advisory board which was probably the equivalent of the SAI associates". (Hertzberg 1971:190)

By October, 1921, the Society of American Indians was close to losing all direction and coherence. A "big Indian pow wow" was organised for Detroit, described as an "International Convention of the American Indians" which would bring together all the disparate groups in any sense involved in Indian welfare, including the Improved Order of Red Men. (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:193) Only eight Society "active" and "associate" members attended the "convention", which was a campfire travesty of the older ideals of the group. The IORM even officiated over a selection of "Indian songs and recitals". Parker wrote about the Society leadership and the convention to his old Society colleague Daganett, his despondency over events having turned to candid bitterness and disdain:

Francis Fox James, alias Red Fox J. Skuishuhu wrote to me a letter stating that he 'had nothing against' me

and inviting me to 'come and be a man, putting aside petty things and personal feelings'. 'I am an ordained minister,' he goes on to say, and proceeds to preach my duties to me. I told him where he could go.

So far as the conference is concerned, I had no desire to go. I have been spending some time in the medical college lately looking over cadavers. I can stand only so much odor [sic] of carrion and no more.

I never think of the Society without thinking also of the work you and I did in company with the hard heads that helped us. Then, thinking of the present state of things, I develop nausea. That bunch of bolshevists could never have started the Society; now they are living on the reputation we made for it. (Parker to Charles Daganett, 13th October, 1921, Parker Papers, NYSM)

A few months afterwards, he would deliver his 1922 speech to the Albany Philosophical Society. In this, he spoke of a future America without any reference to a positive Indian contribution. Dismissing melting pot ideology, he used eugenics to proselytise openly against both immigration and "racial blendings" arguing for "the preservation of racial type- that of the Aryan white man". By 1922, he was utterly disillusioned and had decided to publicly efface his own Indian heritage. In 1923, in reply to a Society organiser requesting advice on suitable speakers he wrote with a new understanding of Indian tribal and cultural diversity:

To go into the work too deeply only brings a heartache... One must realise that there is no such being or race today in America as 'the Indian'. To the contrary, there are between 300,000 and 340,000 persons of more or less Indian blood, each one of which has his own vital individual interests. Few have any very deep interest based on the idea of race. If there is such an interest it is historical or sentimental and does not lend itself to strong association. In other words, there is no idea of race.

If there is such an interest it is historical or sentimental [sic] and the blunting of the former ideals of the old red man conspire to prevent the floating of any great Indian organisation.

The Society of American Indians lived when a few idealists dominated, but when it fell into other control it became invalid. Then came a rush of Indian societies. My mail every week brought me circulars from one or other Indian association. There is lack of coherence. Why? Because as before stated, there is so much individual interest and so little community of interest. This is quite natural while the red men are undergoing transition. (Parker to M.A. Stanley 13th June, 1923 Parker Papers NYSM)

By this time, white intellectuals and those concerned with Indian reform had little interest in educated Indians. The early 1920s saw the dynamic of national Indian reform shift once again to lie more firmly with white-run organisations. This was symbolised by John Collier organising the American Indian Defense Association in 1923 and providing leadership as executive secretary. With the Twenties came a new understanding of the role of the Indian within American Society and a new emphasis amongst academics and intellectuals on "traditional" tribal cultures.

Hertzberg is no doubt correct in arguing that Parker's involvement within the SAI allowed him to become more comfortable with his "Indian" credentials. He discovered that both his white and Seneca lineage was as presentable as those of other educated Indians. Parker's involvement in the SAI can be seen as a consolidation of his own identity as Indian even if it was eventually to exhaust his belief in the concept of an American melting-pot and force him to question the idea of an "Indian race". Essentially, the SAI achieved nothing in terms of practical legislative reform and both

its sphere of influence and its constituency were limited and ill-defined from the outset. At no point did its "active" membership of "Indian blood" or its primarily white "associate" membership collectively exceed numbers of above a few hundred. I therefore find it difficult to agree with Hertzberg that the SAI was in fact pan-Indian. The SAI did not constitute the kind of interaction which included all Indians or all tribes, even on a representative basis, which the prefix "pan" implies. Rather the SAI was made up primarily of educated, middle-class Indians, rarely of full-blood and often from the eastern boarding schools, who held jobs in the Indian Service or in other professions and who in the main lived off the reservations. Perhaps a majority were Christians. The Society styled itself as representative of all Indians, but although its founding conference recommended each tribe send at least two elected representatives, during over a decade of operation individual tribes were never specifically represented. Hertzberg has herself stated that, "The Society was a town meeting of educated English-speaking Indians rather than a representative confederation of tribes". (Hertzberg 1971:96) The "show-Indian" image, which was both noble, primitive and savage, in a sense, was to win the day. That representation of Indian culture, as opposed to the respectable middle-class and professional image so carefully put forward by SAI members like Parker, had much greater currency within the dominant culture as an anti-modern trope than a more complex understanding of the conditions needed to facilitate full Indian integration. The Indian "problem" remained and significant legislative reform would come only with the onset of Roosevelt's New Deal and it was to be a "primitive" model of Indian culture upon which that reform would be based.

PARKER AS ANTHROPOLOGIST

During the formative years of the SAI, from 1910 to 1916, whilst serving as the organisation's secretary-treasurer, Parker produced three anthropological texts on the Iroquois which were the results of his ethnographic fieldwork. The three monographs, which are still cited by social scientists and anthropologists working today, appeared as Bulletins of the New York State Museum. They remain the most extensive and most significant of Parker's ethnographic publications which also include several papers published in the American Anthropologist. In response to a developing interest in the Iroquois as a teaching topic within secondary-level social studies in the United States, the three monographs were reprinted under the editorship of William N. Fenton in 1968. I will argue that within these texts, Parker highlighted the Iroquois' accommodative responses to white encroachment and constructed an Iroquois "constitution" in order to present that group of tribes as an earlier functioning example of intertribal unity. I will discuss each of the three monographs in turn, illustrating how they served as a development of the work of Lewis Henry Morgan and how they attempted to connect Indian and white worlds. I will detail the critical response to their publication and show how Parker's unique relationship to the Iroquois, his anthropological subjects, both extended and limited his potential as a professional anthropologist.

Parker wrote to his museum superior Clarke in 1909 expressing the hope that his ethnology and "culture history" would "out-Morgan Morgan". (quoted in Fenton 1968:25) According to Fenton, the

publication of Iroquois Uses of Maize and Other Food Plants in 1910, "put ethnology at the State Museum and Parker on the scientific map" and did indeed "out-Morgan Morgan" on this single topic. (Fenton 1968:25) Parker's ethnographic fieldwork was made much easier because of his childhood connections with the Iroquois. This meant that he occupied a unique position as ethnologist given that he had an understanding of the Seneca dialect and had many family ties to certain Iroquois reservations. Therefore, as he wrote in the text's prefatory note, he was able to probe "scores of Indians" on "many interesting facts...brought out from almost hidden recesses of their minds". (1910b:5) The text remains an extensive illustrated description of the history and significance of foods central to Iroquois culture, detailing their influence on Iroquois cooking and eating habits, ceremony and language. Fenton devotes a section of his introduction to the 1968 reprint of Parker's work to detailing Parker's technical errors of scholarship in terms of spelling, grammar, syntax and referencing, a task Fenton himself describes as "nit-picking". His point is to show that "Parker, in representing himself as a scholar to the learned world, took some shortcuts and never got caught" and that had Parker chosen an academic context within which to produce a work of this length "Parker would have been sent back to the library". (Fenton 1968:28) However, Parker's text was well received at the time and was cited in anthropological texts in the decades following.¹ Parker's old friend the anthropologist Frank G. Speck reviewed the text for the American Anthropologist:

¹ According to Fenton, Iroquois Uses of Maize and Other Foodstuffs, inspired and influenced: [Will, G. F. and G.E. Hyde, (1917) Corn Among the Indians of the Upper Missouri, St Louis: Little Histories of the North American Indians, No. 5 and Mangelsdorf, P.C. and Reeves, R.G., (1939) "The Origin of Indian Corn and Its Relatives", Texas Agricultural Experimental Station Bulletin No.574, College Station Texas, 1939]

In this paper we have a most careful and detailed study of an important topic in the ethnology of the Iroquois. The author is in a particularly favorable position to investigate these important tribes which have for so long remained in a state of neglect on the part of the trained ethnologists. The esoterism of the Iroquois has no doubt been responsible for this. Mr Parker, however, in a series of systematic studies which it is hoped will soon appear, possesses unusual advantages with the Iroquois and if the other sides of their culture are treated in the same critical manner as that shown in his recent papers we shall have a comprehensive library on the life of these Indians. (Speck 1911:135-136)

Similarly, in 1917, Clark Wissler referred to this work by Parker as one of the only then existent field studies "approaching a satisfactory standard". (Wissler 1917:447-515)

Parker pointed out in his monograph that the information within it was the result of "purely original enquiry" and had "been gathered during a period of 10 years, while the writer has been officially concerned with the archaeology and ethnology of the New York Iroquois and their kindred in Canada". (Parker 1910b:5) He described the particular importance of maize to the early English colonists: "the maize plant was the bridge over which English civilization crept, tremblingly and uncertainly, at first, then boldly and surely to a foothold and a permanent occupation of America". He demonstrated that Indians and their corn had been essential to English colonisation of North America: "Had it not been for the corn of the Indians the stories of Jamestown and Plymouth instead of being stirring accounts of perseverance and endurance might have been brief and melancholy tragedies. The settlement and development of the New World would have been delayed for

years. (Parker 1910b:13,15, 64) Parker's text built upon Morgan's ethnography in The League of the Iroquois, specifically contradicting certain of Morgan's findings and exemplifying others. (Parker 1910b:34,39,62) Parker's evidence of corn cultivation among the ancient Iroquois contradicted Morgan's characterisation of them as a people in the "Lower Status of Barbarism" and in this sense improved their position within the social evolutionary scale of development used by Morgan and other scholars. (Morgan 1887:125) However, something of the Boasian anthropological approach can be seen in Parker's attempt to describe Iroquois culture through meticulous attention to small detail.

The Code of Handsome Lake, the Seneca Prophet, recounted the history and impact within the Iroquois of the moral code of Ganiodaio or Handsome Lake, who experienced the first of a series of visions in 1799, aged 64 and who died in 1815. His teachings had a tremendous impact upon the religious life of the Iroquois and the faith is still practiced by the New York Iroquois today. Parker's record of the faith enjoyed only one printing of 2000 copies but, according to Fenton, it became upon its publication "for want of anything better,...the Bible of the 'new religion'", that is, the Longhouse religion; Gai'wiio' or "Good Word". (Fenton 1968 :32)

Parker's text described how Seneca Chief Edward Cornplanter, or Soson'dowa, one of "six authorized "holders" of the Gai'wiio', or Handsome Lake faith, was the source for the text's primary record of The Code. Fearing that the original form of the faith would be lost, Cornplanter had begun writing it in the Seneca dialect in

1903. As Parker wrote in his introduction in 1912 "He [Cornplanter] was implored to finish it and give it to the State of New York for preservation. He was at first reluctant, fearing criticism, but after a council with the leading men he consented to do so. He became greatly interested in the progress of the translation and eager for the time to arrive when all white men may have the privilege of reading the 'wonderful message' of the great prophet". Parker somehow persuaded Cornplanter to entrust the document to Parker's employer, the State Museum, and to accept a Christian preacher as translator:

The translation was made chiefly by William Bluesky, the native lay preacher of the Baptist church. It was a lesson in religious toleration to see the Christian preacher and the "Instructor of the Gai'wiio" side by side working over the sections of the code, for beyond a few smiles at certain passages, in which Chief Cornplanter himself shared, Mr Bluesky never showed but that he revered every message and revelation...(Parker 1912:8)

Fenton states that, "Parker did try to secure an accurate Seneca text. Evidently Cornplanter read from his minute book or recited from memory, Bluesky rendered it into English, and Parker wrote it down". (Fenton 1968:33) However, as Bryan Wilson has pointed out, although Parker considered The Code to be a definitive text, divergent traditions and versions have since been recognised. (1973:391) Nonetheless, Parker's text remains today the best single early record of the Handsome Lake faith. Earlier versions existed recorded by Arthur Parker's great-uncle Ely Parker in 1845 and 1848 and had been used as the basis for Lewis Henry Morgan's 1851 account of the Handsome Lake religion. (Morgan 1851) Ely Parker's notes on the Handsome Lake faith were later

published by Arthur Parker in 1919 and much later by Fenton in 1951. The 1840s version, according to Wallace, agrees remarkably well with the version produced by Parker from Edward Cornplanter in 1912. (Wallace 1961:139-151) Within The Code Parker did not refer to himself as "Indian" and made no reference to his familial relationship to Ely S. Parker to whom he referred. As has been shown, Parker's full-blood great-uncle, Ely Samuel Parker was the maternal great-great grandson of Handsome Lake and it is likely that Parker would have been aware of the fact since childhood.

The Code detailed the history of Handsome Lake's fall into a catatonic state and the supernatural revelations which then came to him. Four celestial messengers appeared in order to bring Handsome Lake to repentance and to deliver a message for him to proclaim which would reveal all forms of evil within Iroquois society. Handsome Lake spoke of four "words" that "tell a great story of wrong" and which summarised the practices which made the Creator sad and angry. These practices involved: whiskey, witchcraft, love magic, abortion and sterility medicine. Alcohol, the tool of the Evil Spirit, caused other associated vices: insanity, nudity, vandalism, laziness, depopulation, murder, and accidental death. Handsome Lake made further injunctions against, among other things: wife-beating, quarrelling in marriage, sexual promiscuity, fiddle-playing and card playing, failure to keep promises, failure to repent and lack of belief in Gaiwiio or the "Good Message" of Handsome Lake. He also admonished gossip, vanity, pride and advocated filial obedience. The Code recorded Handsome Lake's divine journey which was, it seems, a kind of

Pilgrim's Progress, led by a guide dressed in sky-blue clothes. On "The Journey over the Great sky-road", he met George Washington, occupying a privileged supernatural residence near the new world of the "Creator". Washington was generally well-thought of by the Iroquois because he allowed them to retain their land after the Revolution. Handsome Lake was then taken on a tour of the infernal world of a devil-like figure (with horns, tail and cloven hoof) named Ganos'ge', the "punisher". The fiery world of Ganos'ge' was filled with unrepentant Indian sinners, suffering ironic punishments for their respective sins. After travelling, like Dante, through the underworld, Handsome Lake visited "heaven" with its "delicious looking fruits" and "beautiful things... on every hand".

Handsome Lake's visions demanded that he ban traditional medicine societies and totem worship and caused him to carefully stipulate which of the older dances and rituals were still to be held as appropriate. He preached that the worship of individual animal spirits was displeasing to the "Creator" and were an opportunity for illicit drinking. His teaching attempted to redefine the Iroquois attitude to their ancestors. Whereas other comparable faiths such as the Ghost Dance were essentially restorative and the ways of the ancestors were extolled and true happiness was only to be found by living exactly as they had, without white influence; in Gaiwiiio or church of Handsome Lake, the ancestors were vaguely placed, not in heaven but elsewhere "in a place separate and unknown to us, we think, enjoying themselves". The prophet stated that the ancestors had no bearing upon the "Creator's" precepts. (Parker 1912:56) However, Handsome Lake's flock objected in particular

to the ban on medicine societies and claimed that disbanding the societies caused illness. After the record of Handsome Lake's visions, and a description of the circumstances of his death at Onondaga, The Code's main section on the Handsome Lake faith ends.

Parker included two articles he had published previously in journals together with his field notes on funeral rites and ceremonies and legends (Parker 1909). With The Code he reprinted "Secret Medicine Societies of the Seneca", which described medicine societies, "of ancient origin", which had gone underground with the growth of the Handsome Lake faith. His description of the Seneca medicine societies made them sound like white fraternal organisations: "Very little is known concerning these lodges or their ceremonies. Each was a brotherhood into which new members were admitted by formal initiation". (Parker 1912d:113) With the assistance of his wife, Beulah Dark Cloud, he had gained access to societies which Morgan had previously written off as lost. Parker described his ethnographic fieldwork in an "objective" scholarly style which effaced his own and his wife's Indian connections and "wrote up" his ethnography on Seneca secret ritual and society just as a white anthropologist would:

Even so close an observer as Lewis H. Morgan says: "The Senecas have lost their Medicine Lodges, which fell out in modern times; but they formerly existed and formed an important part of their religious system".

Morgan's experience is that of most observers, close as their observation may be. The writer, with the assistance of his wife, however, living with the "pagans" and entering fully into their rites, discovered that the medicine lodges, so far from having become

extinct, are still active organizations, exercising a great amount of influence not only over the pagans but also over the nominal Christians. (Parker 1912d:113,114)

Parker made no reference to the obvious way in which Handsome Lake's teaching very closely resembled the formal millennial teaching of orthodox Christianity not least in its call to essential repentance before the end of the world, which Handsome Lake prophesied to be the year 2100. From a "scientific" and comparative point of view, the faith was clearly an Indian appropriation of Christian teaching given its adoption of concepts such as heaven and hell, the soul, afterlife, sin, repentance, self-sacrifice and the idea of a single omniscient "Creator". Perhaps the greatest cosmological innovation to Iroquois theology introduced by Handsome Lake was the biblical concept of heaven and hell, together with the stress upon what were in fact white standards of morality. However, in Parker's analysis, what was most significant about the faith was the way in which it served to "crystallize the Iroquois as a distinct social group" and "created a revolution in Iroquois religious life". (Parker 1912d:10,11) He argued that the reservations where Handsome Lake did not preach, such as Tuscarora, Oneida and St Regis were in 1912, less "Indian". This attempt by Parker to redefine Indian status connects with separate attempts within the SAI. The whole project, to redefine "Indianness", for Parker, is clearly related to his own ambiguous position as assimilated Indian. Yet in constructing his argument to deny "Indianness" to the Iroquois who had not benefited from the prophet's teachings, Parker simultaneously described elements which could be held to constitute "Indianness":

Their "Indianness" is largely gone. They have no Indian customs though they are affected by Indian folk-thought and exist as Indian communities, governing themselves and receiving annuities. Their material culture is now largely that of the whites about them and they are Indians only because they dwell in an Indian reservation, possess Indian blood and speak an Iroquois dialect.

By comparison, Parker argued, adherents to the Handsome Lake faith in the second decade of the twentieth century, lived in poverty in accordance with their religion. As a social unit they were "at variance with the social and accepted economic systems of the white communities about them". (Parker 1912d:14) It appears that Parker's close relationship with his ethnographic subjects mitigated against any comparative, systematic or searching analysis of the Handsome Lake religion. Instead, he stressed what he considered the essentially Indian nature of the faith:

The writer of this sketch has no complaint against the simple folk who have long been his friends. For a greater portion of his lifetime he has mingled with them, lived in their homes and received many honors from them. He has attended their ceremonies, heard their instructors and learned much of the old-time lore. Never has he been more royally entertained than by them, never was hospitality so genuine, never was gratitude more earnest, never were friends more sincere. There is virtue in their hearts and a sincerity and frankness that is refreshing. If only there was no engulfing "new way" and no modern rush, no need for progress, there could scarcely be a better devised system than theirs.

How long will they seek to meet overwhelming forces with those their ancestors devised but devised not with a knowledge of what the future would require?

Asked about the clothes they wear, the houses they live in, the long house they worship in, they reply, "All these things may be made of the white man's

material but they are outside things. Our religion is not one paint or feathers; it is a thing of the heart". That is the answer; it is a thing of the heart - who can change it? (Parker 1912d:15)

Parker's text carefully avoided any discussion of the validity of the prophet's message and his comments within it were generally prefaced by statements such as, "His message, whether false or true" or "Whatever may be the merits of the prophet's teachings". What he considered significant was the uniquely Indian character of the faith and the way in which it helped define Indians as Indians within the dominant culture. He described it as "a creation of their own" which "afforded a nucleus about which they could cluster themselves and fasten their hopes" and did not attempt to place Handsome Lake within the broader context of other Indian messianic movements. (Parker 1912d:11) It seems likely that Parker's background and the personal relationships with Handsome Lake adherents which he had formed in the course of his research made him reluctant to publish "objective" or comparative conclusions on the phenomenon. For example, Parker made no reference to the fact that Handsome Lake's visions reflected many of the prophet's own personal concerns (his fervent wish to overcome an alcohol addiction, his alienation from his family, his loss of a niece). Parker never stressed the dictatorial aspects of Handsome Lake's teaching even though around 1800 the prophet declared himself divine and undertook an extensive witch hunt which led to several deaths.² He also negotiated with the U.S. government so that he could own his own personal estate - the Oil

² For further details on Handsome Lake as a historical figure, see: [Wallace, A.F.C (1972) The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca New York: Vintage Books pages 256-60]

Creek Reservation and did a fair amount of political manoeuvring in order to ensure his supremacy over his main political rival, Red Jacket, the topic of a separate publication by Parker in 1952. As Hertzberg has suggested, Parker may have wished somehow to preserve the uniqueness of the Handsome Lake faith and this corresponds to a general concern by Parker throughout his professional life to portray the Iroquois as singular and special in comparison with other Indian groups. (Hertzberg 1979:62)

Handsome Lake's visions consolidated practices and sanctions which had already been put forward within Iroquois society while also incorporating selected white ways. (Deardorff 1951:104) His teachings can be seen as an accommodative response to the political and economic circumstances of the Iroquois in the aftermath of the Revolution. His teaching offered sanctuary and salvation to the faithful through the acceptance of inevitable change because of white penetration and respect for the Indian landbase. He encouraged Indian attendance at white schools and, although not opposed to profitable exchanges of land, his visions demanded an end to extensive land cessions, prophesying doom to those who would "consent to the sale of Indian reservations" and "hardship for those who part with their lands for money or trade". (Parker 1912d:68-74) He envisioned for his followers an autonomous reservation community which rejected social evils and the white private profit motive but adopted useful aspects of white culture and retained a sense of Indian identity. Iroquois salvation would accompany the preservation of the biological and cultural integrity of the Iroquois. Most contemporary scholars have described the Handsome Lake faith as an example of Indian

adaptive change and as a response to the breakdown in Iroquois social order as a result of land fraud and military defeat. (Lanternari 1963; Wallace 1952, 1972) However, Elizabeth Tooker has suggested that this analysis over-simplifies the phenomenon. In Tooker's analysis, Handsome Lake was not so much attempting to control socio-cultural disorganisation as much as he was attempting to introduce a value system which would be consistent with "the economic system that was also introduced about the same time". Tooker relates the success of the faith to its recognition of the need to respond to changing Iroquois economics, particularly the adoption of the plough and the move towards fixed agriculture which, she feels, demanded the religion's condemnation of individual autonomy and the advocacy of restraint in social affairs. (Tooker 1968:187-195) Whereas scholars such as Wallace have related Handsome Lake's influence to psychological needs (for conformity and control within a disorganised, or as Wallace has termed it "irresponsible", socio-cultural system), Tooker argues that the faith's purchase stemmed from its applicability to a changing Iroquois economy which, in response to the curtailment of hunting and trading activities, had come to focus upon more intensive agriculture.³

Although Parker argued in The Code that the Handsome Lake faith operated to preserve "Indianness" and did much to help the Iroquois "to crystallize...as a distinct social group", the faith was in essence an accommodatory response to removal and cultural disintegration which received the sanction of prominent whites. As

³ Tooker's ideas imply that religious change can be directly related to changes in the economics of societies and specifically that agricultural economies demand religions which suppress individual autonomy and produce settled conformity, whereas hunting economies do not.

Parker noted in his text, Handsome Lake gained credibility among the Iroquois through his correspondence with President Thomas Jefferson. On 10th March, 1802 the Senecas' "father and good friend, the President of the United States" had his Secretary of War, Henry Dearborn write to the Senecas:

Brothers - The President is pleased with seeing you all in good health, after so long a journey, and he rejoices in his heart that one of your own people has been employed to make you sober, good and happy: and that he is so well disposed to give you good advice, and so set before you good examples.

Brothers - If all the red people follow the advice of your friend and teacher, the Handsome Lake, and in future will be sober, honest, industrious and good, there can be no doubt that the Great Spirit will take care of you and make you happy. (Parker 1912d:10)

Wallace has noted the way in which such correspondence was treasured and displayed by the Senecas at the turn of the 19th century and was, "of supreme importance to Handsome Lake and to his followers, for it proved the sanction of his mission by the highest authorities of the land". (Wallace 1972:271-272) A copy of the President's commendations was held by all the chiefs of the Iroquois six nations and was taken at the time as virtually a licence to teach and minister the new faith. Wilson, using a version of the Code other than Parker's, has cited a report of Handsome Lake having commented that, "the Indians liked some of the white people's ways very well, and some Indian ways very well. It would take some time to lead the Indians out of their set ways". (Wilson 1973:392) Wilson's discussion of the Handsome Lake faith describes it as "an aid in the accommodation of the Iroquois Indian peoples to life as a dominated minority". (Wilson 1973:387)

However, Parker shied away from any structural or comparative evaluation, avoided detailing the presence and influence of Quaker missionaries on both Handsome Lake and the Iroquois and described the faith simply as "a thing of the heart". In Parker's analysis, the code testified to early Indian patriotism and social cohesion. At the time of the publication of Parker's text this was also the theme of his reform work within the Society of American Indians. In the context of the SAI, like his distant relative Handsome Lake before him, he attempted to bring consolidation and leadership to the Indian "race" as an minority accommodating to the dominant culture.

Parker's acquaintance, the New York representative of the Society of American Indians, Alanson B. Skinner, produced a review of The Code for the American Anthropologist in 1915. Skinner described Parker's text as "a translation of one of the most remarkable documents of modern Indian propaganda". Unlike Parker, Skinner was at pains to point out the structural similarities of the Handsome Lake faith to other Indian religions and to highlight missionary influence upon its form:

One point which Mr Parker does not mention is this: [sic] Almost since our first contact with the Indians of North America there has been a constant succession of Messianic or revealed religions outcropping sporadically among all the tribes south of the Canadian line. That of Tenskwatawa and Handsome Lake in the East, and the Dream Dance, Ghost Dance and Peyote, in the west, being perhaps the best known. In almost every one of these the half-digested teachings of the missionary have been apparent. The white man's theory of morality and justice, if rarely seen in practice, was highly appreciated by the Indian, and the idea of a revealed religion was nothing new to him.

He continued, specifically comparing the Handsome Lake religion to the peyote faith:

Nevertheless, of all these cults, the two to make the most lasting, if not the most profound, impression, were the Peyote (miscalled "Mescal") and the Code of Handsome Lake.

The Peyote teachings have been far more prosperous and popular than the Code of Handsome Lake, having spread like wild-fire over many of the tribes of the West, and are now working eastward and northward, while that of Handsome Lake has always been confined to the Iroquois. (Skinner 1915:182)

As has been shown previously, the peyote issue was a focus of factional strife at this time within the SAI and it is likely that Skinner made his comparison as a jibe at Parker who, as SAI secretary-treasurer, was associated with the anti-peyote camp.

The second half of Skinner's review compared Handsome Lake to his contemporary, Tenskwatawa, the Shawnee Prophet and twin brother to the Indian nationalist Tecumseh. Like Handsome Lake, Tenskwatawa believed he had a divine mission, but unlike the Seneca Prophet whose message was peaceful and accommodatory, he preached war and hatred against whites and advocated a return to ancient customs and traditions. Like Wovoka, the prophet of the restorative 1890s Ghost Dance religion of the Sioux, Tenskwatawa promised immunity to Indians in battle against whites. Skinner noted, "The Code is preeminently one of submission to the inevitable, and it is remarkable that it was endorsed by some of those same white officials of high authority who ordered the troops to advance against Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa". He concluded,

praising Parker's achievement in gathering the text's material, noting that, "Only an intimate knowledge of the people, combined with tact and genuine sympathy for their viewpoint, can bring it out. It is not to be bought for money alone". However, Skinner expressed his disappointment that Parker did not venture to make a comparative analysis:

...the reader may feel disappointed that Mr Parker has given us none of his own conclusions on the subjects which he presented, since, from his intimate knowledge of the Iroquois, and particularly of the Seneca, he is well qualified to do so. The writer, however, through his personal acquaintance with Mr Parker, realizes the many difficulties which surrounded and hampered the publication of this paper. (Skinner 1915:183)

Although Parker's first two anthropological monographs largely escaped damaging criticism, this was not the case with Parker's 1916 publication, The Constitution of the Five Nations. The monograph consisted of a series of documents which described the Deganawida and Hiawatha legends on the founding of the ancient Iroquois Confederacy and what Parker termed its "Great Immutable Law". As will be shown, Parker took on a stronger editorial role in the production of this 1916 text than he had in The Code of Handsome Lake. He presented his work as an extension and development of the ethnography of both Morgan and Hale, noting that "The Iroquois constitution is mentioned by both Morgan and Hale, but neither seems to have been able to make a transcript and translation of it". In Parker's analysis, the significance of the Constitution lay "in the fact that it is an attempt of the Iroquois themselves to explain their own civic and social

system". He held that the ancient Iroquois system of government was symptomatic of Iroquois superiority: "as a governmental system it was an almost ideal one for the stage of culture with which it was designed to cope. I think it will be found to be the greatest ever devised by barbaric man on any continent". (Parker 1916d:7-8) Parker described the Iroquois as a superior and advanced group among all Native Americans, indeed among all the world's "barbaric men" whose civic structure had brought peace and "political coherence" to the tribes of the Northwest. The Constitution had "produced leaders and finally the great lawgiver who should bring about peace and unity and make the Iroquois the "Indians of Indian," the "Romans of the New World". Indeed, as he noted, the Iroquois Five Nations "called themselves Ongweoweh, Original Men, a term that implied their racial superiority". However, the adoption and absorption of other tribes meant that "The Iroquois...became an ethnic group of composite elements. Thus from the ideas of universal peace and brotherhood grew universal intermarriage, modified of course by clan laws". Parker characterised the Iroquois' war chief as "a sort of aboriginal public service commissioner who had authority to voice their will before the council". The constitutional structure also allowed for a sort of associate membership within the governing council; "Men of worth who had won their way into the hearts of the people were elected pine tree chiefs with voice but no vote in the governing body". Parker wrote: "Here, then, we find the right of popular nomination, the right of recall and of woman suffrage, all flourishing in the old America of the Red Man and centuries before it became the clamor of the new America of the white invader. Who now shall call Indians and Iroquois savages!" (Parker 1916d:7-13)

Thus Parker interpreted the Iroquois as late 14th century practitioners of a sort of Indian melting pot and their "constitution" as an early form of the reform organizations of the Progressive period, an early example of his vision for the SAI. Intertribal Indian unity, lead by a government of noble "'lords' or civil chiefs" with an associate membership of "men of worth" ensured that the Iroquois became "the dominant native power east of the Mississippi". Further, because of the constitution and the heroes it produced, Iroquois numbers and identity were preserved: "Through the law as a guiding force and through the heroes as ideals the Iroquois have persisted as a people, preserved their national identity and much of their native culture and lore. Today in their various bodies they number more than 16,000 souls. This is a remarkable fact when it is considered that they are entirely surrounded by a dominant culture whose encroachments are persistent and unrelenting in the very nature of things". (Parker 1916d:7-13) Parker's text provided an example of an early system which had, through intertribal unity, gained power, produced leadership and preserved Indian identity.

His text consisted of two principal manuscripts. Parker claimed to have "found" the material for the first constitution manuscript in 1910 at the Six Nations Reserve at Grand River, Ontario after meeting a native Mohawk scribe named Seth Newhouse and finding ancient rites and ceremonies practiced there as if the League of the Iroquois still operated. He wrote of the first manuscript:

This material has been brought together by Seth Newhouse, a Mohawk, who has expended a large amount of time and given the subject a lengthy study. His account written in English was submitted to Albert Cusick, a New York Onondaga-Tuscarora, for review and criticism. Mr Cusick had long been an authority on Iroquois law and civic rites, and had been a chief informant for Horatio Hale, William Beauchamp and in several instances for the present writer. Mr Cusick was employed for more than a month in correcting the Newhouse manuscript until he believed the form in which it is now presented fairly correct and at least as accurate as a free translation could be made. (Parker 1916d:7-13)

He stated that the second manuscript was produced by the chiefs of the Six Nations Council. However, Parker did not refer to the fact that Newhouse had for many years come into conflict with the Six Nations Council because of his desire to reform its system of hereditary chiefs. The Council had produced their version because of dissatisfaction with that of Newhouse.⁴ Parker's failure to contextualize his sources caused particular ire to a fellow ethnologist, J.N.B. Hewitt, of the Bureau of American Ethnology, himself of partial Iroquois (Tuscarora) descent. Hewitt was a respected Iroquois ethnologist and his critical review of Parker's work appeared in the American Anthropologist in 1917. He stressed the "untrustworthy character" of Parker's text and bemoaned Parker's failure "to point out the value of either manuscript, or to explain the serious conflict of statements of essential facts or events between the two". He argued that the reader "should have been told the essential fact that the document prepared by the Committee of Chiefs of the Six Nations was

⁴ Further details on the ethnographic and Indian politics surrounding the Newhouse version were published in 1949 by Fenton, then Senior Ethnologist at the Smithsonian Institution's Bureau of Ethnology under the title "Seth Newhouse's Traditional History and Constitution of the Iroquois Confederacy". [Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 93:2]

prepared as a substitute for the Newhouse document, which the chiefs had thrice rejected as faulty in arrangement and erroneous or spurious in many of its statements". Hewitt attacked Parker for claiming that he had "discovered" both manuscripts in 1910 given that both had been known to ethnologists like Hewitt working on the Six Nations Reserve since 1880 and 1900. Further, Hewitt pointed out that the Chiefs' version had already been published earlier in 1912 by Duncan Campbell Scott through the Royal Society of Canada. (Scott 1912) Hewitt took issue with Parker's claim that a "free translation" had been made of the Newhouse version. He pointed out that this was "contrary to the facts" given that every version of the Newhouse manuscript "were one and all originally recorded in the English language making the concept of a "free translation" redundant". He went on to detail various "serious blunders in translation and statement", highlighting a particular lack of evidence for "any notion of peculiar 'originality' of descent or of 'superiority' of race" among the Iroquois. To some extent, it seems likely that Hewitt was irked because in publishing the manuscripts in the way he did, Parker had stolen his fire. As Fenton has pointed out, "Hewitt, who had labored so long to get Newhouse to write in the original Mohawk was badly scooped". (Fenton 1949:158) Hewitt concluded his review with irritated resignation:

But to enumerate the redundancies, the contradictions, and the misconceptions in Mr Parker's Bulletin would require a volume larger than the publication in question. It is most unfortunate for the cause of historical truth that great institutions insist on publication at the expense of study and accuracy. It may be mentioned that this publication of Mr Parker has been most unfavorably reviewed by Dr. Goldenweiser... I have purposely not given out this

unfavorable estimate of Mr Parker's recent work until it had been reviewed by one whose motive Mr Parker might not question. (Hewitt 1917:438)

It seems clear from the above, that the his relationship with Parker was not entirely genial. Hewitt had been a fellow executive council member of the SAI and in 1915 had expressed his criticism to Parker of certain of its policies, particularly its lack of contact with the reservations and the university focus of its conferences. (J.N.B. Hewitt to Parker 27th September, 1915 Parker Papers, NYSM) Goldenweiser's 1916 critique, had, like Hewitt's, attacked Parker's scholarly integrity, but had been if anything more scathing. Goldenweiser began his review of Parker's text by dismissing the ethnographic information in his appendices as "of so superficial and fragmentary a character that the printing or reprinting of it could hardly be regarded as justifiable". Next, Goldenweiser discussed the two manuscripts found by Parker at the Six Nations Reservation. He noted with surprise the fact that Parker failed to discuss the fact that the Six Nations Council manuscript had appeared in print previously concluding archly that, "As Mr Scott's publication could not have escaped the notice of Mr Parker the absence of any reference must be due to a regrettable oversight". Goldenweiser held that because of the differences he isolated between the two manuscripts there could be, "no doubt that MS 1 [the Newhouse version] reflects Iroquois society at a much later stage in its development than is the case in MS 2 [the Six Nations Council version]" and that the Newhouse version reflected, "ancient Iroquois society distorted by abnormal social conditions and the intrusion of modern traits". Although Newhouse's document had value as, "material for a study of the breakdown of a

highly complex and coherent socio-political system, under the stress of modern conditions", it could not properly be seen as a "genuine native product" and was, in fact, "a figment". Goldenweiser found that native material had been, "welded into a highly formal and rationalized document, the product of a sophisticated mind, and, as such, conspicuously un-Indian in character". Although this sentence seems to imply that Indians cannot produce anything formal, rationalised or sophisticated, Goldenweiser's larger point holds true. Parker had created and presented a document in Newhouse's manuscript, which although not altogether a lie, was not true either. The Newhouse document was practically fiction and Parker had re-presented the second Council of Chiefs document as though he had himself "discovered" it. In comparison with the Council of Chief's version, the Newhouse document which Parker put forward uncritically, re-historicized the Iroquois as reform-orientated democrats, blotted out the central political influence of women and created a "Constitution" where there was evidence only of a legend. As Goldenweiser made plain, "apart from the legend of Deganawidah, the Indians of the Iroquois League had no constitution, either written or unwritten". (Goldenweiser 1916:431-436)

Parker fought back in print, writing a trenchant reply to both his critics for the American Anthropologist in 1918. He began his reply by thanking Hewitt for pointing out, "both the faults of the native authorities who supplied my information and the errors in editing". This was hardly the case. Hewitt's primary criticism had centred upon Parker's use and presentation of material, not the material itself. In fact, Parker seemed to be offended that any

criticism should be made at all, writing, "In the light of the conditions under which the bulletin under discussion was presented, a compilation of native documents, criticism seems gratuitous". He continued:

Especially significant is Mr Hewitt's attempt to controvert my statement of Mr Cusick's help. One would almost suspect this to be designed to impute a falsehood, but in the light of Mr Cusick's assistance, this imputation would seem to fall little short of maliciousness through probably not so intended.

Parker attempted to explain his claim to having made a "free translation" by arguing that "no presentation in English can gracefully and fluently express the Iroquoian idiom", arguing that:

The lack of accuracy, consistency and forethought on the part of the authors of the manuscripts is to be deplored but even though these Indian annalists wrote clumsily it did not occur to me that of my own initiative I should alter their writings, even for the sake of presenting them as I personally desired to see them.

Throughout the reply Parker seemed to misunderstand the thrust of Goldenweiser and Hewitt's criticisms. Rather than address the accusations that he was a poor scholar and had misrepresented ethnographic material, he laboured the fact that the manuscripts were written in the best English his sources could achieve and insisted that, "we do not believe that in presenting the Indian manuscripts, we should eliminate their 'crudity and naiveté from consideration', even to satisfy those who possess other versions of these Iroquois codes and legends". Parker attacked Hewitt as someone who "has had a large influence in directing the minds of his informants", accused him of having written the introduction to

the Chief's version and challenged him to produce his own record of the constitution:

We are grateful to Mr Hewitt's criticism, for he has pointed out a store of facts that should have been made available years ago. Modestly he refrains from more extensive criticism, but we hope to have all the necessary data when he publishes his own version of "The Constitution of the League" for which he has prepared native texts in Mohawk and Onondaga. An English parallel in Mr Hewitt's own fluent English will then be available....

We trust that...we may be prevented from getting into further sloughs of error by his speedy publication of his own version of the "Constitution of the Five Nations".

Parker went on to distance himself from both manuscripts by stating that, "They do not necessarily represent what the present writer thinks accurate in detail or satisfactory" even though this is exactly how he presented them in The Constitution. His finishing touch to his reply was a quote from Kipling:

There are nine and sixty ways of constructing tribal lays,
And - every - single - one - of - them - is - right.
(Parker 1918b:120-124)

As has been shown, Parker's reply ignored the main criticisms of his peers, Hewitt and Goldenweiser. According to Fenton, it would also appear that Parker completely misrepresented his editorial input in the production of Newhouse's contribution to The Constitution. Parker wrote to Newhouse in 1911, after receiving his manuscript, informing him that he had "made a codified version of the Constitution for comparative purposes and placed similar articles together regardless of the original form...". Parker

explained to Newhouse that he had changed the language, "just as a barrister would do", and made the style conform to "the Regents editing system", so that "our readers may understand". However, he assured Newhouse that the meaning would not be changed at all. (Fenton 1968:41-42) Fenton has gone some way towards excusing Parker, arguing that he "was ill-equipped to go behind native literature that came to him in Indian-English manuscripts and ... was anxious to publish ". (Fenton 1968:38,41-42)

Whatever the case, it is clear that Parker published a valuable record of versions of Iroquois history across time, even if one of those versions had already been published elsewhere four years earlier. His text presented the Indian, and specifically the Iroquois, in a good light. The Constitution presented the Iroquois as progressive, enlightened and democratic early Americans. Essentially, the controversy over Parker's two primary sources centred around the contemporary anthropological approach to the Indian. Parker had upset his fellow anthropologists by presenting a manuscript as essentially "Indian" when in fact it was heavily influenced by the dominant culture. His peers required that Parker, as a professional anthropologist, point out that the Chief's version was more valid and more "Indian" because it showed less evidence of acculturation. Within the discipline of anthropology, what was authentically "Indian" by definition could not incorporate what was "American". But Parker did not compare the two documents, and instead gave each equal validity in the construction of his text even though the knowledges constructed by the anthropology of the early twentieth century demanded the isolation of specifically "Indian" sets of materials. As Copans has

argued; "Ethnology is the eternally renewed quest for an object which escapes one's grasp. For it can only be defined by the *a priori* exclusion of the implications of the non-scientific relationship that produced it. Ethnology takes an ideological product as its subject matter". (quoted in Bonte 1974:37)

Very possibly because of the negative professional response to his 1916 text, its publication effectively marked the end of his production of primarily anthropological texts. Whatever the case, these texts show that Parker's "Indianness" or sympathy for Indian culture, conflicted with the "scientific" and "objective" approach required by the anthropological discipline. Because Parker's professional roles involved the interpretation of Indian culture to the dominant culture, he was continually confronted by the effects of his multiple loyalties. As an "assimilated Indian", his position was both complex and ambiguous. What Parker later described as the "cost" of assimilation and the whole issue of the Indian's relationship to the dominant culture became a central concern in a number of his publications from this point onwards.

PARKER AND AMERICAN INDIAN ASSIMILATION : **CHANGE OVER TIME**

This chapter will focus upon seven texts and speeches written by Parker between 1916 and 1951 which related to the Indian's position within American society. They variously addressed white, Indian and mixed audiences. In these texts Parker presented himself as a middle-class, educated, professional, mixed-blood Indian arguing discursively for the political and social status of the "progressive" Indian in the twentieth century. The significant exception was a 1922 speech in which Parker completely excluded the Indian from his vision of American society. To facilitate his arguments on Indian assimilation and the proper or potential role of the Indian within society Parker drew freely from the scientific and popular thinking of the period which included the melting pot concept and ideas from social evolutionary theory. I will discuss each text or speech in chronological order and argue that they are symptomatic of the complex and problematic status of the "assimilated Indian" within twentieth century America. Within them Parker argued for conditions to allow the fulfilment of what Hoxie terms America's nineteenth century "final promise" of full Indian assimilation. The problematic nature and limitations of twentieth century Indian assimilation can be seen in Parker's emphasis upon the assimilative process itself and his changing attitudes to Indian and white culture. Parker's shifting self-identification, as Indian, as American and as anthropologist within the texts, was a result of his multiple loyalties as "assimilated Indian" within both Indian and white cultures. I will argue that although writing in the early twentieth century, Parker made repeated use of the social evolutionary ideas of pioneer

anthropologist Lewis Henry Morgan because those ideas reflected the late nineteenth century belief in total Indian assimilation. In so doing, he wrote and spoke avoiding the implications, as he saw them, of prevailing anthropological ideas and the contemporary limitations placed upon full Indian membership within American society.

It is perhaps surprising that these texts and speeches, produced in the early twentieth century when cultural relativism dominated anthropological thinking, made repeated use of a theoretical framework developed in the late nineteenth century by Morgan. The earlier discussion of Morgan and his work concentrated on Morgan as a forebear of Arthur Parker, however here it is important to clarify how Morgan's ideas fit into later ideas on Indian assimilation and relate to Indian reform. Morgan's work and the ideas on Indian assimilation of the late nineteenth century, allowed for the possibility of individually successful Indians like Parker. At that time, the educated Indian could in theory, totally assimilate. By comparison, anthropology's focus upon cultural pluralism and the approach to assimilation of the early twentieth century, served to place limits on the extent of Indian membership in American society. In many ways, the educated Indian of the early twentieth century had a much more limited political, anthropological or social place within American society.

Morgan's ideas had dominated anthropology in the latter half of the nineteenth century, particularly after the publication in 1877 of his explanation of the development of mankind, Ancient Society. His work displaced the previous theory of degradation. As Morgan

noted in his text, this degradation theory necessitated viewing "all the races of mankind without the Aryan and Semitic connections as abnormal". (Morgan 1877:513) This degradation theory was a corollary of the Biblical account of creation which held that primitive cultures were representatives of civilisations which had "fallen from grace" and declined. However, in Morgan's analysis the history of all human kind had a unity of source, experience and progress. (Morgan 1877:5-7) Put simply, Morgan argued that each race had to evolve through three stages, savagery, barbarism and civilisation, each stage having corresponding inventions, social organization, kinship and property rules. Civilisation was the pinnacle of this evolutionary progression, having prevailed over the other two systems, and the Aryan race and especially democratic America was its best exemplar. Individual ownership of land characterised and enabled the civilised condition; for Morgan it was "impossible to overestimate the influence of property in the civilization of mankind". (Morgan 1877:426) Mental capacity was also of primary significance in the social evolution of mankind. Ancient Society put forward a Lamarckian argument that mental capacity was an acquired, almost self-help characteristic which developed with increased technological advance. Intelligence with morality progressed geometrically through historical time. (Morgan 1877:42) Most importantly, Morgan's mentalist theme denied the innate sinfulness and degeneracy of "savage" peoples, whom he characterised as simply at a lower stage of development within the social evolution of mankind. Therefore, Morgan rejected what he termed "the distinction of *normal* and abnormal races". (Morgan 1877:428) His analysis therefore modified the stigma associated with the "savage"

condition given that in Morgan's analysis it was simply part of the universal process of human development.

Given that Morgan's analysis allowed for change from the savage state due to environment, his ideas left room for the possibility of individually successful Indians like Parker. We can see this more clearly in Morgan's 1851 work, The League of the Iroquois. Here Morgan wrote; "A portion indeed of the Indian family is destined eventually to be reclaimed and raised to citizenship among ourselves. (quoted in Stern 1931:50) Morgan concluded by noting that the "fatal deficiency of Indian society" was the "non-existence of the progressive spirit". (Morgan 1851:141) Parker's work in these articles dealing with the Indian's relationship to American society can be seen as a constant reiteration and affirmation of the existence of this Indian progressive spirit. They demanded theoretical, social and political space for progressive, assimilated Indians like himself.

Morgan's ideas reflected how late nineteenth century politicians and intellectuals thought about what was a preoccupation of the period, Indian assimilation. The Indian "problem" became pressing with the increasing political power of the Western states and conflict over Indian land and Indian sovereignty. Increasing bureaucratisation within government gave the Indian Service greater potency and the Indian "problem" provided a new focus for American reformers after the Civil War and the end of slavery.¹ A

¹ For further discussion of the Indian reform impetus of the period, see: [Hagan T. (1992) American Indians Chicago: The University of Chicago Press pages 133-169]. Reformers such as Merrill E. Gates, used Morgan's language of savagery, barbarism and civilization to justify Indian detribalization at the Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian in 1896. Gates spoke of "the absolute need of awakening in the savage Indian broader desires and ampler wants. To bring him out of savagery into citizenship we must make the Indian more intelligently selfish before we can make him unselfishly intelligent". [quoted in Berkhofer, R. (1979) The White Man's Indian New York: vintage Books page 173] See Hoxie, 1984: 20-39 On Morgan's influence on the architects of Indian policy in this

belief in total assimilation went hand in hand with the collapse of mass military resistance by Indians. This collapse is often held to have corresponded with the "battle" of Wounded Knee in 1890, yet military control of Native Americans was effectively achieved in the 1870s and the massacre of Wounded Knee had much more to do with Indian cultural regeneration than armed resistance. The late nineteenth century viewed the "transformation" of the Indian from a "savage" state to a state of "civilized" citizenship as a philanthropic and moral national imperative. When Parker wrote and spoke in the twentieth century, he attempted to recapture this nineteenth century relationship between the Indian and American society. This relationship corresponded to and developed Morgan's belief that progressive change was possible for savage peoples and that private property was key to the achievement of the "civilized" condition.

The most obvious expression of these ideas and the desire to transform the Indian from a demoralised and degenerate status on the reservation was embodied by the Dawes, or General Allotment Act of 1887. This Act allotted each Indian family 160 acres and 80 acres to orphans and single Indians over 18. Allotted land was then held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior for 25 years after which it became the individual Indian's private property and could be sold and would be liable to state, territory and federal law. Unallotted land came under federal jurisdiction and the money from land sold was held in trust for the "education and civilization" of former tribal members. The main thrust of the Act was as

period, see : [Hoxie, F.E. (1984) *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press]

Theodore Roosevelt described it in 1901, to "break up the tribal mass" and induce the civilised condition in Indians by making them individuals and nuclear families owning private property. It was the culmination of the decade's reform efforts and it impacted significantly upon Indian affairs for the next fifty years. It attempted to goad Indians towards the abandonment of tribal culture and the adoption of white cultural norms and American citizenship. Central to the government policy of the period was the idea of individualism and the "civilising" effect of the ownership of private property. The period saw the task of "civilising" the Indian, assimilating him into the corpus of American society, as entirely possible. As Berkhofer notes, the Dawes Act was "hailed at the time as the final, comprehensive solution to the Indian problem". (Berkhofer 1979:174) It was even compared in historical significance to the Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence and the Emancipation Proclamation for Blacks. (Berkhofer 1979:175) Although the *language* of the Act was essentially benevolent - it offered Indians the "opportunity" of citizenship and assimilation, its *effect* was not to create assimilated Indians, fully participant in American society, but as Murray terms it "the 'assimilation' of a great deal of Indian land into white ownership". (Murray 1982:13)

Towards the 1920s, when Parker began his assimilative writing, the belief in the possibility of transforming the Indian into civilised citizen had modified. After 1900 the assimilation campaign of the 1880s was fundamentally altered and by 1920 a less optimistic spirit was reflected in changes in the federal approach to the

Indian. The old bargain of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries had been that conquered native peoples could be compensated by eventual full membership of the dominant society. America realised that it could no longer facilitate its end of the bargain, the "final promise" of total assimilation. As Hoxie notes:

Not only did Indians resist the process, but complete acceptance of them demanded more of the nation's institutions, social values , and cultural life than the citizenry was willing to grant.

Instead, by the early twentieth century;

Native Americans were incorporated into the nation, but their new status bore a greater resemblance to the position of the United States' other nonwhite peoples than it did to the "full membership" envisioned by nineteenth-century reformers. By 1920 they had become an American minority group, experiencing life on the fringes of what had come to be regarded as a "white man's land". (Hoxie1984:xiii)

In 1916, when Parker published the first of these articles, only *limited* membership within American society was considered appropriate for Indians, as it was for blacks, certain kinds of immigrants, and Asians. A new category of membership within American society came into being in this period, a new understanding that "groups of people could no longer be wholly included or wholly excluded from the country's institutions". Instead, non-white minorities were granted only "*partial* membership in the nation". Hoxie argues that:

In a complex, modern country, with its hierarchy of experts, managers, and workers, "aliens" could most easily and efficiently be incorporated into society's bottom ranks. In this way minorities could serve the dominant culture without qualifying for social and political equality. Not surprisingly, the new, more

limited interpretation of Indian assimilation gained popularity during the first two decades of the new century, at the same time that the thoroughgoing segregation of blacks, the exclusion of Japanese immigrants, and the virtual suspension of immigration from southern and eastern Europe were winning popular approval. (Hoxie 1984:xiv)

Change in how American society defined assimilation can be related to change within American anthropology. The nineteenth century belief in universal progress was now replaced with a modern focus on racial diversity and a new understanding of the scope and complexity of assimilation. Morgan's ideas were superseded by a series of new orthodoxies which did not readily translate into decisive Indian reform. Anthropologists associated with the Bureau of American Ethnology began to modify the social evolutionism of Morgan and his disciple John Wesley Powell to incorporate new thinking on racial difference. These twentieth century evolutionists included W.J. McGee, William Henry Holmes. Racial formalists like Daniel Garrison Brinton, William Z. Ripley, Madison Grant and Lothrop Stoddard of the American Museum of Natural History in New York used racial characteristics to explain human diversity. These writers invoked an unchanging historical hierarchy of race which usually placed the Indian above the Negro but which nevertheless kept him at a remove from the white man. Environmentalists, such as Otis T. Mason, Fayette McKenzie and George Bird Grinnell, focused on the role of environment in determining human behaviour but again, their approach allowed for absolute cultural and racial hierarchies.

But the heaviest blow to the social evolutionary ideas associated with Morgan came with the run up to World War 1 and the cultural

relativism of the Franz Boas school at Columbia. By the 1920s, Boas' anti-evolutionary ideas were strong within the professionalizing field of anthropology. By 1926, every academic department in America was headed by one of Boas' students. (Krupat 1988:105) Boas' theories insisted upon cultural explanations of cultural differences. As Hoxie notes, "It was Boas who first suggested that culture alone - not race, evolutionary development, or physical surrounding - shaped the lives of Native Americans". (Hoxie 1984:135) Cultural relativism cast doubt on the likely efficacy of the assimilation programme. By the 1920s social scientists could no longer be used to defend the idea or desirability of generational assimilative change for Native Americans. Rather, as Hoxie notes, "they now reminded the public that Indians belonged to primitive, static, cultures that would require years of instruction and training before they could join a complex industrial society". (Hoxie 1984:145) At the time when Parker wrote these pieces on assimilation, the status of the educated Indian had become extremely problematic. Boasian anthropology focused upon salvaging information on Indians of the past and did not acknowledge significantly the Indians, and in particular the acculturated Indians, of its present. As Hoxie puts it, the Indian was now "frozen in time and space".

The first text I want to look at in detail is, "Problems of Race Assimilation - With Special Reference to the American Indian" was published in 1916 in the American Indian Magazine. This was the new 1916 name given to the Quarterly Journal of the Society of American Indians founded by Parker with the inception of the Society itself in 1911. This change from journal to magazine

marked a concurrent change in the tone and direction of Parker's vision within the Society to which he devoted so much time and energy. It reflected Parker's wish to appeal to a broader readership, given that up until this point he had envisaged the publication in a more "academic" context, as the equivalent of a university journal. Parker attempted to model the magazine on the more popular The National Geographic Magazine and the first re-titled front cover reflected the new editorial stance in claiming it was "A Journal of Race Ideals Edited by Arthur C. Parker".² Although since the Society's inception in 1911, Parker had assumed a central and influential role, it was not until this point that he was required to take on full public responsibility for the success or otherwise of the Society's aims and programmes. "Problems of Race Assimilation in America" appeared in the October-December issue of what had become his vehicle, American Indian Magazine. At the time of its publication, Parker retained an implicit faith in the potency of the melting pot concept, then a commonplace in political and social discourse. In 1916 Henry Ford was conducting his "Ford Company English School Melting Pot" rituals where new immigrant workers were "baptised" and, at the end of the ritual, given large diplomas to signify regeneration. Israel Zangwill's play "The Melting Pot" (first performed on October 5 1908 and published in 1909) had

² At the time of this change, Parker was probably aware of the "radical" Carlos Montezuma's plan to set up a rival publication and may, as Hazel Hertzberg has suggested, have wished to change the constituency of the magazine in order to continue publishing independently of the Society if necessary. The new format signalled a more open approach by the magazine which henceforth published a broader spectrum of Indian thinking. The name-change in itself also related to overall difficulties within the S.A.I. which at this stage was confronting serious and ultimately fatal internal conflicts within an overall political climate growing increasingly less receptive to domestic reform. "Radical" factions within S.A.I. resented its support of the Gandy Bill which sought to outlaw peyote, and lack of funds had forced the group to abandon grand legal-aid and community-based schemes. The Carlisle government school, which had been a strong source of Society support, was closing at this time and Hertzberg has even made note of a degree of Catholic-Protestant conflict. [Hertzberg, H.W. (1971) The Search For An American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press pages 138, 153] Parker took on his fullest official role within the Society at the Cedar Rapids, Iowa Conference in September 1916.

solidified the term, although also in 1916, Randolph Bourne, inspired by Horace Kallen's "Democracy versus the Melting Pot" (1915), published his critique of the concept in "Trans-National America" (1916).³

Parker's article systematically compared the conditions of assimilation for three groups of "potential Americans" - the European immigrant, the American Negro and the American Indian. It was directed primarily at reform Pan-Indians and social scientist writers who often compared the Indian against a scale of assimilation with other immigrants and blacks. Also, although in this piece he does not refer to the possibility, Parker was addressing those who held that Indians should remain as much as possible as they had prior to European contact. His article sought to challenge the idea that conditions of assimilation were the same for one race as for another and in so doing to halt what he felt were pervasive negative comparisons of Indians with other races for failure to assimilate successfully. Rather, "*men of different races by reason of their ethnic and cultural development are not able to grasp the concept of assimilation*". (Parker 1916h:301 Emphasis in original) America functioned as a "great melting pot of nations", however, all races could not "melt at the same degree of temperature". (Parker 1916h:302) Assimilation gave "the various racial elements the common national ideals" and the "national household" required conformity. (Parker 1916h:287) Parker noted that "we want men who differ with us in speech, thought and habits to talk, think and act as we do". (Parker 1916h:287)

³ Interestingly, this instance is one of the very earliest uses of the word "post-modern" in print. See: [Sollors, W. (1989) Ed. The Invention of Ethnicity Oxford: Oxford University Press pages vi-ix]

He specified the differing circumstances for each branch of humanity in their quest to achieve being American and first dealt with the European immigrant. The European "makes a deliberate choice" to come to the continent, a choice which "exhibits the evidence of moral energy ". For Parker, joining American society was a moral decision which helped the immigrant attain liberty and money which in turn translated to "the expansion of self and the realization of dreams". (Parker 1916:287) Overall, the European's development within the assimilative process was "not difficult" because "*men of like cultural traits seek association with themselves*". (Parker 1916h:289 Emphasis in original) The melting process was not instantaneous, but gradual. Immigrants withheld from complete assimilation for a period and formed "Little Italys" [sic] and Chinatowns, which were; "against public welfare but in a free country is tolerated because we are optimistic of the final outcome". He also noted that, "About forty per cent return, having failed in America.. (Parker 1916h:289)⁴

Parker continued by dealing at greater length with the assimilative conditions of the American Negro, whom America "desired as a slave". He adopted in his discussion, a tone of arch superiority making repeated reference to what he characterised as the innate mental inferiority of the black race and wrote: "It was not within the range of his intellectual attainments to plan immigration voluntarily and in the maintenance of his independence and freedom, to use as capital his physical abilities. (Parker 1916h:290) Ironically, Parker made many of the same points about the

⁴ Because Parker provided no referencing it is not possible to know how he arrived at this figure.

American Negro which were made in late eighteenth century revolutionary America by whites about American Indians to justify colonisation, that they were cruel to their own race and superstitious in the extreme prior to European contact. Negro peoples were enslaved, in Parker's analysis, by representatives of "a master race" with whom, through their natural servility and "light-hearted natures", they, "became more or less reconciled". (Parker 1916h:290) Although Parker allowed for individual exceptions, he maintained that the Negro had never known the nature of freedom anyway and could not even fully understand his condition when enslaved. Parker further underlined his position as genuine American by making much of the Negro ability to imitate without fully changing, which he used as further evidence of Negro frailty and inferiority. For Parker: "Accretion, or the taking on by imitation, is only an external covering of the unchanged, old nature". (Parker 1916h:291) This concern over imitation of "civilization" was characteristic of Parker's assimilative writing.

Yet in Parker's analysis, the Negro, like the Indian, was capable of transformation towards the civilised condition, capable of "race regeneration". For Parker, it was not black skin that made Negroes inferior but instead unspecified "darky" habits. He cited "awakened leaders" and the work of Fisk University, Tuskegee and Hampton as heralds of an overall Negro race redemption. Their work would speed the development of "real culture" and "productive activity along intelligent lines". (Parker 1916h:292) In order to qualify for "full social freedom" the Negro must first "pay a heavy price and achieve goals that command universal respect". Miscegenation or amalgamation were however, not possible, because of what Parker

considered the understandable wish of the white race to "preserve...racial type". This was contrasted strongly by Parker with the way in which the Indian and white races had freely mixed. Whereas black/white mixing was dismissed as a distasteful impossibility, intermarriage between Indians and whites was described as entirely positive. Parker wrote: "Intermarriage is producing a mixed race and a new type of Indian. The Indian through intermarriage is having his blood diffused through the veins of the white race and at the same time is being absorbed. (Parker 1916h:299) He described Indian "half-bloods" as examples of Indian competence and industry who somehow combined in their personalities the better traits of each parent. This corresponded with a life-long concern of Parker's to promote and bond with other non full-blood Indians. Within the SAI he had set up an inner group of such people who met regularly to form a kind of Indian non full-blood freemasonry. ⁵

In his discussion, Parker, like Morgan, stressed "mental attitude". The Indian, when discovered, "had not the cultural development that would lead to an appreciation of the forces that civilization controlled". (Parker 1916h:294) The Indian did not submit to enslavement in the way of the Negro race, but was simply "engulfed". For Parker, the Indian race simply did not have the appropriate "mental attitude" necessary to grasp the difficult concept of civilisation as an entity. Whereas the black race "deserves" segregation this should not be so for Indians, who were

⁵ Parker's arguments here are reminiscent of the writings of men like Jefferson and Knox prior to the early nineteenth century in their belief that the Indian could be assimilated through progress. Jefferson as President had, like Parker, advocated intermarriage as a means of assimilating Indians.

"landowners" and mentally superior. Indeed, the Indian's very exploitation, was for Parker, a condition spurring endeavour and business success, proven by what he described as "a great change" in the last five years. Parker set out a detailed case for the Indian to be given full citizenship and called for the abolition of the reservation system. Once engaged in "world's work" the Indian was not subject to racism in Parker's analysis, although educated Indians were "expected to be even more civilized" than their "fellow associates". In order to overcome "race inertia" all that was required was the awakening of Indian "moral energy" and a "clear incentive". (Parker 1916h:300) The Indian must metamorphose, must lose all his previous "culture" - an "undeveloped form", now that he was exposed to, "the full glare of twentieth century enlightenment. (Parker 1916:301)

To close his argument, Parker presented the voice of America, "speaking", as it were, to each race in turn, spelling out the nation's feelings towards each:

To the Indians we say, "You were here first, that is true, and though we tried we could not kill you entirely.

Listen to your friends and learn to live and think like us, or - well, you'll become extinct. (Parker 1916h:303)

Parker's article provided an instructive resume of the conditions of assimilation through a form of "American" monologue. He included an invitation to the European immigrant:

Come, we want you in this free country. In many respects you are already like us. In any event you are a commercial asset.

To the Negro, Parker's "American" voice spoke as a stern master;

In many ways you are unlike us and with some of us you are not over welcome. However, we will tolerate you for after all you are a convenient labourer and may do even more for us, in time.

Chinese peoples are mentioned for the first time at this point. They are described as unknowable and therefore unassimilable;

To the Chinaman we say, "Stay away, we don't want you. You are vastly different from the rest of us and we dislike your looks. We know your civilization is old and that you can teach us much - but your ideals - we are afraid. No we cannot assimilate you for we cannot understand you.

Parker listed seven "Factors of Assimilation" which fall into seven basic categories - focusing upon desire (to be American), ability to speak the language, education, religious tolerance, participation in "American" activities and patriotic loyalty. Once Parker's American "others" are in possession of these basic qualities, Parker assures his readers, "we need have no fear of granting them political equality and the privilege of the ballot. (Parker 1916h:304)

Several points stand out from Parker's text. For Parker as for Morgan, civilisation was a form of heightened mental state reached through evolutionary development which corresponded to a further moral development. Civilisation was "an inward growth" which bore no reference to outer displays of "imitation". (Parker 1916h:291) Indian "culture" was vestigial and needed to be sloughed off in order to fully appreciate the "civilisation" of the "master race". Also Parker had an obvious difficulty with self-identification. He wished to separate the Indian race from the

prejudices and attitudes which pertained to Negroes, to uphold by comparison his own race and yet to identify himself strongly with whites. This difficulty with identification - the tension in this article between Parker's identity as Indian and the direction of his analysis, is seen in the variety of names Parker used to describe Indians - "American Indian", "native American", "the red race" and describing whites with a new term, as "Native citizen Americans". (Parker 1916h: 287, 300, 304) The "we" used in this article is the American voice speaking through Parker, while Indians are "they". This slippage between Parker's identity as Indian, in this case as President of the Society of American Indians within its journal, and his textual voice as "American" is carried through in the other written articles. Negroes are omitted from his concluding paragraph on those who could securely be granted political and social equality within America, even though he must have been aware that many whites who supported the Indian cause would also have been "friends" of the Negro. It is also unlikely that he would have been unaware of tribes within the state of New York, like the Shinnecocks, who had much Negro blood. He presented Indians as protecting "racial type" against Negro blood but fully "amalgamating" with whites.⁶ Parker also stressed the psychological strain of the process of assimilation. He noted that "it costs the other man something" to achieve assimilation within America and felt that "just what this cost is we should know". (Parker 1916h:300) This was a reflection of Parker's problematic

⁶ The essential fallacy of Parker's argument is exemplified by: [Forbes, J. D. (1993) Africans and Native Americans: The Language of Race and the Evolution of Red-Black Peoples Urbana: University of Illinois Press & Smith, D. D. (1982) Long Lance: The True Story of an Imposter 1982 Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press]

status as a figure "in between" white and Indian worlds.⁷ It is possible to compare this article by Parker to analogous writing produced in 1913 by another contemporary educated Indian, Dr Carlos Montezuma. Appearing in the then Quarterly Journal of the Society of American Indians Montezuma's piece "Light on the Indian Situation", was written from very much an Indian standpoint, and betrayed none of Parker's textual difficulty over positioning. Rather, it stressed tribal links and read like a reverse captivity narrative. Yet Montezuma's basic message was similar to Parker's. He asked for Indian freedom from the Bureau, for "equal rights" and for "absolute free association of the Indian race with the paleface". (Montezuma 1913:53) It is difficult to imagine Parker using terms such as "paleface" to describe, in his term, the "master race". Perhaps because Montezuma's point of address is different, (his writing here is directed to his own race in the first instance), he felt able to use ironic and vaguely derogatory terms such as the above. The most salient difference between the two, is that Montezuma made clear that he had never left the Indian race whereas Parker adopted a problematic textual identity, fully assimilated American Indian.

Parker's second 1916 piece, "The Social Elements of the Indian Problem", was written for the American Journal of Sociology. It was published before Parker assumed the Presidency of the SAI and he here signed himself as "Archaeologist of the University of

⁷ In the January 1917 issue of Carlos Montezuma's vehicle *Wassaja*, Parker's article was described scathingly as: "a choice selection of wide generalizations (not always true), meaningless conclusions, bad reasoning, as senseless as it is shallow", but "...well meant, no doubt" [Montezuma, C. (1917) *Wassaja* :116].

the State of New York" (Parker had in 1906 passed exams which enabled him to take up the job of the state's first paid archaeologist). What is initially striking about this article is its sarcastic tone, what Parker described as "a tinge of satire". (Parker 1916g:257) But what is most interesting is Parker's change of rhetorical position even within the progression of the text. Once again, Parker used "we" throughout, but this time the "we" refers to the Indian race for whom he speaks and lists complaints. He writes: "For the sake of definiteness and to stimulate constructive thought we wish to lay down seven charges, out of perhaps many more, that the Indian makes at the bar of American justice. (Parker 1916g:253) For Parker at this point, the Indian "race" was not only a viable construct, but one for which he was entitled to speak unreservedly. Just as in the previous piece Parker felt able to speak for America and dissociate himself from Indians, here in the same year, he speaks for and very much of, the Indian race. He even refers negatively to Indians who may disagree with his points as those, "trained in the narrow school of the conqueror". (Parker 1916g:253) Instead of listing seven factors required for assimilation, Parker presented his ideas as "seven stolen rights" which America should restore so as to redeem "the red race". Parker referred to the loss of Indian land and resources only as an aside or as a secondary issue to be discussed at a later time, and instead chose to stress Indian intellectual freedom as primary. In the section he entitled "The Restitution" his first request, prior to mentioning social organization, economic independence, the right of freedom and "a good name among nations" was for an intellectual life for his race. He wrote;

Human beings have a right to an intellectual life, but civilization has swept down upon groups of Indians and, by destroying their relationship to nature, blighted their intellectual life, and left a group of people mentally confused. (Parker 1916g:258)

Indians needed to be returned a, "mental life, primitive though it was". This concern for intellectualism relates to some of Parker's opening statements in this article where he bemoaned the fact that responsible bodies when dealing with the Indian had not submitted their plans to a "psychologist, a sociologist, or an ethnologist for criticism or suggestion". (Parker1916g:253) As Parker spelt out these restitutive requests his position within the text shifted He began to speak of "the red man's" need to know God in order to "rebuild his character". (Parker 1916g:260) Although initially he had spoken as a kind of pontiff writing for and of the Indian race, by the final paragraph the "we" of the text shifted to become synonymous with the American people. For example, he wrote in closure as the voice of American conscience;

If need be, let [us] prick our conscience and so cause us to stir ourselves to renewed effort along more logical lines.

Let us acknowledge our present substantial failure.
(Parker 1916g:267)

Although at the beginning of the piece Parker wrote with extreme sarcasm, towards its close he wrote in terms of heartfelt polemic and his prose took on the cadences of a public speech. He wrote: "Why then should the truth not be known? Why besmear the pages of the red man's history with the blood that clots thick on the white man's hidden record". (Parker 1916g:261) Parker continued by quoting himself at length from an article in the Quarterly Journal of

The Society of American Indians, together with two notaries, Professor F.A. McKenzie and Franklin E. Lane, the then Secretary of the Interior, to back up his pleas for Indian equality and status. He also made note of an SAI petition to the President of the United States to form a commission to legislate for the Indian (he omitted to point out that this effort was ignored). Parker stressed throughout the psychological and mental strain of the Indian position, repeating the same theme which featured in the other 1916 article. He concluded;

The psychological character of the problem must be recognized, for most of the red man's woes are diseases of mental attitude. The miseries of his external life are the results of a bewildered, dispirited, and darkened mind. (Parker 1916g:266)

The article made no explicit reference to assimilation and instead stressed that Indian redemption depended upon the "atonement" of the white race. American restitution would allow the intellectual development that accompanied the civilised condition in Morgan's analysis.

"Indian Tribal Government a Failure" was published by Parker in State Service in 1920. In this article Parker still used the language of Morgan and the late nineteenth century to discuss the relationship of New York Indians to the dominant society. Morgan's "progressive spirit" needed to be encouraged through education and governmental reform. "Competent" New York Indians should be given the opportunity for full membership within American society. Parker's basic message was to bemoan the situation on New York reservations and call for change. He criticised tribal government and complained that "The inclination

of the residents of the several reservations is to assert that they are exceptions to the general requirements of normal American citizens". (Parker 1920d:100) Reservations were "refuges for the incompetent and thriftless who may live on the energy of the thrifty and landholding tribesmen". Intermarriage was diluting Indian blood, in a positive way, so that if the tribes kept their status "the preponderance of blood will be European". (Parker 1920d:101) Barriers to "progress" and Indian citizenship must be removed. Adult and child education must reveal to New York Indians their "real destiny" and make them "understand that every individual and aggregate of individuals must conform to the laws of moral, economic and social progress". The Supreme Court must adjudicate outstanding land claims given that Indians had now "out-grown...special forms of legal protection". (Parker 1920d:101) Indians should "capitalize all tribal property" and levy costs on railroads and industries using their land. Citizenship and the right of franchise should be extended to "all competent Indians". It was the duty of the state to give New York Indians "*the rights and priveleges [sic] and responsibilities that other Americans enjoy, subject to such forms of temporary protection in the matter of property as may be found just and expedient*". (Parker 1920d:102 Emphasis in original)

By 1919 Parker had disassociated himself completely from the SAI and lost faith in the possibility of Indian race unity. He wrote to the Society: "I am convinced that our educated Indians as a class...have no appreciation of the value of adhering to an individual principle". (Parker to Thomas Moffett, July, Parker Papers, NYSM) The 1919 Minneapolis SAI Conference, which Parker did not attend, had

been convened around the slogan "American citizenship for the Indian" but found itself unable to unite in support of it. By 1920 Parker had resigned from the SAI advisory board and shifted his "Indian" concerns to the Presidency of the New York Indian Welfare Society. As Hazel Hertzberg has noted, this marked a shift by Parker from Pan-Indian to Pan-Iroquoian concerns. (Hertzberg 1971:189) By 1921, Parker's relationship to the Society had utterly deteriorated; in a letter to a colleague he described the Society leaders as "a bunch of bolshevists". (Parker to Charles Daganett, October 13, 1921, Parker Papers, NYSM) In 1922 he received his honorary M.S. degree from the University of Rochester, following publication of a work on prehistoric cultures, "Archaeological History of New York". (Parker 1922a)

He had, by this time, also completely reversed his opinion on the melting pot concept so stressed in his 1916 articles. His speech of 1922 before the Albany Philosophical Society delivered a searing attack on the whole melting pot theory. He said; "there are some of us who are skeptical [sic] enough to think that the myth of the 'melting-pot' has all gone to pot". He continued by listing eight points, whose tone differed significantly from the seven points listed in both the 1916 articles. He described the "national philosophy of the commonwealth, as expressed by our Nordic-Aryan forefathers of the colonial days" as demanding the following:

1. a common political ideal, and loyalty to our form of government; both in spirit, principle and detail;
2. conformity to established institutions and customs;
3. speaking the common language - English;
4. an education of the average standard;
5. a common moral standard; but wide religious liberty;

6. a common standard of living;
7. similar modes of behaviour and democratic etiquette;
8. the preservation of the physical type - that of the Aryan white man. So important was the latter demand that when our national constitution was formed there was a lengthy debate as to whether the European white man alone should be eligible to citizenship, to the exclusion of the Asiatic, negro and native red man. (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:195)

Here he omitted his previous stress on the importance of the desire of the non-citizen to be assimilated, together with the requirement of their common association with other Americans and the necessity of "the realization of cherished hopes". The eighth point given by Parker made a new clear and unequivocal statement about the sanctity of the white race. Parker's speech manuscript even had the phrase "and native red man" crossed out, thus removing his only reference to the American Indian in the whole piece. His work at this point had therefore gone from advocacy of integration, assimilation and amalgamation for European immigrants and Native Americans to general advocacy of exclusion and the preservation of the white race. To further this case he made reference to the new science, eugenics:

Students of eugenics have much to say of the results of racial blendings, especially those of different blood stocks. In general such blendings are discouraged; although a few, such as the Scotch, English, and early Athenians and Romans, may be "advantageous". (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:196)

Parker went on to advise a ten year cessation of "the tide of immigration" while America concerned itself, "with the elimination of race poisons, feeble mindedness, the sex disease,

tuberculosis and cancer and built up a higher intelligence standard". He ended with a stern warning;

If we fail to heed the plain, clear voice of experience as it points out the fatal results of indiscriminate blood blending and inharmonious race contacts, we shall only build a nation known for its glorious industrial achievements, and finally for its blindness, its palsy, its leprosy and its death by fire upon a bed of scented silks. (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:196)

Parker's 1916 and 1920 articles had argued for special conditions for Indian assimilation and made much of the beneficial effects of Indian-white intermarriage. Yet by 1922 he was instead using eugenics to exclude the Indian together with most other non-Aryans from American society and stressing the detrimental effects of the majority of mixed-blood unions. In this new vision of America given by Parker the Indian was for the first time not central, but more or less relegated as a "blood stock" which could contaminate the true America. (quoted in Hertzberg 1971: 196) It is difficult to imagine exactly where Parker placed himself as the product of Indian-white intermarriage in this analysis. It seems he placed himself above the issue, in some transcendental analytical space where his own doctrine did not apply. Hertzberg finds this 1922 speech evidence of what she terms a "deep inner turmoil" within Parker. (Hertzberg 1971:197). By 1922, Parker had discarded Morgan's theoretical framework and with it any positive vision of the Indian's role within American society.

By the following year, Parker had not only cast off his belief in the potency of the American melting pot, but also lost faith in any Pan-Indian progressive consensus. He wrote a disillusioned letter in

reply to an ex-SAI colleague, Miss Stanley, in 1923, which read in part:

One must realize that there is no such being today in America as "the Indian". To the contrary, there are between 300,000 and 340,000 persons of more or less Indian blood, each one of which has his own vital individual interests. Few have any deep interest based on the idea of race. (quoted in Hertzberg 1971:197-198)

In the same year Parker presided over the sessions of the Committee of One Hundred, set up by Herbert W. Work, the then secretary of the Interior, a government advisory committee on Indian policy. In 1924, he left his post at the New York State Museum to become Director of Rochester Museum, New York.

By 1929 Parker seems to have regained his belief in full Indian membership of American society within the Indian publication The Six Nations. In "Solving the New York Indian Problem" he resumed the old argument that the Indian's problem was "how to achieve competence". (Parker 1929c:1) Although he did not explicitly refer to Morgan, Parker reverted to the nineteenth century faith in rapid assimilative change. However his approach had become cynical. The Indian "must show by actual achievement that he can play the white man's game of life" in order to achieve full integration and status within the white world. As Parker put it;

Any Indian who has polished his brains, cultivated his manners, trained his hands and then gone out into the world and done something worth while will tell you that he has no problem at all that the white man does not have. (Parker 1929c:2)

He again called for state, federal and Indian co-operation in eliminating poverty, alcohol abuse and ill-health on New York

reservations, in resolving land claims, promoting Indian schools and in stopping government payment of "annuity funds". Indian progress was a "you and I problem" and both white and Indian cultures had a unity of purpose and a common future. Parker wrote:

The white man and the Indian as citizens and co-partners must step and walk side by side, for there is no white man's path and Indian's path alone. There is but one path and that is the road to life, liberty, enlightenment and the pursuit of happiness. On it all nations may walk. When the Indian understands this there will be no problem. He then will concern himself most with his practical present, rather than his romantic past. He will then be a conqueror of the earth rather than a discarded by-product. (Parker 1929c:3)

In 1931 Parker published, "The Attitude of the American Indian to American Life" in Religious Education. He incorporated the new awareness of the diversity of the Indian "race" which he had stressed in his correspondence in 1923 after the SAI disbanded. (Parker 1931a:111) He opened his piece with a plea for the acceptance of Indian diversity. He bemoaned the "American tragedy" what he termed "our proneness to generalize". (Parker 1931a:111) Again in this article Parker's self-identification within the text is of interest. He wrote at one point as an anthropologist, firmly identified himself with the dominant culture as the previous quotation shows and signed the article, "Arthur Parker*" and in italics - Director, Rochester Municipal Museum, Rochester, New York. The asterix referred significantly to small type at the bottom of the page which read, "Mr Parker is a Seneca Indian born on the Cattaraugus reservation. (Parker 1931a:111) I have not been able to discover whether this was an editorial note or

whether Parker wrote it himself as integral to the text. In any case, the phrase is misleading, given what has already been said in this thesis about Parker's problematical Seneca tribe status and mixed descent. Hertzberg has placed Parker as at most one quarter Seneca and three-quarters white and Fenton has described him as "no more than one-fourth Seneca, and probably nearer one-eighth". (Hertzberg 1971:49; Fenton 1968:5) The note did however signal that Parker was Indian, although throughout the text he makes no overt claim to being American or Indian. Again Parker used variety of names to describe Native Americans: -"our aboriginal stock", "*Indians*", "American Indians", "the red race", "aboriginal sons of the soil", "native American" and "America's first Americans". (Parker 1931a:111,112,114 Emphasis in original)

Throughout his life Parker maintained a strong tribal association and was adopted as a chief of the Seneca Iroquois Bear Clan around 1906 yet here he stated that "The native life of the red man is all but gone, save in a few spots with barriers that the white race has not yet chosen to obliterate". He wrote against the stereotypical image of the "blanket" Indian and his writing gives a sense of the "picturesque" Indian as a white construct, of the Indian as "object" within white subjective representation:

To the artist, the novelist and to our citizenry in general, there is only one Indian - the red man of the plains whose picturesque bonnet of eagle plumes and whose fringed buckskin shirt, hung with weasel skins, present a striking picture. (Parker 1931a:112)

He stressed Indian diversity but made clear that the progressive Indian was part of that diversity, citing Indian scientists, business managers, surgeons and bridge-builders (perhaps in the latter

referring to his great uncle Ely Samuel Parker). He made clear that progressive Indians were part of the diversity of tribal society and again used Morgan's language to posit progressive stages of human development. "Observation" showed that: "each tribal group presents examples of men and women in every stage of advancement, from the most backward and diseased to progressive citizens who are healthy in mind and body". (Parker 1931a:112) Parker stressed the diversity of Indian types, noting that there were over "three hundred different tribes" and "some 58 stock languages with several hundred dialects to help explain a perceived lack of "intertribal coherence or concerted action". (Parker 1931a:111) He used the language of social Darwinist William Graham Sumner's Folkways as opposed to that of the melting pot, to explain the difficulties of Indian "deculturation". (Sumner 1906) He wrote: "Folkways are not quickly expunged even by civilization and Christianity. The old *mores* crop out when least expected. (Parker 1931a:111)Emphasis in original) He wrote, by now nostalgically, about the halcyon days of the SAI : "Some years ago, it was 1911, there was founded in the city of Columbus a national society of American Indians and their friends". (Parker 1931a:112) He described progressive SAI members as representative of the Indian ability to dissociate from a tribal past: "All these people...were proud of their ancestral heritage. When they spoke of the race it was with poetic pathos". (Parker 1931a:112) These Indians had been leaders, who had once spoken before "mighty assemblages", who were loyal American patriots, as were the many Indians who had fought in the last war. Parker stated rather preposterously that "some anthropologists" held that Americans were slowly becoming physically more akin to ancient American Indians. (Parker

1931a:112) Contradicting social evolutionary theory he stated: "Some anthropologists tell us that our physical structure, with each succeeding generation, more closely resembles that of older natives of the soil". (Parker 1931a:114) This was an odd tangent on earlier romantic views (shared by Morgan) of the Indian as the spiritual ancestor of democratic America. Parker went on to sum up the Indian attitude to America with two questions he felt were always discussed "where-ever [sic] the aboriginal son of the soil gathers with his kinsmen". He asked: "How may we as Indians meet the requirements of the new era?" and "When will the government settle our tribal claim and give satisfaction for our stolen rights and acres?". (Parker 1931a:114)

Thus in 1931 Parker asked for redress from the dominant society for the Indian as he had in his 1916 "Restitution". Redress was necessary because the Indian had "poured out the richness of his own culture" into America. (Parker 1931a:114) He still used Morgan's theoretical framework to argue for the status of progressive Indians, but called for a new understanding of Indian diversity. In fact, Parker did not give serious consideration to cultural pluralism which had dominated anthropology since the late 1920s, until 1951 when he was seventy years old. The final text I will look at is an unpublished article written by Parker in that year entitled "Genius and the Culture Process" - a discussion of a 1949 paper, "the Science of Culture" given by the anthropologist Leslie A. White at the Philosophers Club of Rochester. (Parker Papers, UR) Although Parker's lengthy critique was never intended for publication, it registers his concern over the implications of cultural pluralist ideas. He questioned the way in which White's

ideas denied personal agency to the individual within history. He held that they necessitated "re-evaluating many of our beliefs concerning the evolution of society and of moral responsibility of the individual". ("Genius and the Culture Process" Parker Papers, UR) What concerned Parker in his eleven-point list of "Implications and Questions" was the culture concept's apparent denial of "free will" and the implication that "conscience and judgement" were "only the result of the preponderance of weight of the opposing cultural views, determined by the fear of non-conformity". Morgan's ideas had been much more useful to Parker in the twentieth century than those of the cultural pluralists as they seemed to allow both "free will" and "judgement" as powerful tools in the quest for individual assimilative change.

With the exception of his speech of 1922, Parker argued in these texts and speeches that this assimilative change was possible for "competent" Indians. Further, Indian assimilation was authentic, not just the semblance of true developmental change. Repeatedly Parker argued that assimilated Indians did not copy or imitate white ways but were *essentially* transformed. In 1916 he made special reference to the fact that Indians, unlike Negroes, were "not essentially imitative" and "count it no virtue to imitate other races". He even asked "Why should we imitate you?". (Parker 1916h:296) In 1931 he again discussed imitation and noted that, for assimilated SAI members;

taking up the modern way of life was not simply to emulate the white race and become a copy only. Far from this, they girded their loins as America's first Americans and discussed the means by which they might become well-equipped, contributing factors in the commonwealth. (Parker 1931a:113)

The progressive Indian did not copy or mimic the civilised American condition, rather he was transformed completely by the assimilative process. The post-colonial theorist Homi Bhabha has discussed the effect of mimicry or copying by subaltern peoples upon white authority. Bhabha's analysis of the split nature of colonial discourse can be applied to these examples of Parker's writing. In Parker's constructed presence within these texts,

two attitudes towards external reality persist; one takes reality into consideration while the other disavows it and replaces it by a product of desire that repeats, rearticulates "reality" as mimicry. (Bhabha 1984:132)

Parker was, in Bhabha's catchy term, "almost white, but not quite". (1984:126) His engagement with the discourse which defined assimilation to the dominant society was in itself an appropriation of the knowledge of authority. His texts focused upon what was in essence the slippage between being American, being Americanised and being Indian - what Bhabha terms a metonymy of presence. (Bhabha 1984:130) His texts and speeches on the Indian's relationship to American society were counter-appeals to, and discussions about, the authority of American representation of Indian identity. Thus he wrote about the inaccuracy of the "picturesque" Indian stereotype and attempted to replace it with evidence of Indian "progress". Parker's subaltern enunciation is evidence of what Bhabha terms "the repertoire of conflictual positions that constitute the subject in colonial discourse". (Bhabha 1984:127) Parker's textual positioning as assimilated Indian conflicted with his other loyalties as Indian and as anthropologist, a conflict reflected in Parker's shifting self-identification within and between these texts and speeches. Parker clung to Morgan's

theoretical framework because this allowed the late nineteenth century's approach to Indian assimilation to persist into the twentieth. However, Parker's texts and speeches reveal the problematic nature of that status, "assimilated Indian". Parker was clear about his dream: "The native American of the older stock...dreams of no future for self or race save that as an American in the fullest sense". (Parker 1931a:114) But it was exactly this, being American in the fullest sense, that was no longer deemed possible or desirable for Indians in the twentieth century and this conflict lies at the heart of these texts and speeches by Parker.⁸ There were, however, certain contexts within American society where Parker could achieve full integration and retain an Indian identity. American fraternities offered an opportunity for Parker, as Indian, to come closer to the realisation of his dream of being American in the fullest sense.

⁸ Young, Robert in White Mythologies: Writing History and the West, has argued that such retrospective charting of subaltern resistance by the critic belittles more obvious documentary evidence [Young, R. (1990:149 London: Routledge]. This may be true, but it does not necessarily make the whole project of detailing subaltern resistance redundant. It is often necessary to look beyond obvious documentary evidence in order to chart the response of historical figures such as Parker whose resistance was by necessity both subtle and complex.

PARKER AND AMERICAN FRATERNALISM

To date Parker's involvement in American fraternities has gone undocumented. Yet on 16th September, 1924 he achieved the highest rank within American Freemasonry, the award of the thirty - third degree, an honour conferred only by selection. As a Mason, Parker attempted to bring the idea of the Indian in the twentieth century closer to the American mainstream. Masonic discourse allowed him to identify the idea of the Indian with a group which was positioning itself as representatively American. Membership of fraternal organizations was yet another ratiocinative focus in Parker's struggle within a matrix of citizenship, nationality, class, culture and ethnicity. For Parker, the world of Freemasonry was a unique and significant avenue of integration. The Masonic world was an American hierarchy within which he was able to excel without sacrifice of his Indian identity. In fact, I will show how Parker used his Indian identity to reaffirm and develop his fraternal status and to influence the fraternity's construction of the Indian "Other". Close analysis of the fraternal texts produced by Parker will show him to be using this fraternal discourse to further his own position and to re-orientate citizenship, nationality, class, culture and ethnicity as they applied to contemporary Indians. Parker's discursive practice served to bring Parker and the Indian race further within the rhetorical boundaries of who could be a Freemason and therefore who could be an American, who could be middle-class. Parker's discussions of the Indian relation to the Masonic fraternity operated to broaden the idea of the Indian as "Other".

Twentieth-century fraternal organisations were based upon a central contradiction. Typically, their rhetoric stressed brotherhood, universality, equality and cohesion around central themes of morality and good character. (Dumenil 1984:123) Yet at the same time, these men's clubs practised de facto exclusion and their rhetoric made constant reference to a "profane" or non-fraternal, world. Most historians of fraternalism agree that the phenomenon was primarily white and middle-class. Parker was certainly middle-class but did nothing to hide his Indian, that is, non-white, heritage. Instead, he used his Indian descent to gain entry to the fraternity and his position within it to position his "race" within white, professional male America. The fact that Parker achieved such success within a middle-class social organisation and had an active relationship to its discourse has significant theoretical implications. It necessitates a broadening of current uses of the analytical idea of the "Other". As Indian Parker stood outside the prevailing white, Anglo-Saxon political and social hegemony. As a Mason however, Parker was able to subvert and manipulate that very "othering" discourse. The Masonic fraternity's rhetorical adoption of the Indian was useful to Parker: it allowed him entry to the fraternity and the chance to gain rank. Freemasonry was one American hierarchy where his Indian heritage was an advantage and not a limitation. Parker's fraternal identity allowed him agency to engage with the wider construction of his status and position as Indian and to engage with contemporary debates over the Indian societal role. The significance of documenting Parker's fraternal involvement lies in the fact that it retrieves from the past a different kind of Indian,

an Indian who used discourse to close the gap between myth and legitimation for himself and for his race. These kinds of Indian, and this way of "seeing Red", adds further subtlety to the "Indian as Other" analytical approach. It exemplifies what Philip Deloria has termed "contests on the discursive battlefield that involves real Others" in his own recent article discussing Masonic Indians. (Deloria 1993:39)

In order to understand Parker's relationship to American Freemasonry it is essential to get a sense of the significance of fraternalism in this period and of Freemasonry as a fraternal organisation. Fraternalism and its ritual is easy to dismiss as ridiculous and irrelevant. As one scholar has pointed out;

Scholars have understandably dismissed the notion that on the eve of the twentieth century between 15 and 40 per cent of American men, including a majority of those categorized as middle-class, were transfixed by this hokum. (Carnes 1989:2)

The social significance of fraternalism within turn of the century America has recently been re-evaluated by Lynn Dumenil in Freemasonry and American Culture 1880-1930 (1984); Mary Ann Clawson in Reconstructing Brotherhood: Class, Gender and Fraternalism (1989) and Mark C. Carnes in Secret Ritual and Manhood in Victorian America (1989). I shall discuss their interpretations of fraternalism in greater detail later in this chapter, but it suffices here to note that Clawson has written of "the social metaphor of brotherhood" as a hitherto "unrecognised social fact". (Clawson 1989:4) She makes the point that it is remarkable that the nature of fraternal identity has not to date received greater scholarly attention. Although fraternalism has a

history stretching back to the colonial period, Carnes' work has highlighted the last third of the nineteenth century in particular as the "Golden Age of Fraternity". In 1896, five and a half million out of nineteen million adult American men belonged to some form of fraternal organization. (Carnes 1989:ix) The Masonic type of fraternalism in particular served as the organizational model for hundreds of American social organizations, trade unions, agricultural societies, nativist organizations and political movements across the ideological spectrum and over centuries. Among the major fraternal orders, the Knights of Pythias, and the Odd Fellows, were most similar in organisational structure to Masonry. (Dumenil 1984:220) The Ancient and Accepted Order of Freemasons was the most popular and prestigious secret fraternal organisation and was the organisation most central to Parker's fraternal life. In 1879 it had over 55,000 members, by 1900 over 1 million. After World War 1, Masonic membership and participation boomed, perhaps connected to the post-war desire to "get ahead". According to Dumenil "post-war, Masonic membership may have proved to be much more materially beneficial than in the past" and membership of a Masonic lodge "could well have been an expression of a desire for 'normalcy'". (1984:152-153) By 1925 there were over three million Masons . Freemasonry, as Dumenil notes, "touched the lives of millions of American men". (Dumenil 1984:xi; Carnes 1989:7)

The Masonic fraternity probably originated in Scotland over three centuries ago as a stonemasons' guild and in its cross-over to the United States it retained its essentially reactionary,

conservative nature.¹ (Freke 1852:6) As Dumenil notes, during the colonial period its tone very much reflected Enlightenment thought, with an emphasis on deism, rationalism, science and man's relationship to nature.² Nineteenth and twentieth century Masons essentially progressed through levels of initiation, "degrees", which were accompanied "secret" and esoteric ritual symbolic of greater knowledge of the central truths of Freemasonry. These central truths invoked charity, fraternity, morality and a form of religiosity. The fraternity was a "white, male, primarily native, Protestant society" which mirrored the values of middle-class America, with a commitment to self-improvement, temperance, piety and industry. (Dumenil 1984:xi) Clawson has detailed the economics of fraternal organisations at the turn of the century and the way in which leaders and organisers made thousands of dollars which conflicted with the fraternal ideals of mutuality and brotherhood. She notes that: "Regalia manufacturers and merchants, job printers, physicians, and above all fraternal agents and leaders found in the fraternal order a source of material benefit and personal advance". (Clawson 1989:213) Fraternal organisations also ran beneficial societies. By 1898, these beneficial societies had over two and a half million members, which was nearly half a million more policy holders than private companies. (Carnes 1989:10) The

¹ Carnes insists that Freemasonry began in London in the early 1700s. [Carnes, M.C. (1989) Secret Ritual and Manhood in Victorian America New Haven: Yale University Press pages22-24]

² George Washington (initiated 1752), eight signatories of the Declaration of Independence, including Benjamin Franklin and seventeen Presidents including Ronald Reagan have admitted to, or been claimed by the fraternity as, Freemasons. Knight accurately notes that the American dollar bill bears not only Washington's likeness but also the all-seeing eye symbol of Freemasonry. Masonry was particularly popular in the 1920s. Famous figures of the time were Masons, including Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Ford, Charles Lindburgh, and many movie stars and politicians. For a further discussion of Freemasonry's relationship to Enlightenment thinking see, [Jacob, M.C. (1981) The Radical Enlightenment: Pantheists, Freemasons and Republicans London: George Allen & Unwin]

income of the various Masonic bodies alone numbered in the hundreds of millions without taking into account the insurance revenue.

In 1907, when Parker joined, ritualism would still have been a central focus within Freemasonry. For Clawson, fraternal ritual "functioned as a form of entertainment that enlivened and gave purpose to the sociability it justified". (Clawson 1989:228) Promotion within the fraternity was rewarded with initiation, new ritual and fuller understanding of the earlier rites. Fraternal orders are generally termed "expressive" - that is, they existed to meet the social and personal needs of their members and because of this rituals changed significantly across region and over time. Carnes concludes that: "The record shows that fraternal ritualists, through a maddeningly unpredictable process of trial and error, attempted to "give satisfaction" and "gratify the desires" of members; they did not respond to the voiceless dictates of social necessity. (Carnes 1989:105) Although there is now an extensive literature on Freemasonry per se (one estimate cites fifty thousand items on Masonry published by the 1950s), the exact fraternal significance and nature of the higher degrees which Parker was party to, remains obscure. (Knight 1985:15) This is perhaps because secrecy has always been integral to the rhetoric of Masonic fraternity. Ritualistic admittance to each of the successive degrees or stages warned of certain punishments should the applicant betray Masonic secrets to those outside the brotherhood - i.e., to the "profane". The first three degrees list as penalties; having the tongue torn out, the heart torn from the breast and the bowels being burned to ashes respectively. (Knight

1985:30) Ancient Charge VI.4 of the Masonic Constitution, provides further evidence of the fraternal importance of secrecy;

You shall be cautious in your words and carriage, that the most penetrating stranger shall not be able to discover or find out what is not proper to be intimated; and sometimes you shall divert a discourse and manage it prudently for the honour of the worshipful fraternity. (quoted in Knight 1985:7,19-35)

Of course, the most likely punishment for the betrayal of Masonic secrets would have been the disapprobation of fellow Masons. However, the initial three Masonic degree rituals: Entered Apprentice, Fellow Craft and Master Mason, although predicated upon secrecy, have been well-documented since the nineteenth century.

How then, can we interpret the significance for Parker of this ritual-based men's club in the early twentieth century? This next section will examine the different approaches to Victorian and early twentieth century fraternalism of the three authors listed above in order to give context to Parker's involvement.

Freemasonry allowed Parker a privileged access to the discourse of ethnicity and to early twentieth century conceptions of what it meant to be an American. Parker's goals in the early twentieth century (he joined in 1907), perfectly matched those of the organisation. At this time Masons wanted to be seen as reinforcing all-American ideals and to be seen as practically working to bring about social reform and social cohesion. Parker wanted to be seen in the same light, as all-American and as a

positive factor in the struggle to maintain American values. Changes in the national political and social climate, the United States' entry into World War 1 in 1917, the aftermath of the 1919 Red Scare and nativist concerns over immigration, caused Freemasonry to play down its commitment to the ideals of brotherhood and universality and in their place to promote the organisation's social conservatism and commitment to American democracy. The prevailing concern over radicals, Catholics and immigrants caused Masons to display their credentials as loyal and patriotic citizens and to re-assert the dominance of old-stock, white American values. By the 1920s, anti-immigrant feeling was strong among Masons. The concern to modernise the fraternity and place it more firmly within the secular sphere reflected the national drive towards 100 per cent Americanism. Masons responded to the perceived threats to national vitality of the time - radicalism, immigration and Catholicism. As Dumenil notes:

the demands for a modern Masonry and the concern to reinforce native, old-stock American ideals prompted Masons to depart from the traditional emphasis on individual morality pursued in a sacred environment in favour of becoming more involved in the profane and secular world. (Dumenil 1984:xiv)

Although Dumenil is unable to provide statistics, she presents evidence of a strong connection between Masonry and the Ku Klux Klan. (Dumenil 1989:122) Yet overt racism was not expressed in official Masonic publications, given that racism contravened the fraternity's central tenets of universality and brotherhood. However, in 1918 one Norman Frederick de Clifford found cause to write The Jew and Masonry in order to combat racism within the fraternity. He wrote in order to:

"eradicate the hostile and Anti-Semitic feelings now existing in some of our Christian Masonic lodges toward the Jewish Brethren and the race in general". (quoted in Dumenil 1984:122) Although it would seem that Jews within Freemasonry suffered racism, by comparison, Parker's articles of the same period reaffirmed a privileged position for the Indian within Masonic rhetoric.

Within Masonic rhetoric, assimilation was held as essential for American immigrants. As Dumenil has argued: "the major thrust of Masonic rhetoric was to castigate immigrants' unwillingness to assimilate and to typify them as impediments to a unified America. (Dumenil 1984:123) Dumenil has also documented the 1920s Masonic reaction against Catholicism, Masonic authors' equation of Protestantism with Americanism and the fact that, "Ethnic qualifications and good citizenship, more than morality, became the primary standards for evaluating respectability. (Dumenil 1984:126) Thus, as Freemason and Indian, Parker was at the centre of a discourse on respectability and ethnicity because Masons sought to designate themselves as representative Americans, exactly Parker's desire. As Dumenil states: "The motives for joining Masonry in the 1920s...seem to have been very much the same as they had always been: fraternity, sociability, personal gain, and status. (Dumenil 1984:151) Masonic fraternalism was about a shared sense of community; it "offered its members identification with the values honored in the middle-class world of late nineteenth-century America". (Dumenil 1984:xii) She characterises Freemasonry as a sanctuary against an industrialising and changing American world. Masons argued that their fraternity had

separate standards and concerns from the immoral, competitive, and commercial world beyond the temple and provided a sacred asylum in which men could ignore the social, political, economic, and religious conflicts of the time while cultivating love of God, bonds of fellowship, and improvement of the individual. (Dumenil 1984:xiii)

This was the world that offered Parker an avenue of success within mainstream America. The value of Clawson's text, is that it further reveals the complexity of that Masonic world. She argues that, "Its significance resides not only in the social networks it created, reinforced, or displayed, but in the meanings it articulated, the cultural context it provided for social action". (Clawson 1989:11) Whilst it offered an antidote to individualism in its facilitation of mutual aid and in its symbolic relationship to the artisan at the same time it affirmed individualism. It offered, "the vision of a society in which individual advancement and social solidarity were complementary rather than antagonistic - and attempted to create that society in miniature. (Clawson 1989:14) For Clawson Freemasonry was about denying class and instead offering "gender and race as appropriate categories for the organisation of collective identity". (Clawson 1989:15) Fraternal orders were peopled by "skilled workers and proprietors - the two groups for whom the identity of the artisan remained crucial". (Clawson 1989:16) Fraternal ritual was used, "to create solidarity, to articulate group identity, and to address concerns about class, gender, and other kinds of social difference. (Clawson 1989:18) As with the street parades which Susan Davies has analysed, Masonic ritual acted out "dramas of social relations" in which "performers define who can be a social actor" and therefore "what society was or might be". (quoted in Clawson

1989:13) Clawson goes into detail on what she describes as "fraternalism's consistent engagement with contradiction". Fraternalism resolved conflicts - over religion, gender, across generations, between wage workers and entrepreneurs. It was "a cultural institution that maintained and idealised solidarity among white men". (Clawson 1989:243) This constructed version of social reality was a reality which Parker tried to make sure included the Indian. Clawson's primary conclusion is that fraternalism "defined manhood as an alternative reference point to a collective identity and critique based upon class difference and workplace identity". (Clawson 1989:256)

Carnes' central argument in Secret Ritual and Manhood in Victorian America is similar. He focuses upon fraternal ritual's symbolic relation to masculinity. For Carnes: "these long and 'perilous' initiatory journeys facilitated the young man's transition to, and acceptance of, a remote and problematic conception of manhood in Victorian America". (Carnes 1989:ix) Carnes posits gender as "one of the most important tensions in Victorian American life", a tension which fraternalism and its ritual helped to assuage. When a young Victorian American male:

left the home for the lodge several evenings a week, keeping his wife in the dark about what transpired there, he imparted to her a painful message about the marital relation. When he performed the roles of Old Testament fathers or Indian chiefs, he re-enacted paternal roles replete with gender significance. And when he ventured into the deepest recesses of fraternal secrets, he encountered ideas about gender expressed nowhere else in Victorian America. (Carnes 1989: 57)

Whilst gender is obviously salient within any analysis of an organisation exclusive to men, Parker's Masonic writing was centred around the relation of the Indian to Freemasonry as an organisation which had agency within American definitions of ethnic status. Parker's Masonic membership was a symbolic statement of commitment to the fraternity's moral system, a tangible and semi-public bond to middle-class American culture. Masonic rhetoric "enunciated a moral code of self-improvement through self-restraint that harmonised with the prevailing Protestant middle-class culture". (Dumenil 1984:88) Gender-focused scholars, like Carnes and Clawson, are unsatisfied with this argument. For example, Carnes rejects Dumenil's "bonding" argument because of evidence that "the fraternal performance of so many long, repeated rituals left very little time for members to get to know each other" and Carnes insists that fraternal ritual had a great deal to do with constructing manhood and much less to do with establishing social communities. (Carnes 1989:3) However, in connection with Parker, Dumenil's analysis is much more persuasive. The type of brotherhood Parker found within the Masonic lodge was much more to do with bonding with those middle-class Protestants in power, than with reaffirming his gender. As Dumenil makes clear; "It brought together men, primarily native Protestants, who shared beliefs in American social, political and religious ideals". (Dumenil 1984:109) Parker gained privileged position within a community at the apex of respectable American middle-class life.

Early twentieth century Masonic organizational fervour may well have served many other functions. It served as a spiritual retreat

in an increasingly religiously diverse society; in its stress on brotherhood it no doubt offered an alternative to the rugged individualism of the time; it sought to reaffirm traditional values of self-restraint, industry and morality. But above all this, it was a middle-class, predominantly white, club. Progressive reform originated with the new middle-class and of course most progressive leaders were "old stock", WASPs. This was the group making change and the group which allowed Parker access to constructions of the idea of the Indian. It allowed him a forum to position and re-position Native Americans within a discourse which was relevant to social change, i.e. to broaden mainstream American ways of "seeing Red".

In order to detail and explain this ethnic "Indian" engagement with Freemasonry by Parker, it is necessary to look closely at his Masonic texts and the way he attempted to influence Masonic discourse from within. We need to isolate the play of dependencies between Parker's Masonic discourse and the larger political and social factors which affected his status as Native American, as hybrid and as American professional. The best examples of these Masonic texts are four articles by Parker "American Indian Freemasonry" (1919), "Secrets of the Temple" (1923), "American Indian Freemasonry" (1924) and "Ely S. Parker - Man and Mason" (195?). Further material has resulted from his associate editorship of Masonic publication The Builder, lectures delivered in many lodges, charters and consistatories and the twelve Masonic plays which he wrote and produced. (Parker's entry in Masonic International Who's Who under "other Masonic data" Parker Papers, UR)

In 1907, aged twenty-six, Parker joined Sinclairville Lodge No.303; Sinclairville, New York.³ His initial progression was slow. It was not until 23rd September 1918, aged thirty-seven, that he achieved the second degree, Fellow Craft. (Parker to Lester W. Herzog 13th September 1918, Parker Papers, SEDA) Yet, on September 16th, 1924, aged 43, he received the ne plus ultra of Masonic recognition - the 33rd Degree and with it the fraternal tag, Sovereign Grand Inspector General.⁴ The thirty-third degree represented Freemasonry's highest echelon.⁵ Above the level of third degree, Master Mason, fraternal administration switched to the jurisdiction of a Supreme Council with headquarters in London, a building known within the fraternity as the Grand East, as mentioned in Parker's letter below. The thirty-third degree was an honorary degree and, like all the degrees above the third, was conferred only by selection. Historians generally agree that Masonic membership conferred honorific status, what Dumenil calls "a badge of respectability" within middle-class American culture. (Dumenil 1984:74) Parker therefore, had succeeded in placing himself close to the pinnacle of success in this context.

³ I rely on the version of Parker's Masonic degrees given in his personal correspondence record of his Masonic International Who's Who entry and not correspondence 17/9/1953 to Parker from William R. Denslow. [Parker Papers, UR] Denslow in his capacity as business manager of The Royal Arch Mason: Official Publication of the General Grand Chapter wrote to Parker in an effort to identify Freemasons who were of Indian descent. I am presuming that the first source cited, given that it is in Parker's own handwriting, is a more accurate record of the details of Parker's Masonic initiation than the version which Denslow gives. Denslow wrote to Parker as part of his preliminary research for his text: [Denslow, R.W. (1956) "Freemasonry and the American Indian", Transactions of the Missouri Lodge of Research 13:25-50]

⁴ Parker received the 33rd Degree in the Northern Jurisdiction of the A.S.S.R.

⁵ According to Knight, the thirty-third degree still exists today and is restricted internationally to only seventy-five members and is "the only cohesive masonic group on truly international lines". [Knight, S. (1985) The Brotherhood: The Secret World of Freemasons London: Panther Granada Publishing page 45]

Like many men of the period, Parker belonged to more than one fraternal group at once. He was a member of the Knights Templar, the Royal Order of Scotland and the Philalethes Society and the Sons of the American Revolution. Indeed, late in life, aged 70 he was elected one of the "immortals" of the Philalethes. (Hollcroft 1961:257) We know that membership of fraternities was expensive. Members spent huge sums on initiation fees, annual dues, mutual assessment funds and ritualistic paraphernalia. (Carnes 1989:5) Almost certainly, in reaching the thirty-third degree level of Freemasonry, Parker would have undergone repeated initiations. In addition to the first three degrees of Freemasonry (called Blue Lodge Masonry), there were ten additional degrees sequences associated with Royal Arch, Royal and Select Master and the Knights Templar organisations.⁶ According to Clawson, office within the higher degrees, such as the 33rd, was even more exclusive and more expensive. (Clawson 1989:78-83) Yet it is clear just from Parker's correspondence that he felt fraternal membership was a worthwhile investment. In fact, it was of supreme personal significance. This is evident in Parker's reaction in 1923 to the news of his elevation to the thirty-third degree. He wrote:

The honor is almost overwhelming and makes me feel that I must now do my utmost to justify the confidence that our beloved brethren of Buffalo have reposed in me. If I pass the probationary period and am eventually brought to the Great East of the H.E. to be crowned a S.G.I.G., honorary, I shall feel that I have received the highest honor that men and Mason's can give - namely, the testimony of the

⁶ All thirty-three degrees and their titles are listed in: [Carnes, M.C. (1989) Secret Ritual and Manhood in Victorian America New Haven: Yale University Press Appendix B]

greatest and truest fraternity the world has ever known.

I cannot express myself now, for I am filled with conflicting emotions. I am mighty happy and capable of doing all the undignified things that jubilant persons are, and yet the weight of honor awes me into discretion. (Parker to George L. Tucker, Buffalo Consistory, A.A.S.R., September 22, 1923, Parker Papers, UR)

Further affirmation of the import of the honour is provided by Parker's friend and fellow-Mason the anthropologist, Alanson Skinner, who wrote to congratulate him on the 33rd Degree honour: "You certainly deserve it, for in you are more of the elements that go to make up greatness than any other person I know. I feel, as a Mason, that the Fraternity has honored itself as much as it has you by this act. (Skinner to Parker. 26th September 1923, Parker Papers, UR)⁷

Having established Parker's position within Freemasonry and something of its significance in the early twentieth century, I will discuss the ways he manipulated its discourse from within. Two main factors allowed Parker special purchase within Masonic discourse: the fraternity's rhetorical commitment to universality as opposed to exclusion and Parker's "Indian" identity and its relation to Masonic ritual. Freemasonry's rhetoric of universality allowed Parker specific and significant power within the fraternity.⁸ Masonic rhetoric did not impose restrictions on membership beyond those listed by Dumenil below:

⁷ See also the congratulatory letter to Parker from John M. Clarke and 8 Sept. 1924, Parker Papers, UR.

⁸ See Parker's Masonic drama The First Grand Lodge for a reiteration of the Masonic rhetorical commitment to universality and reference to "Dissenters, Jews, Catholics and Quakers who have

Masons insisted that their order was committed to the principle of universality, which they defined as the association of good men without regard to religion, nationality, or class. The prospective candidate must be physically sound, free-born male who believed in God and lived a moral life. (Dumenil 1984:9 Emphasis in original)

But in fact, the fraternity exercised racial and religious exclusion and in practice excluded non-whites. Masonry did not accept blacks and used legalism to exclude Prince Hall, a black Masonic order. (Dumenil 1984:10) There is evidence of only small numbers of immigrants holding membership. Masonry was essentially Protestant. The Catholic church had long been opposed to secret societies. As early as 1738, Pope Clement XII had forbidden Catholics to join Masonry under threat of excommunication and in 1884 Leo XIII brought out an encyclical which condemned European Masonry as politically subversive. It was this gap between Masonic practice and Masonic rhetoric that gave Parker power within Masonic discourse. But Freemasonry's rhetorical commitment to universality was not what allowed Parker to become a Mason. It was the fraternity's construction of itself as ancient and anti-modern and indeed, noble, which allowed Parker access because of his ethnic identity. Because of the matrix of connotations surrounding the idea of the Indian in early twentieth century America, was able to place himself at the centre of Masonic discourse and to manipulate that discourse from within.

suffered persecution". [Parker, A.C. (n.d.) The First Grand Lodge: A Masonic Drama , Parker Papers, UR]

For this reason Parker's Masonic writing has as its central theme the issue of the Indian relationship to Freemasonry and from this, the Indian relationship to Americanism. Through repeatedly publishing articles which made connections and correspondences between the Indian and Masonic worlds, Parker worked to bring the Indian closer to middle-class American life. He untiringly compared American Masonic ritual with aspects of Indian religious life which shared the same emphasis. His article on his great-uncle, "Ely S. Parker - Man and Mason" is an excellent example. (Parker Papers, UR) Parker's history of his great-uncle's Masonic involvement makes connections between Seneca Indian religious ritual and Masonic ritual. His description of the Seneca Little Water Society ritual bears striking similarity to what Masons would have known as the "traditional history" - the final ritual of the Masonic third degree. This similarity would have been obvious to his Masonic readership, although Parker never makes the point explicit since to do so would reveal a Masonic secret. In Carnes' interpretation, the Masonic third degree ritual served to symbolically resolve generational conflict. (Carnes 1989:70-4) Parker's concern was to reveal its inherent similarity to Indian ritual. He detailed the way in which the ritual which conferred the title Master Mason matched the Seneca Indian Little Water Society ritual. The Master Mason or Royal Arch ceremony mimed the murder by three Apprentice Masons, of Hiram Abiff, the principal architect of King Solomon's temple, because he refused to reveal Masonic secrets. It then re-enacts Abiff's subsequent resurrection and final reinstatement. The mimed story of the Royal Arch ceremony goes on to describe a crypt in the foundations of the ruined King Solomon's temple

where the lost name of God, the "omnibus word" is discovered. (Knight 1985:30-54) Parker's description of the Little Water Society ceremony is given below and the similarity is clear;

It had three sections, and it was devoted to a ceremony taught by the hero who had resisted the blandish of three ruffians who demanded the secret of his power. He refused to divulge this or betray his trust and so was slain. When his forest friends, symbolised by various animals, found him, they sacrificed the vital sparks of their own bodies, while an aide collected them in an acorn cup, the contents of which were poured down the throat of the prostrate hero. He was then raised to his feet and to life by the powerful clasp of the Bear's claw. ("Ely S. Parker - Man and Mason" Parker Papers, UR)

Parker went on to note how this Little Water Society ritual "exercised a profound influence on the Seneca people", that he had "seen educated and well-to-do Indians from city homes return for the ceremony of this society, and several Freemasons, Indian and white, have been admitted. ("Ely S. Parker - Man and Mason" Parker Papers, UR) Thus Parker communicated to his fraternity that the Indian shared the values and aims of the Masonic order. We can turn to Clawson for a deeper look at these aims and values. Clawson's discussion of the same Master Mason ritual shows it to be "an idealised defence of individual private property" presenting "an idealised version of capitalist production and market relations". (Clawson 1989:82) Clawson locates the appeal of Freemasonry in its ability through voluntary association, to mitigate the reality of an individualistic, market-orientated society with its inevitable winners and losers. Through discursively connecting with the Masonic ritual, Parker was tying the Indian to this reaction against modernity. Parker repeated a

ritualistic connection between Indians and Masons in two further Masonic articles, "American Indian Masonry" (1924) and "American Indian Freemasonry" (1919). Both articles described initiation into Indian secret societies by white Freemasons. Like his great-uncle Ely, Parker was himself a member of the Seneca Little Water Company; he held the title "Deputy at Large of the Guards of Mystic Potence, or Little Water Company". He was also a member of two other religious Seneca fraternities, the Society of Mystic Animals and the Company of Whirlwinds. (Parker 1924e :137) Thus Parker held high status in both Indian and "American" worlds. We know from Parker's personal correspondence that prior to his Masonic membership he held ceremonial rank within the Iroquois Seneca. In 1903, Frederick Ward Putnam, then at the University of California, wrote to him to congratulate Parker on being adopted a chief of the Seneca Bear Clan. (Putnam to Parker 1st January 1903 Parker Papers, UR)⁹

We can see therefore, that Parker enjoyed fraternal and secret membership on two levels; within the white world as a Freemason, and within another hierarchy, that of the Seneca tribe. Through making connections between the two Parker could reaffirm his position within both worlds and extend the Masonic principle of brotherhood and universality to encompass his Indian heritage. Parker's 1924 article highlighted his ownership of the role of intermediary, as bridge between white and Indian worlds:

⁹ In 1909, Parker wrote the first detailed ethnographic account of Seneca secret societies, since they were first cursorily noted by Lewis Henry Morgan in Ancient Society (1887). [Parker, A.C. (1909) "Secret Medicine Societies of the Seneca" Parker American Anthropologist II: April-June:161-185]

"When the traveller or the ethnologist returns from his journey to one society of his friends and brothers, he finds that there are certain subjects that are of perennial interest and that men are curious to know what he has learned of them". (Parker 1924e:137) Seneca societies shared with Masonry the virtue of secrecy, a virtue Parker dwelt on at length in two 1920s publications Secrets of the Temple (1922) and "Why All This Secrecy" (1923). The 1923 article presented secrecy as a specifically male virtue: "In Freemasonry, secrecy is more than a mere device for shutting out the profane, God rest their souls, but it is employed as a symbol of something that a man practices always and everywhere; in other terms, it is a virtue, and Freemasonry teaches it as such". (Parker 1923:361) This secrecy Parker described as attractive to "normal American citizens of good character". (Parker 1923:361) But what really bound the rhetoric of Freemasonry with the twentieth century idea of the Indian was the concept of antiquity. Just as the idea of the Indian is discursively rarely coeval with the present given that Indianness as essence exists within a mythologized past, the essential truths of Freemasonry are discursively constructed as being similarly "outside" history and time. Freemasonry used this "Politics of Time" to use Fabian's phrase, to legitimise its own message. (Fabian 1983:px) Parker in turn, used this gap between Masonic rhetoric and the real, to legitimise the Indian within Masonic discourse.

Freemasonry has always tried to legitimate its claims to knowledge of universal truth through stressing its ancient origins. The philosophic, religious and ritualistic mix that goes to make up

Freemasonry draws on many ancient sources, - some, like the Isis-Osiris myth which Parker dwells upon in his Masonic writings, dating back to the dawn of history. Knight lists Rosicrucianism, Gnosticism, the Kabbala, Hinduism, Theosophy and traditional notions of the occult as all playing a part. (Knight 1985:15) According to Clawson's discussion of the Masonry's changing character since the eighteenth century, American Masonry chose to trace its origins for ideological reasons to groups such as the Knights Templar (stalwarts of most conspiracy theories). (1989:78-83) This had many benefits, not least that it allowed the costume of knighthood to be incorporated into higher degree Masonic ritual. Even better, it connected Masonry with the ancient wisdom of the Holy Land. This phenomenon was not unique to Freemasonry. Characteristically, fraternal orders claimed that their orders originated in the very distant past. Odd Fellows claimed Adam as the first member, The Knights of Pythias (founded in Washington, D.C. in 1864) claimed Pythagoras as the first Pythian. The Improved Order of Red Men at first claimed descent from the Sons of Liberty of the American Revolution and then at an 1864 committee meeting decided to trace their origins to the "discovery" of America by Columbus. As Carnes points out, the primary reason for this "was to confer legitimacy upon institutions of recent origin". (Carnes 1989:22)

American Masons claimed the Indian as a "natural Mason" to bolster their own claims to ancient origin. American images of the Indian, as ritualistic, ancient, noble and wise fitted well with Masonic identity. As Deloria has pointed out in his discussion of Indian Masons:

The Freemasons peopled their world with colorful historical figures - temple builders, crusader knights, and wise holy men - who had passed along the ancient secrets of Masonry. Indians inhabited this Masonic world as a curious primal branch of the brotherhood.

If seemingly ancient Native American cultures possessed the same wisdom and ritual, Masons could claim that the great age of their origins had been confirmed". (Deloria 1993:28-36)

The Indian was a positive, legitimating force within the Masonic construction of self. This "ancient" basis to Masonic "enlightenment" allowed Parker special and powerful access to Masonic discourse. By comparison, other fraternal societies such as the Improved Order of Red Men needed to deny not only membership to, but the very contemporary existence of, the Indian. The discourse of the Improved Order of Red Men constructed the Indian as a figure in opposition to modernity and demanded that he remain as an historical artefact. It therefore denied membership to the material, progressive Indians of its heyday in the early twentieth century. (Deloria 1993:36) Their very existence, as living examples of a supposedly "vanished" race, conflicted with the fraternity's construction of self, which needed the Indian only as symbol. Freemasonry, by comparison, needed the Indian as brother, as an historical custodian of its own obscure and mystical "truths". As Deloria points out, this meant that Masons were "trapped in effect by their own discourse of legitimation", a trap which necessitated Masonic conflation of the real and imagined Indian. (Deloria 1993:37) Yet I would qualify Deloria's argument by noting that Masonry displayed this

openness only to *certain* Indians - those adept at cultural brokerage. All the Indian Masons whom Deloria lists; the Cherokees John Ross and Elias Boudinot, the Choctaw Peter Pitchlyn, the Creek Alexander McGillivray were all illustrious and educated exemplars of cross-cultural exchange. Parker's education and Masonic familial history is likely to have contributed to his admission and success within Freemasonry. His great-uncle Ely S. Parker in the nineteenth century had found the same sanctuary in Freemasonry that Parker found in the twentieth. In 1859 Ely spoke to a Masonic audience at a Masonic convention in Chicago, asking:

Where shall I go when the last of my race shall have gone forever? Where shall I find home and sympathy when our last council-fire is extinguished? I said, I will knock at the door of Masonry, and see if the white race will recognise me, as they had my ancestors, when we were strong and the white men weak. I knocked at the door of the Blue Lodge, and found brotherhood around its altar. I knelt before the Great Light in the Chapter, and found companionship beneath the Royal Arch. I entered the Encampment, and found valiant Sir Knights willing to shield me there without regard to race or nation. I went farther. I knelt at the cross of my Saviour, and found Christian brotherhood, the crowning charity of the Masonic tie. (quoted Parker 1919e:97)

Ely S. Parker's entry into the fraternity was, of course, an extension of a connection between Indian leadership and Freemasonry that stretched back to 1776 and Joseph Brant's adoption to the group in England. (Hollcroft 1961:229-47)

This discursive connection between antiquity and Freemasonry, and therefore the connection between the Indian and the Mason,

explains Parker's emphasis upon his "Indian" heritage in his construction of self in his biographical entry submission to the Masonic International Who's Who. (Parker Papers, UR) Here, under Section 4b "Notable facts in career of father, mother or earliest ancestors" Parker wrote;

Father descendent of the Sayen-Quaraughta line of Iroquois chiefs, also Jikonsaseh, compeer of Hiawatha. Mother descendent of line of Earl of Clarendon, (England). Father's family noted all through American history; great grandfather William Parker, (born King), turned Indians to friendly attitude to whites in War of 1812. Name Parker taken at Treaty of Niagara. General Ely Samuel Parker (Uncle), was Gen. U.S. Grant's military secretary. (Parker Papers, UR)

Parker's entry is much more interesting because of what it says about the mores of Freemasonry than it is as a version of Parker's ancestry. Here Parker constructs a "noble" Indian ancestry and lists his mother as being related to English aristocracy. His "Indian" ancestry is patriotic, whilst his mother's aristocratic relative, the Earl of Clarendon, is mentioned in the earliest histories of English Freemasonry. His religion is listed as Protestant (Presbyterian), his politics Independent Republican. He is therefore, an exemplary Mason. By comparison, the ancestry Parker listed in his application for membership to the National Society of Sons of the American Revolution, contains no Indian names. In this context Parker chose to trace his ancestors through his white mother, Geneva H. Griswold. Instead of listing his rather illustrious Indian descent, Parker made no reference to it and instead played up his maternal great-grandfather, Captain Abraham Batchellor, "4th Sutton Company 5th Worcester co.,

reg.," who "marched to Providence on alarm".¹⁰ (Parker Papers, UR)

Masonic ritual was essentially a form of theatre which connected the Indian's dislocation in time with the Masonic dislocation of time in that both the Indian and the Mason existed within a separate and mythical time. The gap between real time and time as it was perceived within the Masonic world has been pinpointed by Carnes:

From the moment the lodge opened, a member's sense of time was blurred. Although meetings were always held in the evening, the ceremonies characteristically began at "daybreak", further distancing members from the outside world. While initiates were being prepared, the actors for the evening took off their clothes and put on robes, loincloths, or aprons. Others placed the scenery, lit the candles and turned off the lights. Gradually the present dissolved, and a conjured sense of the past appeared before their eyes. After the initiations, the process was reversed. (Carnes 1989:29)

Carnes argues that Masons needed to commune with this "alternative past' and were unconcerned over its authenticity. (Carnes 1989:30) These were modern men, those building a new industrial order in a fast developing country, but at the same time they were choosing to invent a ritualised fraternal past. This invention allowed Parker to position himself in the gap between the two realities. Carnes argues that fraternal members were

¹⁰ It would seem that the expression of American patriotism was of importance to Parker throughout his life, as it had been to his father. Parker served as President of the Rochester Chapter of the Empire State Society of the Sons of the American Revolution from 1936-38. In 1944, aged 63, he published A Paragraph History of the Rochester Chapter Sons of the American Revolution which described the group as, "a reservoir of men who pledge their lives to the promotion of the Americanism of the Constitution and who rally to the defence of the blessings that their forefathers achieved during the Revolutionary struggle that finally led to independence. [Parker Papers, UR]

reacting against their present, a present which had "proven barren, devoid of emotional and intellectual sustenance". (Carnes 1989:31) Carnes explains nineteenth-century fascination with fraternal ritual using Victor Turner's analysis of "liminal ritual" which discusses symbols which are in opposition to existing hierarchies and rules. For Turner these rituals were a symptom of societies undergoing cultural change. (Carnes 1989:33)

The work Johannes Fabian is helpful in detailing this dislocation of time within Freemasonic ritual as applied to the Indian. Fabian has highlighted the importance of Time as a "carrier of significance, a form through which we define the content of relations between the Self and the Other" . Time in Fabian's hands is a concept which "may give form to relations of power and inequality under the conditions of capitalist production". (Fabian 1983:ix) The Masonic adoption of the Indian helped to articulate its reaction to turn of the century industrialising America. As Fabian notes; "The posited authenticity of a past (savage, tribal, peasant) serves to denounce an inauthentic present. (Fabian 1983:14) Just as the Indian has been kept out of the time of anthropology, the Indian as Other within turn of the century American discourse was denied "coevality"; denied the same time as, modernising America. Masonic ritual used this temporal distance of the Indian to legitimate its own claims to truth. Parker stepped into that gap between times, as it were, and worked within that space to further his own aims. In a sense, he used a rhetorical fiction as a social and political lever. The "allochronism" of contemporary discourse, its political and rhetorical denial of "coevalness" in Fabian's terms, was useful to

Freemasonry but also useful to Parker. Parker himself used "the ethnographic present tense" within his own anthropology and in his Masonic discourse. (Fabian 1983:31) Fabian has defined "the ethnographic present tense" as "the practice of giving accounts of other cultures and societies in the present tense. A custom, a ritual, even an entire system of exchange or a world view are thus predicated on a group or tribe, or whatever unit the ethnographer happens to choose". (Fabian 1983:80) For Parker, the Indian "race" was a survival, a left-over from another time, an example of "primitive society". He wrote as though his subjects were frozen in history at the time of observation. Worse, this denial of Indian history was in a sense a denial of self in that Parker was living proof of the continuity and change of his own culture.¹¹

I have shown the significance for Parker of making connections and isolating commonalities between Freemasonry and the Indian. This next section will detail Parker's discursive practice. Parker's 1920 article, "Freemasonry Among the American Indians" directly addressed the question of connecting Indian and Masonic worlds. He wrote: "One of the most frequent questions directed to the ethnologist who concerns himself with a study of the American aborigine is, "Are Indians Masons?". (Parker 1920f:295) Parker's first task in this article was to connect Indians of the past with contemporary Masonic Indians. He made clear that twentieth century Indians have fully progressed within the fraternity:

¹¹ For a fuller explanation of the idea of "the ethnographic present tense" see: [Fabian, J. (1983) *Time and The Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press in particular:80-87] For a separate account of Indian "timelessness" see Baker, W. (1983) *Backward: An Essay on Indians, Time and Photography* Berkeley, Cal.: North Atlantic Books.

Today there are numerous Indians who are Free and Accepted Masons. One can scarcely travel in Oklahoma, Nebraska, Kansas or the Dakotas without meeting Indians who belong to the ancient fraternity. Many of the most influential Indians of the Dakotas and especially of Oklahoma have full knowledge of the mysteries of Masonry and have sought further light in the concordant orders. (Parker 1920f:295)

All the Masonic writing by Parker dealt with in this chapter returned to this same question - whether Indians have ever been in possession of some proto-Masonic understanding. His conclusion here was that ancient Indians may have had knowledge of some "extra-limital masonry, as if some uninstructed groups of mankind saw through a glass darkly, - and craved more light". (Parker 1920f:298) To support his argument that Indians possessed "extra-limital or universal freemasonry", he described four "Masonic" characteristics ascribable to "the more cultivated natives of the new world". These were: a) Indian belief in a Supreme Deity b) an Indian conception of virtue c) Indian belief in a future life d) Indian knowledge of "the universal and eternal kinship of all created things". (Parker 1920f:297) This last "fraternity" corresponded to the fraternal ideal of universal brotherhood. Parker argued that the four characteristics meant that Indians had possessed "the ability to construct an organisation similar under the circumstances of forest and plains life to the freemasonry of the white man". He discussed the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin who had "fraternal or 'medicine' societies" which, like Masonry, had "several degrees culminating in the resurrection of the candidate who represents a slain hero". (Parker 1920f:297) The 1920 article also detailed The Little Water Society ritual, the ritual of the Iroquois "Ancient Guards

of Mystic Potence" or "Neh-Ho-noh-chee-noh-ga Nee-ga-hee-ga-aa" which Parker argued were evidence of universal Freemasonry.(Parker 1920f:297) His description of the Little Water Society ritual shows it to be very similar to "the rites of Osiris" integral to third degree Masonic ritual. (Parker1920f:297) He described the ritual lodge as being similar to the Masonic temple. The Masonic allusions and keywords are obvious: "It may be interesting to state further that the form of the lodge is an oblong and has two altars, one east and one west. Its ritual is sung or chanted by all the members, thereby rendering "lost words" or forgotten sections next to impossible". (Parker 1920f:297-298) Parker tied Masonic ritual to the survival of the Indian, describing how when these mystic guards stopped practising their ritual, which was so similar to Masonic ritual, then "the red man" would "pass into extinction". (Parker 1920f:297)

Parker repeated the argument that there were commonalities between Indians and Masons in the 1919 article "American Indian Freemasonry" published in a Masonic journal. Parker held that the topic was "a Masonic opportunity to which the writer as a student of anthropology, respectfully invites your interest". Here he concluded that "the Indians had indeed a Freemasonry but not the Accepted Masonry". (Parker 1919a:9) Like Masons, Indians drew lessons and symbolism from a temple, the "Temple of Nature". (Parker 1919a:13) Their "unwritten gospels" preached exactly the same values so cherished by Masons - "Fortitude, Loyalty, Patriotism, Tolerance, Fraternity and Gratitude". (Parker 1919a:22) Like Freemasons, Indians had understood the significance of secrecy and their societies had "possession of

ritualistic words that belonged exclusively to the cult or fraternity' which were "jealously guarded". (Parker 1919a:16) The Seneca Iroquois had "the thread of the legend of Osiris" evidence of "inherent Freemasonry". (Parker 1919a:33) Parker even called for the organisation of "a Masonic Museum of Archaeology and History" because of the "intimate connection between archaeology and Masonry" arguing that "Every relic that is found on the sites where once lived the primitive peoples of the world is a lost letter syllable or word". (Parker 1919a:16) Again in the 1922 article, "Secrets of the Temple", published by the Buffalo Masonic Consistory, Parker spelt out his "deep interest in these Masonic subjects" and reiterated the beliefs common to the Indian and Masonic worlds. (Parker 1922c:4) The article was an attempt by Parker to present "the bare truth...regarding the inner history and significance of certain Masonic symbols, signs and customs". (Parker 1922c:3) He described the Masonic significance of the Biblical Ark of the Covenant and related it to Indian culture: "the various tribes of American Indians had their sacred oaks or boxes and these were carried into battle just as was the ark of Yahwe Militant by the Jews, to give success in battle". (Parker 1922c:42).

Later in life, aged 66, Parker was still repeating his message that the Indian shared common ground with Masons. His address in 1947 to a lodge in Vermont was entitled "The Age-Old Appeal of Universal Freemasonry" and it once again connected the Indian to the Mason. (Parker on the occasion of the Sesqui-Centennial of Franklin Lodge, No.4, F. and A.M. of St. Albans, Vermont, 15 October 1947, Parker Papers, UR) His address traced the Scottish

and English origins of the "mighty fraternity" back to the 16th century, but was essentially an argument for Indians as always having had special understanding of Masonic principles. Parker's premise was that "the deeper meaning of Freemasonry" was "ageless as well as ancient" and that it was known to his race. ("The Age-Old Appeal of Universal Freemasonry" Parker Papers, UR) He argued that recent research had shown the Indian to be of true Masonic calibre: "Only when these aborigines had been broken, confused and reduced to hunted animals did an awakening science find in them better values than had been dreamed". ("The Age-Old Appeal of Universal Freemasonry", Parker Papers, UR) Parker argued that historic conflicts over Indian lands might have been mitigated had civilised America "not only known but recognised the essential "Brotherhood of Man" adding as a codicil that the famous Mohawk Iroquois chief Joseph Brant was a Mason.¹² Once again Parker set himself the question of whether the American Indian "could have qualified as a Freemason", justifying his discussion by arguing that an examination of Indian religious and moral beliefs would allow his Masonic audience to understand their own "deeper philosophy". ("The Age-Old Appeal of Universal Freemasonry", Parker Papers, UR) Parker isolated five aspects of Indian belief which had Masonic significance. Like Masons, "higher groups of native people recognised a force in the universe that is beyond man", the "primal cause". Because "primitive" peoples had "a deep belief in an ever-lasting essence within man called the soul" which "acquired the substance of its immortality" they comprehended

¹² The Iroquois Joseph Brant is, of course, reviled within a section of present-day Iroquoia because of his historical connection to the British. He was initiated as a Mason in London in 1776 whilst visiting England negotiating the Iroquois role in the Revolutionary War.

the central Masonic tenet of immortality. ("The Age-Old Appeal of Universal Freemasonry", Parker Papers, UR) The Indian also understood morality, another idea central to Masonic thinking. Further, Indian pantheism was, he argued, a form of fraternal brotherhood and Indian hospitality was further evidence of their understanding of the "idea of universal brotherhood" and charity. Although Parker made clear that Masonry was in itself unique, he tempered the general thrust of his article by concluding that the Indian possessed " a pre-Grand Lodge Masonic philosophy in a generative form". The Mason:

must ever remember that behind the rite and ceremony, behind the letter-perfection of the catechist, the initiation and raising, the signs, grips and words, the symbols, the oaths and the lights, are deep meanings that are understood and have been understood for centuries by many diverse peoples of the earth. ("The Age-Old Appeal of Universal Freemasonry", Parker Papers, UR)

Parker discussed Iroquois myth in order to provide evidence that the "red man...sensed eternal truths and found similar symbolic language" to the American Freemason. ("The Age-Old Appeal of Universal Freemasonry", Parker Papers, UR) In other contexts, such as in his role as Director of the Rochester Museum of Arts & Sciences, Parker similarly reinforced common correspondences between Indian and Masonic ritual. In Museum Service Parker underlined the significance of Masonic aspects to Iroquois Indian life; the common focus upon ritual, rites of adoption and the symbolic and spiritual significance of names and naming. However, by the 1930s, Masonry had lost much of its centrality to middle-class male American life and the American public had begun to laugh at the brotherhood and fraternities of

previous generations.¹³ Yet, as late as 1947, Parker remained committed to conservative Masonic values and characterised Masonry as a bulwark against any threat to Democracy, Masonic morality being integral to the "defence of American character". Parker concluded his article by warning his fellow Masons that Masonry should protect itself against any "diseased thinking that puts self above the common good". ("The Age-Old Appeal of Universal Freemasonry", Parker Papers, UR)

We have seen that Parker's status within early twentieth century Freemasonry - a white, male Protestant and middle-class society, allowed him to bring the idea of the Indian closer to the American mainstream. The Fraternity's rhetoric facilitated this because its idea of the Indian existed within a dislocated sense of the past. The rhetorical connection of Indian and Mason served to legitimise the fraternity and also served to bring the idea of the Indian closer to American middle-class values. Parker's use and manipulation of the fraternity's rhetoric allows us to see the integrative forces of the period operating from a unique perspective. We see a determined Native American being constitutive of integrative change, rather than simply being subject to those forces. This viewpoint is a departure from standard approaches to the nature of Native American assimilation in this period. Most such studies, however they choose to define assimilation, tend to take a "top down" analytical approach and discuss white integrative forces acting *upon* Native Americans. One example, is Hoxie who deals with *white* leaders,

¹³ One example was the TV character Ralph Kramden, a member of the "Loyal Order of Racoons".

mostly those in the executive or legislative branches of the federal government or in anthropology. Of course, these whites were the architects of the drive for assimilation that was the larger political and social Native American reality for Parker during the period when he wrote most of these Masonic texts. These were the people who mapped out the limitations of Indian integration and assimilation. As Hoxie makes clear, in the early twentieth century, Indians as a group were asked to "remain on the periphery of American society, ruled by outsiders who promised to guide them toward 'civilisation' but did not expect them to participate in American life as the equal of their conquerors". (Hoxie 1992:241)

Parker's white and Indian heritage meant that he inhabited the interstice of these two separate cultures and viewpoints and his was a radically different perspective from those who sought to structure his role within American society. As a Freemason, Parker stubbornly attempted to do exactly what white society no longer held possible for modern Native Americans, that is "to participate in American life as the equal of their conquerors". By the early twentieth century a redefinition of Indian assimilation was in progress reflecting fundamental shifts in social values. As Hoxie has made clear, in this period, "politicians and intellectuals rejected the notion that national institutions would dissolve cultural differences and foster equality and cohesion. (Hoxie 1992:241) In place of that idea American leaders argued "that each group should play its proper role and work with others to preserve the social order". (Hoxie 1992:242) The value of detailing Parker's Masonic involvement is that it shows him to be participating in the construction of the Indian's "proper" role. He

used Masonic discourse to add his voice to the American debate on the nature of society and to position the Indian positively within that debate. If Freemasons were representatively American, as middle-class, white Protestants of good character and Parker was a respected Freemason, and tribal Indians were inherent Freemasons, there should be no hindrance to full Indian participation in American life.

PARKER AND THE INDIAN NEW DEAL: 1935-1941

This chapter will show that the Indian New Deal, in the form of the Seneca Arts Project and Tonawanda Community House, provided Parker with an opportunity to stimulate Indian integration into American society; the chance to emulate his mentor Morgan; and the chance to create commodities which had trade value within the museum economy. The *rhetoric* of Collier's Indian New Deal administration centred on Indian cultural revival and Indian self-determination, an approach based on a model which did not fully recognise the diversity of Indian culture. However, in the 1930s, Parker and the Indian New Deal shared the same expressed aim of integrating the Indian into American society without sacrifice of Indian cultural traditions. By analysis of the Indian New Deal and Parker's use of New Deal funds to run the Seneca Arts Project and build the Tonawanda Community House, I will draw conclusions about time in relation to the ethnographic and popular representation of the Indian in this period and describe how and why the Seneca were required by Parker to reproduce their material past in order to facilitate their future integration into twentieth century American society.

Roosevelt's New Deal for the American people included an extensive relief programme to combat the poverty and suffering caused by the Great Depression and two of the new bureaucracies he created to distribute relief were the Works Progress Administration (WPA) and the Temporary Relief Administration (TERA).¹ Since 1924, Parker had worked as Director of the

¹ For a discussion of the W.P.A by Parker, see: [Parker,A.C. (1938) "We Like the WPA" Museum Service 11:7: September 15]

Rochester Municipal Museum, New York. He found at Rochester many of the same problems that he had struggled against as archaeologist at the New York State Museum in Albany including a lack of opportunity for growth and a low budget.² Ironically, the New Deal response to national economic distress allowed Parker an opportunity to turn around the finances of the museum and increase its resources. As Parker put it in 1935, "We set the machine going once more". (Parker to J. Keppler 10 July, 1935, Parker Archive, RMSC) During this period, Parker used his position as director of the Rochester Municipal Museum to organise two separate reservation work-relief schemes: the construction of a reservation community house at Tonawanda from 1935 to its final dedication in 1939, and the Seneca Arts and Crafts Project which operated from 1935 to 1941. The Tonawanda Indian Community House was funded by the WPA and The Seneca Arts Project was funded initially by the TERA and from 1935 by the WPA in co-operation with Parker's employer, the Rochester Municipal Museum which acted as a sponsor. The Arts Project was based at the Seneca Tonawanda reservation, near Akron, New York and to a lesser extent at the Cattaraugus reservation, about 50 miles from Tonawanda, sites which Parker had known well since childhood. The Arts Project employed around 100 artists who produced over 5000 separate arts and crafts items which remained the property of the Rochester Museum. The Tonawanda building used all Indian labour, taught the Senecas involved transferable skills and provided a social and educational focus for the

² In December 1932, Parker resigned from the position as Director after the museum's finance was cut by almost two thirds to \$17,000. When the city council reconsidered and the budget was partially restored, Parker retracted his resignation [Parker, A.C. (1932) "Arthur Parker Resigns" Museum Service 10: 1: 1st December]

reservation. It remains to this day, a testimony both to Parker and to the best of the Iroquois Indian New Deal.

Change in the nation's idea of the Indian had begun in the 1920s with a series of governmental assessments of Indian conditions. In 1923, Hubert Work, then Secretary of the Interior took steps to examine the Indian "problem". Work appointed the Committee of One Hundred "to review and advise on Indian policy". The group included civic leaders, reformers headed by John Collier, anthropologists Alfred A. Kroeber and Clark Wissler and a delegation from the Society of American Indians. The SAI group included Thomas D. Sloan, Sherman Coolidge, Henry Roe Cloud and Arthur Caswell Parker. Congress largely ignored the group's recommendations to improve health and educational provision on the reservations, sponsor training to develop Indian leaders, settle claims and investigate peyote use but did not make any recommendation on the salient issue of Indian citizenship. Collier described the group's achievements as "innocuous". However, the Committee's deliberations did signal a beginning to the significant Indian reform of the succeeding decades. In the following year Congress gave citizenship to all Indians born within the boundaries of the United States. Yet this in itself did not universally guarantee Indians the vote or other civil rights, particularly in the West. The next important review of the Indian "problem" began in 1926 and was independently sponsored by John D. Rockefeller, Jr. through the Institute for Government Research. It was published in 1928 as The Problem of Indian Administration. The publication, informally referred to as the Meriam Report, highlighted what it termed "deplorable conditions" on the reservations. High mortality rates

reflected poor health provision, disease, malnutrition, low income and unsanitary living conditions. Clearly, the reform impetus and programme of assimilation embodied by the Dawes Act of 1887 had failed. The Meriam Report made many of the same recommendations as the Committee of One Hundred. It also called for a loan fund to stimulate business on the reservations and recommended that the policy of allotment should end. It referred to "The fostering and development of the native arts" as "a wholesome thing in inter-racial relations". The basic thrust of the report was in essence Indian integration through education. Indians needed to be educated to help themselves "so that they may be absorbed into the prevailing civilization or be fitted to live in the presence of that civilization at least in accordance with a minimum standard of health and decency". (Meriam et al., 1928:51) The Meriam Report, like the Dawes Act, assumed Indian integration into American society could be achieved in a generation:

The belief is that it is a sound policy of national economy to make general expenditures in the next few decades with the object of winding up the national administration of Indian affairs. The people of the United States have the opportunity, if they will, to write the closing chapters of the history of the relationship of the national government to the Indians. The early chapters contain little of which the country may be proud. It would be something of a national atonement to the Indians if the closing chapters should disclose the national government supplying the Indians with an Indian Service which would be a model for all governments concerned with the development and advancement of a retarded race. (Meriam et al 1928:51)

As Berkhofer notes, "Cultural pluralism seemed but the icing on the cake of assimilation". (Berkhofer 1979:182) However, most

Indian reform required the support of Congress and it was not until 1932 and the election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt that significant legislative change began.

Roosevelt appointed John Collier Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1933. Collier helped set the tone for the work of government agencies like the WPA and although not directly involved, politely co-operated with the plans for the construction of the Tonawanda Indian Community House. (Hauptman 1981:xii) He held the position of Commissioner longer than any other and facilitated significant and long-term change. His twelve years of office saw a new governmental approach which resulted in new legislation: the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) and Johnson O'Malley Act of 1934, the Indian Arts and Crafts Board Act of 1935, the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act of 1936 and the Alaska Reorganization Act of 1936. Most significantly, the Indian New Deal saw the repeal of the land allotment dynamic of the Dawes Act and ended the alienation of Indian land which accompanied it; it set up tribal governments and granted those bodies "certain rights of home rule" and established reservation credit loan facilities. The Indian New Deal eased poor conditions on the reservations, began the process of rebuilding Indian self-determination and self-esteem and preserved and developed the Indian landbase.

Yet it is important to note that Collier always justified his reform in terms of the ultimate integration of the Indian into American society, albeit on Indian as well as white terms. From 1922 to 1933 Collier had attacked Indian land allotment and the drive for assimilation because it centred around a belief that all Americans should conform to one, homogenous cultural standard. He was

concerned to actively *promote* Indian culture, rebuild tribal society and government and develop and expand the Indian landbase. Collier's history of the New Deal, and the histories of those involved in it, have presented the events of the New Deal period as being largely a fulfilment of this dream of Indian autonomy. However, since the late 1960s, Indian and white scholars have provided another perspective on that history. (Kelly 1975; Costo (1986); Parman 1976; McNickle 1980) Recent work has made a distinction between Collier's New Deal rhetoric, wider governmental aims and the actual effect of legislative change on native communities. Collier's original 50-page proposal in 1934 for an Indian New Deal was undeniably revolutionary in that it detailed a case for the restoration of Indian political and cultural self-determination. The document proposed to give Indians power over the selection and retention of government employees and to create a federal Indian court system. However, these proposals underwent major modification so that, as McNickle has pointed out, "colonial rule was left intact". Kelly has argued that certain changes to Collier's original proposal were made "more as a means of integrating Indians into the white economic system than as a means of increasing their autonomy". For Kelly, the IRA was not a radical break with policies of the past; it "sought not so much to reverse the nation's historic attitude toward the Indians as to freeze it where it was in 1934". (Kelly 1975:310) As Berkhofer notes; "If Collier hoped to revive old-time tribal community control and culture, Congress at best preferred to stabilize Indian acculturation and assimilation as it was in 1934 without forcing change either forward or backward". (Berkhofer 1979:184) Collier feared for the cultural survival of the Indian and saw the development of Indian

arts and crafts as integral to a successful Indian economic policy, which he believed would in turn lead to cultural preservation. As Robert Fay Schrader argues, "the motivation behind the federal government's early role in Indian arts and crafts was a desire to industrialize the Indians" and therefore "to assimilate them into society". (Schrader 1983:244)³ Parker saw the Seneca Arts Project as just such an exercise in integrating Indians through industry. Irrespective of the rhetoric of Collier's aims and speeches, the Indian New Deal was concerned with the incorporation of the Indian into American society, a concern reflected in Parker's aims for the two schemes. Whereas the Dawes Act of 1887 had been fundamentally concerned with stimulating individualism and individual ownership of private property within tribal communities, the rhetoric of Collier's Indian New Deal was concerned with its opposite, tribal community and tribal ownership of communally-held land. Collier's work among immigrants in New York prior to World War 1 had led him to share the ideas of community pluralism, developed by people like Mary Follett and E. Lindeman. They saw community based on ethnicity as the basis of the renovation of American society. This approach demanded a rejection of assimilationist ideals for both immigrants and Indians.⁴

Boasian anthropology and the cultural pluralist view of cultures as self-sustaining, integrated wholes accompanied a new approach to

³ Schrader's book has a distinct regional bias, makes very little mention of the Iroquois and mostly deals with Plains tribes.

⁴ See, [Collier, J. (1963) From Every Zenith: A Memoir Denver: Sage Books:93-100, 230-234] for the genesis of Collier's social reform ideas. Collier registered the major influences on his ideas on Indians: his concern to recover a sense of community in the cities in his early work at the Peoples Institute in New York City and also his fascination with the British colonial system of indirect rule. Refer also to: [Collier, J. (1945) "The Indian Administration as a Laboratory in Ethnic Affairs" Social Research 12:265-303 & Kunitz, S. J. (1971) "The Social History of John Collier" Ethnohistory 18 :213-239]

the Indian. The *unassimilated* Indian became representative of an older and better form of society when contrasted by intellectuals and reformers with a materialistic, automated and secular modernising America. The perceived social disintegration of an individualistic and increasingly urban America was compared with an idealised and ahistorical concept of community within tribal culture. The American public's general interest in traditional crafts was related to this intellectual back-lash against increasing industrialisation. Those Indian groups which were least assimilated, least like modern America, received most attention. One example was the agricultural Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, who provided the backdrop for Mabel Luhan's artists' colony at Taos. Collier visited the colony in November, 1920 and found in the Pueblos, his dream of ideal society. He wrote in his autobiography:

The discovery that came to me there in that tiny group of a few hundred Indians, was of personality-forming institutions, even now weakened, which had survived repeated and immense historical shocks, and which were going right on in the production of states of mind, attitudes of mind, earth-loyalties and human-loyalties, amid a context of beauty which suffused all the life of the group...It might be that only the Indians, among the peoples of this hemisphere at least, were still the possessors and users of the fundamental secret of life - the secret of building great personality through the instrumentality of social institutions. (Collier 1963:126)

As Berkhofer puts it, Collier "romanticized the heritage of these folk societies as part of his alienation from his own 'sick' times, and the Pueblos became his own personal countercultural utopia". (Berkhofer 1979:178) Many of the most serious criticisms made of

the Indian New Deal can be related to the limitations of this idealised picture of Indian society when it formed the basis of Indian reform. Collier's reform was tailored to this vision of Indian society and not to the diversity of Indian experience which included interaction and accommodation to white culture, both in the past and, crucially, in at the time of New Deal reform. In this, the Indian New Deal denied the history of the Iroquois and assimilated Seneca Iroquois like Parker. Neither did Collier have the unmitigated support of the anthropological discipline. Boas showed characteristic fear of generalisation when he wrote to Hubert Ickes, Secretary of the Interior in 1932, to oppose Collier's appointment, accusing Collier of being unnecessarily opinionated and emotional about Indian reform. (Tylor 1975:151) Boas' work was a reaction against older "armchair anthropologists" such as Morgan who had formulated laws based on necessarily limited fieldwork. By comparison, Boas shied away from any synthesis which could be translated directly into Indian reform.⁵ However anthropology was an integral part of Collier's New Deal reform. He supervised the creation of an Applied Anthropology Staff at the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1934. The Iroquois "resident anthropologist" or community worker from February 1935 to August 1937 was William N. Fenton. Collier defined his role as being "to promote group meetings, clubs and classes, especially for adults" and to cooperate with the Indians in all efforts to develop "economic, social and health programs, with the objective of fostering of definite civic and social responsibilities". (quoted in Hauptman 1981:108) Through various activities which included

⁵ See: [Krupat, A.(1992) Ethnocriticism: Ethnography, History, Literature Berkeley: University of California Press :81-100] for a discussion of Boas' relationship to modernism and irony.

working closely with Parker on the Community House and Arts Project, Fenton's job was at least partially to educate the Iroquois towards integration into the white world.⁶

The Iroquois rejection of the Indian Reorganisation Act of 1934 is representative of the limitations of Collier's reform. The Iroquois were part of the one third of Indian tribes who did not vote to come under the IRA. They organised a co-ordinated campaign to block the Act primarily because they cherished a fundamental concept of their own sovereignty which they felt conflicted with its application. The six separate nations - Senecas, Onondagas, Cayugas, Mohawks, Oneidas, and Tuscaroras which make up the Iroquois, recognise a second level of pan-national organisation, the League or Six Nations Confederacy. Although the Confederacy has never been recognised by the United States, it represents all Iroquois tribes and bases its claim to fundamental Iroquois sovereignty on three main 18th century treaties - Fort Stanwix (1784), Jay (1794) and Canandaigua (1794). When the United States bestowed citizenship and the vote to all American Indians in 1924, many Iroquois rejected it because they saw themselves as already citizens of their own independent nations within the Confederacy, as guaranteed by treaty. The Dawes Act had not been universally applied to New York and up until the 1930s, the Iroquois, and in particular the Seneca, had had little attention from federal officials. There was entrenched opposition to the Bureau of Indian Affairs which Collier now headed. The Iroquois concept of

⁶ Hauptman claims that Fenton's success at Tonawanda can be attributed to "his keen ability to speak the Seneca language". [Hauptman, L. (1981) *The Iroquois and The New Deal* Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press:106-135] However, in an interview I conducted on 14 March, 1993, Fenton denied ever being in any way fluent in the Seneca language.

sovereignty clashed by definition with Collier's legislation for tribal reorganisation. As Hauptman makes clear, he did not understand the Iroquois and in particular their "overriding concern with legality as well as with the real and symbolic reaffirmation of treaty rights". (Hauptman 1981:29) The Iroquois were not "Indian" in the same way as the quintessential Pueblos which were Collier's standard. They required specific and particular help during the New Deal period which did not correspond to policy formulated to preserve cultures of the southwest. Hauptman argues that Collier "learned a lesson" from his failure to achieve tribal reorganisation in New York and he instead concentrated on working behind the scenes encouraging community projects such as the Tonawanda Community House. It was against this problematic background that Parker formulated schemes such as the Arts Project and Community House which provided a much better and more acceptable deal for the Seneca Iroquois than Collier's 1934 Act.

The Arts project offered Parker a way of raising both finance and the museum's profile in a time of economic cutbacks and decreasing museum visitors. The Seneca Arts Project was his idea and he wrote the required proposals, hired all the Indian and non-Indian personnel on the reservations and at the museum connected to it and was the professional in general charge of the scheme. TERA set up its relief programme for artists in December 1932. In April 1934 Parker's correspondence shows that he had begun circulating a project proposal to New York State agencies. (Parker to Dr. Lewis A. Wilson, April 18, 1934, Indian Arts Project

Correspondence, RMSC)⁷ By July, 1934 the Project was off the ground with its own personnel. An extract from Parker's three-page proposal reads;

The Rochester Municipal Museum proposes a project by which the almost extinct arts and crafts of the New York Indians may be preserved and put on a *production basis in order that such activity and products may contribute to the relief and self-support of the said Indian population.* (Quoted in Hauptman 1979:292 Emphasis added)

In 1935 Parker published "Museum Motives Behind the New York Arts Project" and the article shows that he saw the project as an exercise to enable the Seneca to ascend an evolutionary scale. (Parker 1935d) Rather than community, the first word used by Parker in the article was "racial". (Parker 1935d:11) For Parker, the project was not simply an opportunity to provide relief for a poverty-stricken location, or primarily about the creation of a Seneca artistic renaissance but was an opportunity to equip the Seneca with productive skills so that they could become part of capitalist modern America. In this instance, those productive skills were the ability to reproduce the artefacts collected by Morgan in the early nineteenth century. For Parker, the New Deal provided the Indian with a means of being part of American society economically which did not involve discarding Indian traditions. In fact it required selling those traditions, selling copies of objects symbolic of a constructed Indian past. Parker sought to "capitalize the best in ancient art and to redevelop it as a racial contribution". The Project had "commercial...features" that would "provide a

⁷ The Arts Project was originally combined with another proposal to make an extensive archaeological survey of the Genesee Valley.

better type of manufactures for trade" but reproduced would be "typical of the days when Indian art was original and pristine".

Parker spelt out a clear scheme or "scale" of racial development which echoed Morgan's Ancient Society using Morgan's terms, savagery and civilisation. Like Morgan, he related what he termed "racial genius" to "mental energy":

Racial groups are evaluated [sic] by their creative ability and power to produce that which others greatly desire. Imitative people may succeed for a while in competition but they sink lower and lower in the scale. The thinking producer in the end wins by his originality and mental energy. Imitating does not build a vigorous mind. (Parker 1935d:11)

He bemoaned the fact that Indian "racial genius" had been suppressed because they had been forced to "imitate all the cultural patterns of the European" to the detriment of "native thinking, native art" and "native creative ability". (Parker 1935d:11) He argued: "The fact is that only those who have something in ancestry, racial inheritance and creative ability have power to contribute to the world and are inherently worth saving. The cheap imitator can well be dispensed with".(Parker 1935d:11) This concern with unproductive imitation by Indians is interesting when juxtaposed with his later confusion, exemplified in a 1941 article discussed below over whether the work produced by the Senecas of the Arts Project was in fact "reproduction" (imitation) or original native art. (Parker 1941d:31) The Seneca Arts Project was about making the Seneca "worth saving" through their production of "objects that have ethnological value". (Parker 1935d:12)

Reproducing the artefacts of their ancestors would allow the Seneca a place in American society.

Parker's proposal to the TERA described a plan to manufacture and record the "activities and general ceremonies of the New York Indians", instruction and supervision to be by "native experts" with the Rochester Museum assuming ultimate responsibility. The chief "native expert" was Parker himself. The proposal also stressed that "about forty per cent of the Indian population on these reservations" were on relief and suggested that the project would be largely rehabilitational in nature and provide meaningful employment in hard times. (quoted in Hauptman 1979:292) As Hauptman stresses, in the six and a half years that the Project endured, Parker's role as publicist, promoter and speechmaker enabled the Project to withstand the financial crises that occurred on an annual basis from 1935 to 1941. (Hauptman 1981:287) The fact that it survived the period, Hauptman concludes was because of Parker's "writing and promotional abilities and his ability to work with both Democrats and Republicans as well as Rochester's men of wealth". (Hauptman 1979:303) In fact, at a point when other Rochester Museum projects were being cut, the Project's funding was actually increased. The Project's success owed much to Parker's ability as a publicist and his cultivation of those in control of funding across the political spectrum. Hauptman has detailed the media attention which Parker obtained for the project including his promotion of it through his own radio programme. (Hauptman 1979:304) Like most publicists, Parker stretched the truth a little. For example, he told newspapers that Ernest Smith, the most acclaimed artist on the project who later achieved national

acclaim, had never painted before. He also used the technique which had worked so well to further his museum career, of giving influential whites status within Indian culture in order to cultivate their support. The Governor of New York State was adopted by the Seneca and given a name which translated as "One who governs with justice". The New York WPA director received the name "Sa-Go-Ya-Da-Geh-Hus" or "He Helps All". In each case the adoption ceremony was conducted by a Project worker, Jesse Cornplanter, and Parker presided over the welcoming ceremonies. Cornplanter was a well known "show Indian" and published author. (Fenton 1978:177-195) Parker had a long-standing association with the Cornplanter extended family. Edward Cornplanter had been one of his most significant informants on Seneca rituals and on the Code of Handsome Lake. (Parker 1912) As Fenton has noted, "the whole family was involved in rounding up informants and collecting relics for the museums with which Parker was affiliated". (Fenton 1978:183) Parker employed several other personal contacts for the administration of the scheme. One was Robert Tahamont, married to one of Parker's cousins at Tonawanda, an educated Abenaki and skilled carpenter. Another, Cephas Hill, unlike Parker spoke Seneca well, and his personality and respected position among the Seneca helped the project succeed.

But most significantly, Parker used the fact that the project was "very good business" to sustain the support of the Rochester City administration. His secretary wrote:

There are also a good many hundreds of records and manufactured objects made for us on the project which are priceless due to the fact that they will never be duplicated. There is other material of average quality which through exchange with other museums

brings to us much needed material at a minimum of cost. From the viewpoint of ethnologists and anthropologists of other museums, based on our own experience, it is safe to say that this material is easily worth three times its total cost. (quoted in Hauptman 1979:303)

The original project proposal had carefully stipulated that the museum would supply all tools and raw materials and that the arts and crafts produced would be "turned over to the said museum as its property and which it can use for exchange or other distribution with other museums or the public". The Project produced wooden cradleboards, false face masks, flat carvings, benches, bowls, ladles, spoons; also silver jewellery, "finger-woven" baskets, tump lines, bags and burden straps; embroidered beadwork and pine quill work used for costumes and water-colours (100), oil paintings and pen sketches. The project provided work relief and alleviated the poverty on Tonawanda and Cattaraugus reservations and it revitalised Seneca Iroquois tribal culture. In the early 1930s, the traditional skills of the east had fallen into disuse in favour of Plains Indian design as a response to the tourist trade. In terms of the commodity economics of the museum world, the Project manufactured valuable goods which were a professional boon for Parker. After the close of the Project the Rochester Museum was able to trade some of the Iroquois materials produced to acquire a "richly diverse North American Indian collection as well as other ethnological exhibits". (Hauptman 1979:294) Thus Parker's idea, to give relief to the Indians of "his" reservations, not only helped them, but did much for the Rochester Museum and consequently for its director. The Project fitted with his concept both of the museum as a vehicle for social service within the community and

of the "museist" (Parker's neologism) as business entrepreneur. Parker discussed the duty of the museist to be entrepreneurial in the Rochester Museum publication Museum Service around the time of the Project's close. In "Museums Mean Business" he described how "many a museum worker handles his funds in such a manner that he creates values far in excess of his recompense and does so year after year" and pointed out that;

The vast resources of many museums of note and numerous smaller ones have not come from budget appropriations entirely but from the keen business sense of museum workers in increasing values. ...This was the very technique... employed by research laboratories that give an experimenter a thousand dollars and reap a million". (Parker 1941e:26)

Parker's "keen business sense" as a museum director demanded that the "art" produced by the Seneca had be of good enough quality for exchange within the museum market. Therefore he exercised great control over the type of work produced on the Project so that the Seneca created exactly what had trade value. He attempted to *re-produce* the Indian artefacts which Morgan had collected in the early 19th century. This collection had been destroyed by a fire at the State Capitol in 1911, much to Parker's chagrin. Although he delegated administrative details, he retained overall editorial control over production within the project. As Hauptman notes, "Since few of the artists had any formal training, Parker created, in effect, the "Iroquois School of Art". (Hauptman 1979:297) It was Parker who told artists such as Ernest Smith, who later became known nationally, which myth or legend to paint.⁸

⁸ Whilst on the Tonawanda Reservation in March 1992, I was told by Ramona Charles, who now is in charge of the Tonawanda Community House, how upon taking up her post, Smith's paintings were in disrepair, torn and not on display. She subsequently had to struggle to get them restored. It would seem

What he wanted from the project was ethnographic reproduction rather than contemporary Seneca art. He used the Project as an opportunity to replicate a lost valuable collection and to create reproductions which were valuable museum commodities. As he put it in a letter to the President of the Tonawanda Chief's council: "the workers are required to make duplicates of ancient patterns which the Rochester Museum supplies, suggests, or authorizes various persons to make" in order to "produce such material of any kind or sort as may be of use to the museum". (Parker to President Jones Nov. 21, 1935 Parker Papers, UR)

Parker's published articles about the Project presented a different picture however. In November, 1941 he wrote; "We allowed the workers to develop their own designs, take their own time and to create things *as if* for themselves". (Parker 1941d:31) He gave the impression that the idea to copy "designs found in Beauchamp and Morgan" were the artists' own even though they were "encouraged...to employ correct ethnological patterns". (Parker 1941d:33 Emphasis added) Another article by Parker points out that "only in extreme cases" had "any instruction been given, it being believed that our function is to assist in bringing out the innate ability of our Indian workers themselves". (1935d:11) However, Hauptman has argued that Parker was in fact an exacting critic of the standards of production of his Project workers. He introduced artefacts he or his colleague William A. Ritchie had found on Iroquois archaeological sites to inspire the artists and showed the Seneca illustrations he found from Morgan's writings to copy. Parker, William N. Fenton and Hill worked closely

therefore, that Smith's paintings may not have been valued in the way Hauptman suggests.[Interview Charles, R. 27th March 1992]

together, visiting nearly all the museums, historical societies and galleries in New York that had Iroquois ethnographic material and photographed collections to serve as models for the Project's artists. They also found older Indians, who still remembered traditional skills such as weaving baskets and burden straps and sashes, revived the skill and it was passed on to younger Senecas. Quality and a particular concept of "authenticity" were paramount for Parker, not least because he needed what was produced for trade with other museums and institutions. The Indian Arts Project's correspondence also betrays the difficulty during the New Deal period of finding "authentic" materials to work with - animal bones, beads, buckskins, black ash splint and porcupine quills. Parker's administrator, on orders from Parker, complained that the "costumes are somewhat clownish rather than authentic Iroquois" and expressed Parker's concern to avoid "show-Indian" style dress. (C. Carleton Perry to Cephas Hill, 18th Dec., 1939 Indian Arts Project Correspondence, RMSC) The concern for accuracy was more fully revealed in a letter sent by Parker's administrator to an Oklahoma Indian trading post in 1937:

Do you have any Indian tanned deer skin? If so, will you kindly quote prices. We are looking for skins as near like those used by Indians in the Eastern Woodland Group in the sixteenth century, which are not exactly the same as the buckskin used by the Plains' Indians. However, if the only thing you have available is buckskin, I would appreciate having you send a small sample or skin for examination. (quoted in Hauptman 1979:300-301)

According to Hauptman, Parker fostered rivalry between the two Project sites, Tonawanda and Cattaraugus, and favoured the former location. It was the poorer reservation and was much closer

geographically to Parker, based in Rochester. Even though the programme at Cattaraugus established a tribal museum for a time at the Thomas Indian School and Orphan Asylum and had the Beaux Arts-educated Indian painter Sanford Plummer, it was the first to fall to budgetary cuts. (Hauptman 1979:301) One 1935 article by Parker notes how; "By seeking to make each strive for the highest excellence and showing each the best work of the other [reservation] real standards are being set". (1935d:12)

The "real standards" which Parker encouraged were those which most closely resembled the "art" of the Seneca's ancestors in the early nineteenth century. Although Hauptman has noted "grumblings from people excluded from the project" and "from a few Longhouse people who objected to the secular carving of ceremonial false faces", it would seem that overall the Project's operations instilled community pride and working conditions were festive with "good natured camaraderie and competition". Parker himself enjoyed the project. In one 1935 letter to his friend Keppler he remarked; "I'm having a good time restoring the old Seneca arts - with remarkable results". (Parker to J. Keppler 10 July 1935 Keppler Collection, MAIL) In 1939 the federal government began to seriously reduce WPA funding and the project gradually petered out, despite Parker's best efforts. A serious and mysterious fire in 1941 brought the project to a definitive close.⁹ Although Parker's original proposal for the scheme had suggested that it would stimulate Indian "self-support",

⁹ Fire seems to have plagued the collections of Iroquois material culture to which Parker had connections and his correspondence hints that the circumstances of the 1941 may have been sinister. Publically, he announced "a mysterious fire destroyed the building and what remained of the equipment". [Parker, A.C. (1941) "Art Reproductions of the Seneca Indians", Museum Service 14:9 November.:31-34; also 1/2/1937 A. C. Parker to Keppler, Keppler Collection, MAIL]

the artists of the project were not able to continue in the same trade after funding ceased and the Project ended. This fact lends weight to Alice Lee Jemison's contemporary criticism of the arts and craft aspect of the New Deal. Jemison, a mixed-blood Seneca activist was consistently vociferous in her opposition to Collier and his policies. She complained to the 1937 Senate Indian Affairs Committee that Collier was educating Indian youth for nothing other than arts and crafts and telling them "now we are fitting you for life on the reservation ... and arbitrarily making them supply arts and crafts for government controlled operatives". (quoted in Schrader 1983:244) Arts Project materials did at least become part of the New York World's Fair of 1939. The first floor of the State Pavilion displayed two cases of Seneca Arts together with a large Indian history map by Ernest Smith. Hauptman has noted how further exhibitions were held at Parker's Rochester Museum, at the annual New York State Fair in Syracuse, the annual Monroe County Fair and Rochester Exposition, the Albany City Post office and the New York State Conference on Social Work in Rochester. The "Notes and News" section of Museum Service of one 1939 volume records how the local Batavia Fair had a representative article made by each Indian who had taken an active part in the Arts and Crafts project at the Tonawanda Reservation. Local display was extensive, including an exhibit of arts and crafts at Loew's Rochester theatre during the showing of "The Last of the Mohicans", and loan exhibits to the Children's Museum of Boston and the Schenectady School Museum. (Parker 1939k:150) The project may have had even wider impact. Hauptman argues that the project's success may have been used by Collier to justify the

creation in August, 1935 of the Department of Interior's Indian Arts and Crafts Board. (Hauptman 1981:159)

With the close of the project in 1941 Parker used the significant new collection of Iroquois materials he had had produced to facilitate the Rochester Museum's move to its present location on the old Bausch Estate on East Avenue, Rochester. He used the Project's "art" to trade in museum materials around the world, and to develop his reputation and that of his museum. Although there is no evidence of a connection between the museum's development of its collections through the Arts Project and the move to a new site, Parker's story about the unusual circumstances of the move is worth repeating. The new museum site was donated by Dr. Edward Bausch, Chairman of the Board of Bausch and Lomb Optical Company. He also made a gift of his old home and over half a million dollars for the construction of a new wing, Bausch Hall. The new development was a testimony to Parker's interpersonal skills and promotional ability. In 1943, he recorded the story of how Rochester Museum had had such good luck;

One morning (in 1939) without previous announcement, one of Rochester's eminent citizens knocked at the door of the Director's office. "I feel that I should do more for my city," said he. "I have liked your program and approve of it. But that isn't enough, I know. How would you like a new building?" We gratefully answered that we would welcome one. "Then", demanded the visitor, "you must have a plan for it. Let me see it." Thus did Edward Bausch, the microscopist, challenge our sincerity and preparedness. A drawer was opened and a set of blueprints taken out. Dr. Bausch looked them over and asked us to see his architect. We did. A better set of plans, by far, was produced, since the new plans embodied every modern feature that a

trained staff struggling in poor quarters, could devise for better facilities. (Parker 1943b:81)

Irrespective of Bausch's generosity, the Arts Project added to the collections of the Rochester Museum, improving its reputation and that of its director. It not only furthered Parker's career, but it also went some way towards fulfilling his desire to emulate and continue the work of his revered mentor, Lewis Henry Morgan. Parker intended the Seneca artefacts to serve as a replacement for the Morgan collection of Iroquoia lost in the fire of 29th March, 1911. The fire had destroyed the New York State Library and part of the Capitol. Over two-thirds of a collection of costumes and fabrics acquired by Lewis Henry Morgan was lost, together with most of a collection made by Harriet Maxwell Converse and 200 of almost 300 objects which Parker had himself collected since he joined the State Museum. One letter from Parker to his friend Keppler dejectedly noted; "\$50,000 would not replace loss of Indian collections - only one twentieth saved". (Parker to Keppler 29 March 1911 Keppler Collection, MAIL) The event was traumatic for Parker. He had even rushed into the burning building in a partly successful rescue attempt. He wrote in 1911: "It was an awful experience, I assure you, to see the fruits of one's labors and the results of 60 years by others shrivel up in the merciless flame ... the most discouraging feature of it all is that most of this material can never be replaced". (quoted in Fenton 1968:43) Another 1911 letter made clear the lasting effect of the fire on Parker: "How glad I am that we saved as many as we did - yet how incalculable is the loss of the precious things that did perish! The memory of these things which shrivelled almost before my eyes still lingers to shock me. I was truly heartsick". He continued, ruefully swearing that in

future all his exhibition cases would be steel - "No more fire for me. I could not live through another".¹⁰ (Parker to Keppler 11th April, 1911 Fol.P2 No.35 Keppler Collection, MAIL)

The Seneca Arts Project became part of Parker's life-long attempt to emulate Morgan's achievements - to "out-Morgan Morgan" as he put it in one letter. (Parker to John M. Clarke, 16 June, 1909, Parker Papers, NYSM) He wrote in 1936: "Like the specimens made for Lewis Henry Morgan in 1849, our results are destined to become of historic importance". He saw himself as working within what he called a "Rochester tradition" which he traced back to Morgan who had "made sociology and ethnology something that could be understood and provided a key to the underlying factors of primitive society". (Parker 1936b:8) As Hauptman has noted, the Arts Project was Parker's "opportunity to come full circle in his romantic delusions of being the equal to the 'Father of anthropology' ". (Hauptman 1979:290-291) From the very beginning of his museum career, Parker had seen his work as an extension and development of Morgan's research. Morgan's legacy ensured that the Arts Project became essentially an exercise in reproducing the material past, the creation of replicas, as distinct from the production of contemporary Indian art. It is particularly ironic that in the New Deal period, at a time when reformers such as Collier used Boas-inspired cultural relativist rhetoric to justify change in Indian affairs, that Parker should use the moment as an opportunity to resolve private unfinished business with Morgan, the social evolutionist.

¹⁰ For further comments by Parker on the devastation of the fire see: [Parker to Keppler 29/3/1911 Fol P2 No.34, Keppler Collection,MAIL]

Morgan's ethnographic collection, which Parker used as the model for the work produced by the Senecas during the New Deal period, was in itself similarly constructed "out of time" under Morgan's instruction by Seneca producers of Indian material culture in the mid-1800s. Like the New Dealers, Morgan a century before had also been concerned that Indian material culture should not be lost. In 1848, he advised the New York State Museum to set up an Indian Cabinet where Iroquois arts and crafts could be preserved as the "unwritten history of their social existence". (quoted in Rose 1987:52) Aside from collecting Seneca objects which were in use at the time, Morgan had *also* commissioned Tonawanda Senecas to make "traditional" Seneca items so that they could be stored in the State Museum and a record created of the method of their production. Parker, as director of the Tonawanda Arts Project, was therefore, like Morgan, continuing a "scientific" project of salvaging a constructed past and therefore creating a simulacrum of "original" Iroquois material culture . (Rose 1987:52-54)

Parker's attempt to reproduce Morgan's ethnographic collection of the early nineteenth century produced certain tensions within his writing. Parker's articles on the Project made an interesting distinction between Seneca Indian "art" which was "ethnologically correct" and that which was somehow something other than this. Parker required the Senecas to reproduce the cultural material of their forebears; they were only "correct" when they replicated the art and craft of another time. They existed as "authentically" Indian only when they replicated an unassimilated past:

We now possess hundreds of these recreated objects. They are "Indian made", some are ethnologically

correct but many are things that no ancestor would or could have produced. They are the product of the modern Seneca endeavoring to respond to the racial urge to create.

Parker was confused over the exact nature of the material produced by the Arts Project and about its value and status. He asked; "Shall we pack it away, shall we display portions of the best as "modern Seneca art", shall we send the articles out to schools as reproductions made by the Indians themselves, shall we trade, exchange or give away what we do not want?" He was perplexed about "knowing just what to call these things" and wondered;

Shall it be "1935-1941 reproductions by Seneca Indians" presenting their own material culture; or, shall it be something else? Our choice is "reproductions", but it is hard to convince the Indians that the articles are not "genuine" and as good as they make for themselves. (Parker 1941d:31-33)

Parker was here struggling with a problem of ethnographic time. Were the Seneca "Indian" and therefore producing something "genuine" or were they simply reproducing the past and copying something once authentic but now lost? If their work was "genuine", then so were they; they were still "Indian" and not assimilating Americans. If their work was not "genuine", they were not Indians - so what were they? Ethnographic collection for the museum required the gathering and selection of what was "traditional", what was by definition in opposition to modernity. If the 1930s Seneca Art was to be acknowledged as historical and hybrid, this would detract from its value as a commodity within the museum and problematize its status as "authentic", traditional and anti-modern. Parker's problem classifying 1930s Seneca "art"

reflected a fundamental complexity at the heart of twentieth century salvage ethnography in that what was being finally saved - Indian culture - was in fact indestructible, historical and subject to change.

The issues of temporality, wholeness and continuity as they apply to the status accorded to ethnographic material and institutional collection in the West has been discussed by James Clifford. Clifford connects identity to the act of collecting which operates within a system of value and meaning and "contested encodings of past and future". (Clifford 1988:218) He asks the same rhetorical questions which arose for Parker from the "art" of the Seneca: "What criteria validate an authentic cultural or artistic product? What are the differential values placed on old and new creations?". (Clifford 1988:221) As Clifford notes, "Cultural or artistic "authenticity" has as much to do with an inventive present as with a past, its objectification, preservation, or revival". (Clifford 1988:222) It is produced by "removing objects and customs from their current historical situation - a present-becoming-future". Clearly, Parker appropriated the twentieth century "art" of the Seneca and placed it in another context and time, that of the museum. In this way twentieth century Indian "art" became artefact once subject to the temporality of museum classification. It was necessary to re-present the material culture of the Indian twentieth century as "authentic" examples of a mythic anti-modern past. Only in this way could the Indian hope to achieve integration into modern American society.

Parker's involvement in the construction of the Tonawanda Community House is further evidence of Parker's ability to mediate between and within white and Indian cultures. It remains to this day a testimony to his skills as a negotiator between the organizational structures of both white and Indian worlds and to his pragmatic and sophisticated political approach. Hauptman has described the construction of the Community House as "a living legacy of the New Deal". It remains today a focus for the reservation community - a two-story structure built to resemble the traditional Iroquois longhouse. It was built using almost entirely Indian labour, on land contiguous to the reservation boundary at Akron, New York using donated local natural stone. The land was bought using money raised from the reservation community by the Tonawanda Indian Community House Association. The State agreed to service and maintain the centre on the understanding that the State could lease the land from the Association. This arrangement neatly allowed for a working co-operation between the state and the reservation. On 15th May, 1936 a bill, largely drafted by Parker, was passed by the New York State Legislature. It required the State "to provide the maintenance of the Tonawanda Community House under the Supervision of the State Department of Social Welfare", after its erection by the WPA on lands acquired by the Tonawanda Indian Community House Association and leased to the state for ninety-nine years. The building was solely for the use of

the reservation Indian community for the purpose of housing a recreational room and auditorium and space for laboratories, offices, and rooms to be used for a library, museum, clubrooms and space allocation for groups who may be assisted in vocational and industrial guidance

together with

other facilities for adult education which may equip the community for gainful occupation, all of which shall contribute to the social and economic betterment of the Indians of the Tonawanda reservation. (quoted in Hauptman 1981:132)

Thus Parker justified the scheme as a means of facilitating Indian integration through education. \$5000 was also provided to the State Department of Social welfare for the maintenance and supervision of the centre. The WPA spent \$60,000 on construction, improving the surrounding grounds and extending the water supply from Akron to the community house. It is perhaps unsurprising that Parker should envisage so much "science" in a reservation community house, describing a library, laboratories and of course, what was for him the best indicator of "civilization", a museum. In the end, partly through Parker's efforts, over one thousand books were collected for the community library, through various appeals. (Parker to Keppler 1st February 1937 Keppler Collection, MAIL)

Although the original idea for the Community House was Parker's, Hauptman argues that its creation was primarily the result "of the effective lobbying efforts and political savvy of Namee Henricks, a white woman from Penn Yan, New York". (Hauptman 1981:127) Henricks made three trips to Washington to confer with Eleanor Roosevelt, Commissioner Collier, prominent congressmen, and national WPA administrators. (Hauptman 1981:129) Working with Parker and the local library association, Henricks began promoting the idea of a community centre in early in 1935. Parker, Henricks and a Tonawanda reservation committee headed by Elsinia Doctor,

May Spring, and Wyman Jemison, held meetings on the project which generated community support. Parker wrote a supporting letter to accompany the formal proposal and architectural plans which were submitted to the New York State Department of Social Welfare and the Bureau of Indian Affairs recommending the project

as a fundamental thing for the betterment of the Indians of the entire area. The Tonawanda band of Senecas is the only group without an adequate building for gatherings. (quoted in Hauptman 1981:129)

Namee Henricks' efforts, lobbying the politically important such as Elmer Thomas, chairman of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, W. Carson Ryan, Jr., the director of Indian Education, Commissioner Collier, and Eleanor Roosevelt at a Daughters of the American Revolution convention in April 1935, led to the reservation anthropologist, William Fenton being instructed by Collier to assist Henricks and Parker in every way possible to further the project. (Hauptman 1981:130) Hauptman has detailed the essential significance of Eleanor Roosevelt's support as "First Lady" in the creation of the Community House. He records how she invited Henricks to the White House to discuss the project, provided her with letters of introduction to key politicians, investigated possibilities of government sponsorship and endorsed the project to federal and state officials.

Parker and Henricks did however have to deal with intratribal politics, in particular the chief's council at Tonawanda. The necessity under New York State law to have a sponsoring body or "holding agency" could have upset "traditional Iroquois beliefs

about themselves as an independent sovereignty" and stymied reservation support for the centre. As it was, Hauptman cites the assurances of "the well-respected Parker" that the Association would "consult your honorable body whenever possible to secure the best advice" as contributory to the scheme getting overall community support. (Hauptman 1981:130)

Parker was similarly adroit at liaising with white bureaucrats. When a series of objections to the scheme were raised awkwardly by the then New York State Commissioner of Welfare, David C. Adie, Parker responded to Adie's criticisms point by point, requested a full description of the land to be purchased with a signed option-to-buy statement from the Tonawanda Indian Community House Association. He wrote a formal justification for the project to the WPA office in Albany and forwarded a letter to Eleanor Roosevelt castigating Adie. (Hauptman 1981:131-2) Henricks also responded to Adie's objections by securing approval for the community house from Adie's superiors. She used her close ties to Mrs Roosevelt and obtained a commitment from the WPA to underwrite the complete construction costs of the Community House.

The construction of the Tonawanda Community House is a testimony to Parker's organizational and political skills. That he and his associates could form a board of directors and incorporate the "Tonawanda Indian Community House Association" under state law is evidence of his political acumen and his ability to "get things done", a phrase that reverberated when I visited the Community House in 1993. The fact that he could contribute to a

project that to this day is viewed as a truly community effort, the fact that it was dedicated by no less than Eleanor Roosevelt (on 13 May, 1939) and that the project, which involved the co-operation of the state, the WPA and the reservation was completed so speedily, shows the level of his ability. Parker was an integral part of the practical, community-based efforts at improvement of reservation life which were the form of the Indian New Deal most acceptable to the Iroquois.

I have shown that these community schemes were a continuation of Parker's drive for Indian integration and that he used the New Deal as an opportunity to improve conditions on the reservations where he grew up and to develop production skills within the Seneca which would have market value in the white world. The creation of Indian "art" helped relieve the poverty of the Seneca New York reservation Indians, but it also produced commodities which facilitated Parker's rise within the museum profession. Parker's achievements in the New Deal period are a testimony to his business skills and to his ability to mediate successfully between and within Indian and white cultures. Parker's New Deal engagement with the Tonawanda and Cattaraugus reservations highlights the integrative nature of aspects of the Indian New Deal. Although the period is often associated with Indian autonomy, Parker's history shows that Indian integration into American society was fundamental to it. It also reveals the curious interplay of forces that dictated that a progressive, mix-blood Indian like Parker would require twentieth-century Indians to reproduce the "artwork" of the previous century in order to facilitate their

contemporary integration into American society. The "art" or artefacts of the timeless Indian were a commodity which Parker recognised and used for his own benefit and that of the Seneca. Collier's New Deal rhetoric was symptomatic of a white denial of Indian history - a history which in fact included accommodative responses to that dominant culture and cultural change of which Parker was an example. Yet this denial gave commodity value to the "art" and artefacts produced by the Seneca in the twentieth century. Parker's involvement in the Indian New Deal used a change in the American relationship to the Indian to benefit the people of "his" reservations and to promote the Rochester Museum and its director. Parker used the opportunity of Collier's Indian New Deal to serve his own agenda: Indian integration into white culture, his own success within the museum world and dialogue with the legacy of Morgan.

IN CONCLUSION AND RECAPITULATION

The preceding analysis of Arthur Caswell Parker's life and work has attempted to understand the complex and problematic nature of the position and status of a mixed-blood, acculturated Indian in the early twentieth century. I have documented ways in which Parker attempted to retain an Indian identity whilst achieving full integration within American society. Parker began life with a familial example in his great-uncle Ely S. Parker, of one who had successfully crossed the boundaries between white and Indian cultures and achieved respect and acclaim among both. The associated figure of Lewis Henry Morgan, the renowned pioneer anthropologist and friend of the Indian, provided Parker with a further example of how "Indianness" and Indian culture could have a positive and enabling role within the dominant culture. Parker found within Morgan's ideas on social evolution a way in which the "assimilated" Indian could be seen in a positive and progressive light, as someone in advance of his unassimilated contemporaries in the scale of evolutionary development. Within the museum, Parker was in a position to re-present the Indian within a dislocated sense of time and therefore interpret Indian history within a social evolutionary framework which complemented the triumphant optimism of early twentieth century modernity. His choice of a museum career offered him opportunities to successfully combine professional status and an Indian identity in ways which the structured study of anthropology under Boas in the context of the university could not. His "Indianness" enabled his ethnographic fieldwork and the professional niche he carved as "museologist"

facilitated his integration within the dominant culture as Indian authority, intellectual and professional.

Parker encountered most difficulty over his work in anthropology and his involvement in intertribal Indian reform and it was in these areas where his success was most limited. The Society of American Indians was neither significantly effective in its objectives over Indian reform or, in fact, essentially "pan-Indian" in nature. The difficulties and complexities of a leadership role with an Indian constituency that had separate and varying attitudes towards Indian integration, forced upon Parker a new understanding of the wider diversity of Indian peoples within the United States. However, his prominence within the Society as spokesman and leader provided a base from which he could mediate between white and Indian cultures and allowed him to contribute to a uniquely Indian construction of Indian identity in relation to the dominant culture. Parker's published work as anthropologist presented Iroquois Indian culture in a positive light and made connections and correspondences between white and Indian history and white and Indian culture. However, Parker found that his "Indianness" or sympathy for Indian culture, conflicted with the "objective" and "scientific" approach required by the anthropological discipline. This conflict centred around the fact that early twentieth century anthropology required the bringing together of "authentic" sets of data which did not reveal evidence of Indian acculturation. Parker's speeches and texts on the issue of Indian assimilation and on the Indian's relationship to the dominant culture were indicative of his dissatisfaction over the opportunities for full Indian integration and his dissatisfaction about the wider

Indian response to those opportunities. These writings were counter-appeals to, and discussions of, the authority of American representation of Indian identity and Parker's shifting self-identification within them reflected the discontinuity between being American, being Americanized and being Indian. His "assimilative" writings used social evolutionary thinking to express an Indian need and desire to be what he in one instance described as "American in the fullest sense", even though full Indian integration was no longer deemed either possible or entirely desirable at the time of their production.

The New Deal community schemes which Parker administrated and directed remain a testimony to his business skills, and his ability to successfully mediate between white and Indian cultures. The schemes fulfilled the period's reform ideals of integrating Indians into the dominant culture and maintaining traditional culture. They served to alleviate poverty and improve reservation conditions and provided those Seneca involved with valuable production skills. Parker ensured that the Seneca "art" produced was a reproduction of the material culture commissioned and collected by Morgan in the nineteenth century. "Authentic" Seneca Indian art had currency within both the dominant culture and the museum economy because it was symbolic of a timeless and "primitive" past. A similar, constructed "primitive" past served to connect the Indian to the rhetoric of Freemasonry. The legitimating fiction at the heart of Freemasonry invoked the idea that both the fraternity and the Indian shared ancient, arcane and essential truths. As a high-ranking Freemason Parker was at the pinnacle of a middle-class group made up of predominantly white Protestants of

"good character". Parker used his position to engage in the wider construction of the proper role of the Indian within American society and within Masonic discourse brought the idea of the Indian closer to mainstream American values.

The question arises as to whether and by which criteria of "success" it is appropriate to judge Parker. To-day, on the reservations where he grew up, he remains a respected figure. In many ways, this thesis has provided evidence that Parker was very far from the general idea of the tormented, divided mixed-blood and has shown that he steered a complicated course between and within Indian and white cultures with integrity, if not absolute consistency. Certainly, he enjoyed a great many of the trappings of "success".

Dr. Parker retired from professional life in 1946, becoming Director Emeritus of the Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences and continued writing voluminously from his home in Naples, New York. He had achieved significant recognition for his life's work. In 1916, he had been awarded the Cornplanter Medal of the Cayuga County Historical Society for his contributions to Iroquois ethnology. His "Archeological History of New York" had allowed the University of Rochester to confer upon him an honorary Master of Science. Union College conferred a doctorate of science in 1940 and Keuka College a doctorate in human science in 1943. In 1946 he received the Civic Medal of the City of Rochester and the next year the Citizenship Award of the Rochester Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution. However, I would argue that the list of honours above gives only some indication of the achievements for

which he deserves our respect. Arthur Parker died on 1st January 1955 of a heart attack at his home overlooking Canadaigua Lake. (Ritchie 1956:293-295)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note:

Since there are so many references to the work of Arthur Caswell Parker within this thesis, they are gathered together here, chronologically arranged but alphabeticised to correspond to the way in which they appear within the text.

Published Writings of Arthur Caswell Parker Consulted

1907

"Excavations in an Erie Indians Village and Burial Site at Ripley, Chautauqua Co., N.Y." New York State Museum Bulletin 117: 459-554.

1908

(a) "Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section". New York State Museum Bulletin [Fourth report of the director]. 121: 85-110.

(b) "Myths and Legends of the New York State Iroquois", by Harriet Maxwell Converse; edited and annotated by Arthur Caswell Parker. New York State Museum Bulletin 125.

(c) "Neh Ho-Noh-Ki-Noh-Gah, the Guardians of the Little Waters, a Seneca Medicine Society". Myths and Legends of the New York State Iroquois, by Harriet Maxwell Converse. New York State Bulletin 125: 149-176.

1909

(a) "The Iroquois Wampums". N.Y. State Historical Association. Proceedings 8: 205-208.

(b) "Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section". New York State Museum Bulletin [Fifth report of the director]. 133: 54-77.

(c)"Secret Medicine Societies of the Seneca". American Anthropologist, n.s., April-June 11:161-185.

(d)"Snow Snake As Played By The Senecas". American Anthropologist. 11:2:250-256.

1910

(a)"The Influence of the Iroquois on the History & Archaeology of the Wyoming Valley & The Adjacent Region". Proceedings & Collections of the Wyoming Historical & Geological Society. 11:11: 65-102.

(b)"Iroquois Uses of Maize and Other Food Plants". New York State Museum Bulletin 144:5-119.

(c)"The League of the Five Nations". Livingston County Historical Society Proceedings 25-41.

(d)"Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section". New York State Museum Bulletin [Sixth report of the director].140:59-69.

(e)"The Origin of the Iroquois Silversmithing". American Anthropologist, n.s., July-September 12:349-357.

1911

(a)"The Influence of the Iroquois on the History and Archeology of Wyoming Valley, Pennsylvania and the Adjacent Region". Wyoming Historical and Geological Society Proceedings 11:1-38.

(b)"Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section". New York State Museum Bulletin [Seventh report of the director].149:43-58.

(c)"Fate of the New York State Collections in Archeology and Ethnology in Capital Fire". American Anthropologist, January-March 13:169-171.

(d)"The Mission of Making New Americans From Old". The Assembly Herald February :66-68.

(e)"Additional Notes on Iroquois Silversmithing". American Anthropologist, n.s., April-June 13:283-293.

1912

(a)"The Philosophy of Indian Education". Society of American Indians. Proceedings of the First Annual Conference. 1:68-76.

(b)"Report of the Archeology ad Ethnology Section". New York State Museum Bulletin [Eighth report of the director].158:61-84.

(c)"Certain Iroquois Tree Myths and Symbols". American Anthropologist, n.s., October-December 14:608-620.

(d)"The Code of Handsome Lake, the Seneca Prophet". New York State Museum Bulletin. November 163:5-148.

(e)"Progress for the Indian". The Southern Workman. November 41:628-635.

1913

(a)"A Plea for Social Survey". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal 1:107-114.

(b)"Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section". New York State Museum Bulletin 164:45-57. Ninth report of the director.

(c)"Congress and the Indian Problem". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal. April-June 1:95-97.

(d)"What Makes the Indian a Problem?" Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal April-June 1:103-114.

(e)"The Real Value of Higher Education for the Indian". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal July-September 1:278-284.

(f)"The Real Tragedy of the Red Race". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal, October-December 1:345-350.

1914

(a)"Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section" New York State Museum Bulletin [Tenth report of the director].173:93-102.

(b)"The Legal Status of the American Indian". Lake Mohonk Conference on the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples. Thirty-Second Annual Report :77-82.

(c)"The Quaker City Meeting of the Society of American Indians". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal January-March 2:56-59.

(d)"The American Indian-What Is He?" Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal April-June 2:109-119.

(e)"My Race Shall Live Anew" A Poem by Alnoba Waubunaki, (pseudonym of Arthur Caswell Parker). Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal April-June 2:125.

(f)"The Road to Competent Citizenship". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal July-September 2:178-183.

(g)"Let Us Discover Human Elements of the Indian Problem." Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal July-September 2:183-184.

(h)"The Robins' Song". A poem by Alnoba Waubunaki, (pseudonym of Arthur Caswell Parker), Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal July-September 2:190.

(i)"The League of Peace", by Gawasa Wanneh, (pseudonym of Arthur Caswell Parker). Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal July-September 2:191-195.

(j)"The Legal Status of the American Indian". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal July-September 2:213-218.

(k)"Indian Blood". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal. October-December 2:261-262.

(l)"Blood Mixture Among Races". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal October-December 2:262-265.

(m)"The Discovery of America as an Incentive to Human Achievement". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal October- December 2:265-268.

(n)"The Awakened American Indian". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal October-December 2:269-274.

1915

(a)"Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section". New York State Museum Bulletin [Eleventh report of the director].177:63-73.

(b)"Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section" New York State Museum Bulletin [Twelfth report of the director].187:52-59.

(c)"Certain Important Elements of the Indian Problem". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal, January-March 2:24-38.

(d)"The Persistence of Barbarism in Civilized Society". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal, April-June 3:76-81.

(e)"Red Patriots in the Revolution", by Alnoba Waubunaki, (pseudonym of Arthur Caswell Parker), Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal, April-June 3:82-85.

(f)"Industrial and Vocational Training in Indian Schools". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal, April-June 3:86-97.

(g)"The Crow Indian". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal, 3:129-133.

(h)"In the Path of the Morning Star". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal, June 3:161-163.

(i)"McKenzie - Thinker". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal, June 3:122-124.

(j)"Let Us Pause to Consider Our Ways". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal, July-September 3:159-160.

(k)"The Status and Progress of Indians as Shown by the Thirteenth Census". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal, July-September 3:185-208.

1916

- (a)"The Senecas in the War of 1812". N.Y. State Historical Association Proceedings. 15:78-90.
- (b)"The Functions of the Society of American Indians". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal, January-March 4:8-14.
- (c)"A New Sort of American Day". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal, January-March 4:60-62.
- (d)"The Constitution of the Five Nations". New York State Museum Bulletin. April 1 184:7-158.
- (e)"The Civilizing Power of Language". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal, April-June 4:15-18.
- (f)"The White Aryan and The Red American". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal, April-June: 4:121-126.
- (g)"The Social Elements of the Indian Problem". The American Journal of Sociology. September :22:252-267.
- (h)"Problems of Race Assimilation in America, with Special Reference To The American Indian". Society of American Indians. Quarterly Journal October-December :4:285-304.
- (i)"The Origin of the Iroquois as Suggested by their Archeology". American Anthropologist. n.s., October- December :18:479-507.

1917

- (a)"Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section". New York State Museum Bulletin. [Thirteenth report of the director].196:67-75.
- (b)"Lewis Henry Morgan". American Indian Magazine, 5.
- (c)"Notes of the Banner Stone, With Some Inquiries As to Its Purposes". New York State Museum Bulletin. April 196:1:165-176. Thirteenth report of the director (1916).

(d)"Men and Events Leading Up To The Pickering Treaty".
Ontario County Times 11 July, Canandaigua, New York.

1918

(a)"A Prehistoric Iroquoian Site on the Reed Farm, Richmond Mills, Ontario County, N.Y". N.Y., State Archeological Assoc., Lewis H. Morgan Chapter. Researches and Transactions, 1:1.

(b)"The Constitution of the Five Nations, a Reply". American Anthropologist, n.s., January-March 20:120-124.

(c)"Habitat Groups in Wax and Plaster". Museum Work, December 1:78-85.

(d)"Making Democracy Safe for the Indians". American Indian Magazine Spring 6:25-29.

1919

(a)"American Indian Freemasonry". Buffalo, Buffalo Consistory, A.A.S.R.N.M.J.U.S.A.

(b)"A Contact Period Seneca Site Situated at Factory Hollow, Ontario Co., N.Y". N.Y. State Archeological Assoc., Lewis H. Morgan Chapter. Researches and Transactions, 1:2.

(c)"Presentation and Unveiling of the Morgan Tablet". The Morgan Centennial Celebration at Wells College, Aurora. N.Y. State Archeological Assoc., Lewis H. Morgan Chapter. Researches and Transactions, 1:3:23-27.

(d)"The Iroquois in Canada". Ontario Provincial Museum, Toronto. Thirty-First Annual Archeology Report. 7-55.

(e)"The Life of General Ely S. Parker, Last Grand Sachem of the Iroquois and General Grant's Military Secretary". Buffalo, New York State: Buffalo Historical Society Publications, 23:14-346.

(f)"Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section". New York State Museum Bulletin [Fourteenth report of the director]. 207/208:69-73.

1920

- (a)"The New York Indian Complex and How to Solve It". N.Y. State Archeological Association, Lewis H. Morgan Chapter. Researches and Transactions. 2:1.
- (b)"Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section". New York State Museum Bulletin [Fifteenth report of the director]. 219/220:99-120.
- (c)"A Solution of the New York Indian Problem". Report to State Museum, State Education Department.
- (d)"Indian Tribal Government a Failure". State Service. February. 4:99-102
- (e)Letchworth Memorial Address, William Pryor Letchworth Memorial Association Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Meeting. May 26. 10-16.
- (f)"The Archeological History of New York". New York State Museum Bulletin July-October 2: 235- 238.
- (g)"Indian History of the Genesee Valley". Nunda News. August 20.
- (h)"Freemasonry Among the American Indians". The Builder. November:6:295-298.

1921

- (a)The Indians of New York State, by Arthur Caswell Parker and Gustavus Elmer Emanuel Lindquist. New York, Home Missions Council.
- (b)"Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section". New York State Museum Bulletin [Sixteenth report of the director]. 227/228:28-29.
- (c)"New York Indians". Southern Workman. April. 50:155-160.

1922

(a)The Archeological History of New York. Albany. The University of the State of New York. 2 vol. Originally published in New York State Bulletins July - October:235, 236, 237, 238.

(b)"Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section". New York State Museum Bulletin [Seventeenth report of the director]. 239/240:41-49.

(c)TTGOTGAOTU: Secrets of the Temple. Buffalo: Buffalo Consistory A.A.S.R.

(d)"How Civilizations Grew". New York Central Magazine. September.

1923

(a)"Memorial Tribute to Lewis Henry Morgan". Rochester Historical Society. Publication Fund Series. 2:77-78.

(b)"Method in Archeology". Ontario Provincial Museum, Toronto. Thirty-third Annual Archeological Report :55-61.

(c)"Outline of the Algonkian Occupation in New York". The Algonkian Occupation of New York, by Arthur Caswell Parker and Alanson Buck Skinner. N.Y. State Archeological Assoc. Lewis H. Morgan Chapter, Researches and Transactions 4:49-80.

(d)"Seneca Myths and Folk Tales". Buffalo Historical Society Publications 27.

(e)"The Use of Museums". Knickerbocker Press 15 January Albany, New York. January 15.

(f)"Why All This Secrecy?" The Builder. December. 9:361.

1924

(a)"The Pickering Treaty". Rochester Historical Society. Publication Fund Series. 3:79-91.

(b)"Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section". New York State Museum Bulletin [Eighteenth report of the director]. 251:38-44.

(c)"Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section". New York State Museum Bulletin [Nineteenth report of the director]. 253:44-48.

(d)"Unhistorical Museums". Museum Work. January-February: 6:155-158.

(e)"American Indian Masonry". The Builder. May:10:137-138.

(f)"Fundamental Factors in Seneca Folk Lore". New York State Museum Bulletin. [Reprinted from the nineteenth report of the director]. July:253:49-66.

(g)"The Status of New York Indians". New York State Museum Bulletin. [Reprinted from the nineteenth report of the director 1923]. July:253:67-82.

(h)"Unhistorical Museums or Museums of History, Which?" New York State Historical Association. Quarterly Journal, July:5:256-263.

1925

(a)"Aboriginal Inhabitants". History of the Genesee Country. Edited by Lockwood, R. D. Chicago:S.J. Clarke Publishing Company.

(b)"Ancient Land of the Genesee". History of the Genesee Country. Edited by Lockwood, Richard Doty. Chicago:S.J. Clarke Publishing Company.

(c)"An Approach to a Plan for Historical Society Museums". Museum Work, July-August:8:47-56.

(d)"Report of the Archeology and Ethnology Section". New York State Museum Bulletin [Twentieth report of the director]. 260:57-62.

(e)"The Rise of the Seneca Nation, 1535-1699". History of the Genesee Country. Edited by Lockwood, R. D. Chicago: S.J. Clarke Publishing Company. 1:167-189.

(f)"The Senecas in Their Own Home Land". History of the Genesee Country. Edited by Lockwood, R. D. Chicago: S.J. Clarke Publishing Company. 1:191-222.

(g)"The War of 1812". History of the Genesee Country. Edited by Lockwood R. D. Chicago: S.J. Clarke Publishing Company. 1:455-536.

1926

(a)"An Analytical History of the Seneca Indians". N.Y. State Archeological Assoc., Lewis H. Morgan Chapter. Researches and Transactions. 6:162.

(b)"American Indian Freemasonry" Masonic Outlook, February.

(c)"Hiking Around Rochester". Rochester Herald, 14 February, 1926.

(d)"Parker Advocates Industrial Museum". Rochester Democrat and Chronicle and Rochester Herald. March 28.

(e)"The Museum Idea". Museum Service, April 15:1:3.

(f)"An Approach to a Plan for Historical Society Museums". Museum Work, July-August:3:47-56.

1927

(a)Skunny Wundy and Other Indian Tales. New York:George H. Doran. Company.

(b)The Indian How Book. New York, George H. Doran Company.

(c)"Notes on the Ancestry of Cornplanter". N.Y. State Archeological Assoc. Lewis H. Morgan Chapter. Researches and Transactions, 5:3-22.

(d)"The Amazing Iroquois". Art and Archeology. March. 23:99-108.

(e)"Legend of Famous Oil Spring of Senecas". The Pure Oil News. July:18.

(f)"The Wise Master Builder" Museum Service., December:2:63.

1928

- (a) Rumbling Wings and Other Indian Tales. New York: Doubleday Doran and Company.
- (b) "Government and Institutions of the Iroquois", by Lewis Henry Morgan. Introduction and editorial notes by Arthur Caswell Parker. N.Y. State Archeological Assoc. Lewis H. Morgan Chapter. Researches and Transactions. 7:1.
- (c) "The Museum of History vs. The Historical Society Exhibit". Museum Service, June 15: 3:43-46.
- (d) "A Museum for Rochester - ?" Museum News, September. 3:52-53.

1929

- (a) "The Indian Interpretation of Sullivan-Clinton Campaign". Rochester Historical Society. Publication Fund Series. 8:45-59.
- (b) "Influence of the Erie Canal in the Development of New York State". Rochester Historical Society. Publication Fund Series. 8:265-280.
- (c) "Solving the New York Indian Problem". The Six Nations, January: 3:1-3.
- (d) "Museizing the World". Museum Service, May 15:4:36-37.
- (e) "Modern Museums Stand For Commerce". Rochester Commerce. June 24.
- (f) "Why Not Be An Uncle?" Spokes of the Rotary Club of New York. August 13:17:4.
- (g) "The Value to the State of Archeological Surveys". National Research Council. Bulletin. December:74:31-41.
- (h) "An Educational and Museum Program for Letchworth State Park". New York State Museum Bulletin. December: 284:73-79. Reprinted from the twenty-third report of the director.

1930

- (a)"Ancient Indian Occupation of Mendon Ponds Park". Rochester Historical Society. Publication Fund Series, 9:223-226.
- (b)"Modern Museums Do Not Even Tire Workers". Rochester Democrat and Chronicle. [Letter to Editor]. 18 June, 1935.
- (c)"Man of the Museum". Museum Service, September 15: 5:51.
- (d)"Americans Becoming Indians". Binghamton Press. 18 September.
- (e)"Myths Have Real Meaning" Rochester Commerce. December 8:6.

1931

- (a)"The Attitude of the American Indian to American Life". Journal of Religious Education. February:26:111-114.
- (b)"Patriot Red Man in the American Revolution". Wyoming Commemorative Assoc. Proceedings, July:7-19.

1932

- (a)"Scouts May Save America's Pre-History". Scouting, May: 20:148.
- (b)"The League of the Iroquois". Home Geographic Monthly. August.:2:7-12.

1933

- (a)"The Civilization of the Red Man". History of the State of New York. Edited by Alexander Clarence Flick. 1:99-131.
- (b)"The Iroquois". History of the State of New York. Edited by Flick, A. C. 1:67-97.

(c)"Dramatize the Vital Things of Masonry". Kansas Masonic Digest, May.

(d)"Whence Came the American Race?" The Indian Leader.
September 22: 37:1-2.

1934

(a)"The Classification of History Museum Objects". The Museum News, April 1. 11:7-8.

(b)"The History Museum - An Opportunity". New York History.
July:15:326-331.

1935

(a)Indian Episodes of New York, a Drama Story of the Empire State. Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences.

(b)A Manual for History Museums. [New York State Historical Association Series, No. 3]. New York: Columbia University Press.

(c)"The Small History Museum". New York History, April:
16:189-195.

(d)"Museum Motives Behind the New York Arts Project". Indians at Work, 2:June 15:11-12.

(e)"The Measure of the Museist". Museum Service, September.
8:12-13.

1936

(a)"The Nanticoke". The Pennsylvania Archaeologist. January.
5:83-90.

(b)"The Indian Arts Project". Museum Service, 9:January:15:8-9.

(c)"The Museum Moves Forward". Museum Service, 9:January:
15:3-4.

(d)"A Museum Sponsors an Indian Arts Project". Social Welfare Bulletin. January-February. 7:12-14."In the Not So Distant Future". Museum Service, February 15: 9:18-19.

(e)"The Nanticoke, appendix". The Pennsylvania Archaeologist, April: 6:3-12.

(f)"Hobbies Have Proved a Recreational Avocation, Rochester". 6 September.

(g)"How Does the Museum Do It?" Museum Service, November 15: 9:168.

(h)"Becoming a Participant in a Creative Movement". Museum Service, December 15: 9:195.

1937

(a)"An Old Word With a New Meaning". Museum Service, January 15:10:3.

(b)"The Rochester Hall of Fame". Museum Service. February 15: 10:25.

(c)"The Museum Brings the World to the Classroom". The Science Counsellor. March: 3:12.

(d)"The Ethics of the Museologist.". Museum Service, March 15: 10:51.

(e)"Awake! There is a New Day". Museum Service, April 15. 10:75

(f)"Education Through Industry". Museum Service, May 15. 10:97.

(g)"Archeology Adopts a New Policy". Museum Service, September 15:10:160.

(h)"Does Rochester Need A New Museum Building?" Museum Service, November 15:10:193.

(i)"The Director Walks Around". Museum Service, November 15: 10:195-196.

1938

(a) A Report of the Susquehanna River Expedition Sponsored by the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, compiled and annotated by Warren King Moorehead. Edited by Arthur Caswell Parker. Andover, Mass.: The Andover Press.

(b) "Cash and Civilization". Museum Service, February 15:11:25.

(c) "Better Organisation". Museum Service, February 15:11:27.

(d) "Seven Steps for State Museum". Museum News, March 15: 15:10-12.

(e) "The Museum as a University". Museum Service, April 15: 11:75.

(f) "The Museum and the Genius". Museum Service, May 15:11:97.

(g) "History is Written in Objects". Museum Service, November 15:11:193.

1939

(a) "Museums are One Thing - Exhibits Are Another". Museum Service, January-February:12:3.

(b) "Is There an Unmixed Race?" Museum Service, February-March:12:25.

(c) "A Museum Is a Place in Which to Live! " Museum Service, February-March:12:27.

(d) "The Old Genesee Valley Canal." Museum Service, February-March:12:44-45.

(e) "Making Mockery of Archeology". Museum Service, March-April: 21:52.

- (f)"Will Our Culture Survive?" Museum Service, April-May: 12:75.
- (g)"A City with Vision and a Man". Museum Service, May-June: 12:97.
- (h)"Making a Museologist?" Museum Service, May-June:12:99.
- (i)"Museums in Taverns". Museum Service, June-July:12:121.
- (j)"Twentieth Century Time Chest." Museum Service, September-October:12:147.
- (k) "Notes and News" Museum Service, October-November:8:150
- (l)"Museums Succeed Everywhere". Museum Service,October-November:12:192.

1940

- (a)"Lewis Henry Morgan, Social Philosopher". Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences. Staff Lectures and Addresses.
- (b)"The Realistic Idealism of Lotze: Being a Review of the Philosophy of Rudolph Hermann Lotze (1817-1881)". Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences. Staff Lectures and Addresses.
- (c)"The Museum and Science". Museum Service, January-February:13:1.
- (d)"Our Convocation". Museum Service, March:13:25.
- (e)"Analyzing the Museum Workers". Museum Service, October. 13:147.
- (f)"The Genesee Country Historical Federation". Museum Service, October:13:151.
- (g)"The Museum a Complex Organisation". Museum Service, November:13:169.
- (h)"Tippecanoe and Tyler Too in 1840". Museum Service, November:13:180-181.

1941

- (a)"Edward Bausch Hall of Science and History. Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences. Guide Bulletin 7.
- (b)"Bausch Hall of Science and History of the Rochester Museum". Science Monthly. July:53:96-97.
- (c)"The Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences". Museum Journal, 43:September:6.
- (d)"Art Reproductions of the Seneca Indians". Museum Service, November 14: 9:31-33.
- (e)"Museums Mean Business". Museum Service, 14: November:9.

1942

- (a)"Museum Regulations", compiled by Arthur Caswell Parker. Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences. Museum Regulations No. 9.
- (b)War and the Museum Program. Museum Service, February: 15:37-39.
- (c)"Looking Ahead in Anthropology". Museum Service, March: 15:62-63.
- (d)"Anthropology Looks Ahead". An address delivered before the Rochester Philosophical Society, October 29, 1937, and read before the Rochester Philosophical Society, March 16, 1942. Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences, Staff Papers and Addresses.
- (e)"Looking Ahead in Archeology". Museum Service, May: 15:105-106.

1943

- (a)"Museums in the World Crisis". Museum News, September 1: 21:6-8.

(b)"Rochester (N.Y) Museum of Arts and Sciences". Description of New Buildings and Activities. Museums Journal, September: 43:81-84.

(c)"We Can't Get Away from History". Museum Service, October: 16:66.

1944

(a)A Paragraph History of the Rochester Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution. (Rochester N.Y) Sons of American Revolution, National Society.

(b)"Culture Stimulates Commerce". Museum Service, April: 17:30-31.

(c)"President's Message" (New York State Historical Association) New York History, October: 26:409-414.

(d)"What Is a Transorama?" Museums Journal, October:45:114.

(e)"What Is a Museum? " Museum Service, November:18:75.

(f)"Where Is Our Museums?" Museum Service, December:18:83.

1946

(a)"Lewis Henry Morgan as Social Philosopher". Union (College) Worthies. 1:10-15.

(b)"President's Message" (New York State Historical Association). New York History, 27:January:1-6.

(c)"Policies and Programs for the New York State Historical Association". New York History, 27:January:8-13.

(d)"The President's Message" (New York State Historical Association). New York History, 27:April:133-140.

(e)"The President's Message" (New York State Historical Association). New York History, 27:July:277-284.

(f)"Construction of a Floral Diorama at Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences; abstract". Museums Journal, 46:August:90-91.

(g)"The President's Message" (New York State Historical Association). New York History, 27:October:417-423.

1947

(a)"The President's Message" (New York State Historical Association). New York History, 28:January:1-9.

(b)"Aspects of Philosophical Thought in Primitive Societies". Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences. Staff Lectures and Addresses. April.

(c)"The Future Rules Us Now". Museum Service, 20:April:38.

(d)"The President's Message" (New York State Historical Association). New York History, 28:April:121-127.

(e)"The Future Rules Us Now". The Philalethes. July :11.

(f)"The President's Message" (New York State Historical Association). New York History, 28:July:265-270.

(g)"Rochester Museum Honors Dr. A.C. Parker", by Gawaso Wanneh (pseudonym of Arthur Caswell Parker) Hobbies. 28:August:10-21.

1948

(a)"Which Way Now America". New York History, 29:January:10-20.

1949

(a)"Dr. Ritchie Departs" Museum Service, 77:50-51.

(b)"How Do You Rate in Hobbies?" Museum Service, 22:September:79.

1950

- (a)Red Streak of the Iroquois. Chicago: Children's Press.
- (b)"Financing Museums of History: Analyze Before You Ask". Museum News, 28: 1.
- (c)"The Museum Comes of Age". Museum Service, 23:April:41.

1952

- (a)Red Jacket, Last of the Seneca. New York:McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- (b)"Lewis Henry Morgan, 1818-1881". Museum Service, November. 25:77.

1953

- (a)"How Shall We Get an Indian Name?" Museum Service, 26:June:94.
- (b)"Where Questions are Answered". Museum Service, 26 December:163.

1954

- (a)"Sources and Range of Cooper's Indian Lore". New York History, 35:445-456.
- (b)"Who Was Hiawatha?" Museum Service, 27:December:158.

N.D

- (a)"Ely S. Parker - Man & Mason". Transactions of the American Lodge of Research n.d.:229-247.
- (b)The Indians of New York State. Home Missions Council.
- (c)"The Transcendent Word", by Gawaso Wanneh (pseudonym of Arthur Caswell Parker) Switzerland, n.d. 8 numb. [Typewritten

copy with notation in Dr. Parker's handwriting: "Published in Switzerland. Trans. in French"}.

(d)"Need for Keeping Abreast of Times". Now My Idea Is This. Rochester.

(e)"Origin of American Indian". Christian Science Monitor. (Boston, Mass.) Letter to the Editor.

(f)"The Rambling Lore of the Canandaigua Country". The Daily Messenger (Canandaigua, N.Y).

Edited by Arthur Caswell Parker

The American Indian Magazine, edited by Arthur Caswell Parker. Washington, D.C., Society of American Indians. 1913-1920. 7 vols.

Herodotus, compiled by Arthur Caswell Parker. Rochester, N.Y., Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences. 1935-1944. 36 nos.

The Museologist, compiled by Arthur Caswell Parker. Rochester, N.Y., Rochester Museum of the Arts and Sciences. 1935-1945. 41 nos.

Museum Service, edited by Arthur Caswell Parker. Rochester, N.Y., Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences. 1926-1945. 18 vols.

"Rochester War Council, Speakers' Bureau". Information Bulletin, edited by Arthur Caswell Parker. Rochester, N.Y., Rochester War Council Speakers' Bureau. 1943-1944. 27 nos.

Radio Scripts

Radio Broadcasts, sponsored by Rochester War Council Speakers' Bureau. 1942-1943. 86 broadcasts.

The Romance of Old Indian Days. WHAM (Rochester) Radio
Broadcasts, sponsored by Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences.
1937-1938. 28 broadcasts.

Books, Monographs and Articles Consulted

Alexander, E. P. (1983) Museum Masters: Their Museums and Their Influence. Nashville, Tennessee: The American Association for State and Local History.

Armstrong, W. H. (1978) Warrior in Two Camps: Ely S. Parker, Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Baker, W. (1983) Backward: An Essay on Indians, Time & Photography. Berkeley, Cal.: North Atlantic Books.

Baudrillard, J. (1968) Le système des objects. Paris: Gallimard.

Berkhofer, R.F. Jr. (1979) The White Man's Indian. New York: Vintage Books.

Bender, S. J. & E. V. Curtain (1990) A Prehistoric Context For the Upper Hudson: Report of the Survey and Planning Project. Prepared for the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation. New York: Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs.

Bhabha, H. K. (1983) "Difference, Discrimination, and the Discourse of Colonialism", Barker, Francis. Ed. The Politics of Theory. Colchester: The University of Essex.

---., (1984) "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse". October, 28: 125-133.

---., (1985) "Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority Under a Tree Outside Delhi, May 1817". Baker, Francis. Ed. Europe and Its Others. Colchester: The University of Essex.

Bloch, M. (1983) Marxism and Anthropology: The History of a Relationship. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Boas, F. (1907) "Some Principles of Museum Administration" Science, 25: 921-933.

---., Race, Language and Culture. (1940) New York: The Macmillan Company. [Boas, F. "The Indian Half-Blood" First published in "Popular Science Monthly", October 1894}.

Bonte, P. (1974) "From Ethnology to Anthropology: On Critical Approaches to the Human Sciences". Critique of Anthropology, 1, Autumn: 36-67.

Burnham, J. (1992) in Davis, A.F. & H.D. Woodman Conflict and Consensus in Modern American History Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath & Company.

Carnes, M. C. (1989) Secret Ritual and Manhood in Victorian America. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Clarke, J. M. (1910) "New York State Museum. Sixth Report of the Director of the Science Division". Education Department Bulletin Albany: 140, June.

Clawson, M. A. (1989) Constructing Brotherhood: Class, Gender and Fraternalism Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Clifford, J. (1988) The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature and Art. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Collier, D. (1969) "Chicago Comes of Age: The Worlds Columbian Exposition and The Birth of The Field Museum" Bulletin of the Field Museum of Natural History, 40:5:3-7.

Collier, J (1963) From Every Zenith: A Memoir. Denver, Col.: Sage Books.

Costo, R. (1986) in P. Kenneth Ed. Indian Self Rule: First Hand Accounts of Indian-White Relations From Roosevelt to Reagan New York: University Press of America.

Crum, S. J.(1988) "Henry Roe Cloud, A Winnebago Indian Reformer: His Quest for American Indian Higher Education" Kansas History 11:171-184.

De Waal Malefijt, A. (1974) Images of Man: A History of Anthropological Thought. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Deardorff, M. H (1951) "The Religion of Handsome Lake: Its Origin and Development" Bulletin of American Ethnology Bulletin 149.

Deloria, P. (1993) "White Sachemes and Indian Masons: American Indian Otherness and Nineteenth Century Fraternalism"; Bush, Clive. Ed., Democratic Vistas. 1:2:27-43.

Denslow, W. R. (1956) "Freemasonry and the American Indian". Transactions of the Missouri Lodge of Research. 13:25-50.

Dexter, R. W. (1966) "Putnam's Problems Popularizing Anthropology", American Scientist, 54:3:315-332.

---., (1966) "Frederick Ward Putnam & The Development of Museums of Natural History & Anthropology in America". Curator, 1:151-155.

Dixon, R. B., (1935) "Putnam, F. W."in Dumas, M. Ed. Dictionary of American Biography. [Under the Auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies]. New York: Charles Scribner & Sons 15:276-278.

Dumenil, L. (1984) Freemasonry and American Culture, 1880-1930. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

"Ely Samuel Parker: From Sachem to Brigadier General"(1961) New York State and the Civil War. 1:4:1-5.

Emberley, J. V. (1990) "A Gift for Languages: Native Women and The Textual Economy of the Colonial Archive". Cultural Critique, 17:21-50.

Engels, F. (1884) The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State: In the Light of the Researches of Lewis H. Morgan. London: Lawrence & Wishart Ltd.

Fabian, J. (1983) Time and The Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fein, A. (1972) Frederick Law Olmsted and the American Environmental Tradition New York: Braziller.

Fenton, W. N. & Gulick, J. (1961) Symposium on Cherokee and Iroquois Culture Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American

Ethnology Bulletin, 180 Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

Fenton, W. N. (1941) "Tonawanda Longhouse Ceremonies: Ninety Years After Lewis Henry Morgan" Anthropological Papers of Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 128:13-18 Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

---. (1949) "Seth Newhouse's Traditional History & Constitution of the Iroquois Confederacy" Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 93:2:148-158.

---. (1962) Introduction. Morgan, Lewis Henry. League of the Iroquois. New York: Corinth Books Inc..

---. (1965) "The Iroquois Confederacy in the Twentieth Century: A Case Study of the Theory of Lewis Henry Morgan in 'Ancient Society'." Ethnology. 4:July: 251-265.

---. (1968) Introduction. Parker on the Iroquois: Iroquois Uses of Maize and Other Food Plants; The Code of Handsome Lake, the Seneca Prophet; The Constitution of the Five Nations. By Arthur C. Parker. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.

---., (1972) "The Iroquois in History". in Burke Leacock, Eleanor. Ed. North American Indians: In Historical Perspective. New York: Random House:129-169.

---., (1978) "'Aboriginally Yours', Jesse J. Cornplanter, Hah-Yonh-Wonh-Ish, The Snipe Seneca, 1889-1957" in Liberty, M Ed. American Indian Intellectuals 1976 Proceedings of the American Ethnological Society, St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Company.

Forbes, J.D. (1993) Africans and Native Americans: The Language of Race and the Evolution of Red-Black Peoples. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Franklin, J. H. (1965) Three Negro Classics. New York: Avon Books.

Freke-Gould, R. (1852) The History of Freemasonry: Its Antiquities, Symbols, Constitutions, Customs, etc...Embracing An Investigation of the Records of the Organisations of the Fraternity in England, Scotland, Ireland, British Colonies, France, Germany

and the United States. Received from Official Sources. Edinburgh: T.C & E.C. Jack, Grange Publishing Works.

Goldenweiser, Rev. A. A. (1916) The Constitution of The Five Nations by Arthur C. Parker American Anthropologist, 18:431-436.

Haraway, D. (1985) "Teddy Bear Patriarchy: Taxidermy in the Garden of Eden, New York City, 1908-1936", Social Text, Winter: 20-64.

Harris, N. (1990) Cultural Excursions: Marketing Appetites and Cultural Tastes in Modern America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hauptman, L. M. (1979) "The Iroquois School of Art: Arthur C. Parker & The Seneca Arts Project, 1935-1941" New York History. 60:July:253-312.

---. (1981) The Iroquois and The New Deal. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Hertzberg, H. W. (1966) "Teaching a Pre-Columbian Culture: The Iroquois". Albany: University of the State of New York, State Education Department Bureau of Secondary Curriculum Development.

---., (1971) The Search For An American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

---. (1978) "Arthur C. Parker: Seneca, 1881-1955" Liberty, M., Ed., in American Indian Intellectuals 1976 Proceedings of the American Ethnological Society. St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Company.

---. (1979) "Nationality, Anthropology, & Pan-Indianism in the Life of Arthur C. Parker", Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society Feb. 20:123: 47-72.

Hewitt, Rev. J.N.B. (1917) The Constitutions of the Five Nations by Arthur C. Parker. American Anthropologist, 19:429-438.

Hollcroft, T. R. (1961) "Notes on: Ely S. Parker - Man & Mason". Transactions of The American Lodge of Research, Free and Accepted Masons. 8:2: 248-257.

- Hoxie, F. E. (1984) A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hurtado, A. L. and P. Iverson (1984) Major Problems in American Indian History. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath & Company.
- Hymes, D. Ed. (1974) Reinventing Anthropology. New York: Vintage Books.
- Iverson, P. (1981) "Carlos Montezuma and the Fort McDowell Yavapai", Journal of Arizona History 22: Winter: 415-426.
- Jacknis, I. (1985) "Franz Boas and Exhibits" in Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture. Stocking, G. W. Jr. Ed. (History of Anthropology III). Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Johnson, H. A. (1937) "John Cotton Dana", Library Quarterly, 7: 1: January:50-98.
- Judkins, R. A., Ed., (1987) Iroquois Studies: A Guide to Documentary and Ethnographic Resources From Western New York and the Genesee Valley. New York: Department of Anthropology State University of New York & Geneseo Foundation.
- Kallen, H. M. (1924) Culture and Democracy in the United States. 1970, New York: Arno Press and the New York Times.
["Democracy versus the Melting Pot" Reprinted from The Nation, 18 and 25 February, 1915].
- Karp, I. & S. D. Lavine. eds. (1991) Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics & Politics of Museum Display, Washington, D.C.: The Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Karp, I. & C. M. Kreamer & S. D. Lavine. eds. (1992) Museums and Communities: The Politics of Public Culture, Washington, D.C.: The Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Kelly, L. C. (1975) "The Indian Reorganization Act: The Dream and the Reality" Pacific Historical Review, 44: August:291-312.
- Knight, S. (1985) The Brotherhood: The Secret World of the Freemasons. 1983. London: Panther Granada Publishing.

Kosok, P. Ed. (1951) "An Unknown Letter From Lewis H. Morgan to Abraham Lincoln". University of Rochester Library Bulletin. 6: Winter: 34-40.

Kroeber, T. (1961) Ishi in Two Worlds. London: The Cresset Library.

Krupat, A. (1988) "Anthropology in The Ironic Mode: The Work of Franz Boas". Social Text, 19/20:105-118.

Lanternari, V. (1963) Religions of the Oppressed. London: MacGibbon & Kee.

Lawrence, J. (1987) Freemasonry - A Religion? Eastbourne: Kingsway Publication.

Lowie, R. H. (1936) "Lewis Henry Morgan in Historical Perspective" in Kroeber, A.L. Ed., Essays in Anthropology. Freeport, N.Y: Books for Libraries Press, Inc.

McNickle, D (1980) in Schusky, E. Ed., Political Organization of Native North American Indians New York: University Press of America.

Meriam, L. et al. (1928) The Problem Of Indian Administration. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Montezuma, C. (1913) "Light on The Indian Situation". Quarterly Journal of the Society of American Indians. 1:1: 50-53.

Morgan, L. H. (1851) The League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nee or Iroquois. 1875. Secaucus, N.J.: The Citadel Press.

---., (1858) "Laws of Descent of the Iroquois". Proceedings of the Advancement of Science. 11/12: 132-148.

---., (1868) The American Beaver and His Works 1976 Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company.

---., (1871) Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family n.d. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company.

---., (1877.) Ancient Society or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery Through Barbarism to Civilization. n.d. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company.

---., (1881) Houses and Houselife of the American Aborigines. n.d. Charles H. Kerr & Company.

Murray, D. (1982) Modern Indians British Association For American Studies. Pamphlet 8. Tyne & Wear: Peterson Printers.

"Parker, Arthur C". (n.d.) Who's Who in America. Buffalo Historical Society, Historical Volume 1, 1607-1896.

Parker, E. (1905) "General Parker's Autobiography". Publications of the Buffalo Historical Society. 8:511-536.

"Parker, E. S." (n.d.) Who's Who in America. Buffalo Historical Society, Historical Volume 1, 1607-1896.

Parman, D.L. (1976) The Navajos and the New Deal New Haven, Conn.: The University Press of America.

Resek, C. (1960) Lewis Henry Morgan : American Scholar. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ritchie, W. A. (1956) "Arthur Caswell Parker, 1881-1955". American Antiquity. 21: 293-295.

Robinson, E. S. (1933) "Experimental Education in Museums - A Perspective". The Museum News. X:February 15: 5-8.

Rose, R. (1987) "The Lewis Henry Morgan Collection at the Rochester Museum" in Judkins, R.A. Ed. Iroquois Studies: A Guide to Documentary and Ethnographic Resources From Western New York and the Genesee Valley New York: Department of Anthropology State University of New York & The Genesee Foundation.

Sayers, J., M. Evans and N. Redclift , eds., (1987) Engels Revisited: New Feminist Essays, London: Tavistock Publications.

Schrader, R. F. (1983) The Indian Arts and Crafts Board: An Aspect of Indian New Deal Policy Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press.

Scott, D. C. (1912) "Traditional History of the Confederacy of the Six Nations". Royal Society of Canada, Proceedings and Transactions. Third Series, Section 11: 195-246.

Seymour, F. W. (1975) Indian Agents of the Old Frontier. Millwood, N.Y.: D. Appleton - Century Co. Inc., 1941. New York: Kraus Reprint Co.

Skinner, Rev. A. (1915) of The Code of Handsome Lake, the Seneca Prophet, by Arthur C. Parker. American Anthropologist, 17:180-181.

Smith, D. B. (1982) Long Lance: The True Story of an Imposter. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.

Speck, Rev. F. G. (1911) Iroquois Uses of Maize and Other Food Plants. By A.C. Parker. American Anthropologist, 13:135-136.

Stern, B. J. (1931) Lewis Henry Morgan : Social Evolutionist. New York: Russell & Russell.

Stocking, G.W. Jr. (1973) "Boas, Franz". Dictionary of American Biography. Under the Auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies. 1935. Johnson, A. et al. eds. (1973) Supplement 3. N.Y: Charles Scribner & Sons:81-86.

---., Ed., (1985) Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture. [History of Anthropology Vol.3.] Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Sumner, W. G. (1906) Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores & Morals. New York: Charles H. Kerr & Son.

Thomas, S. W. (1955a) "Arthur Caswell Parker: 1881-1955 Anthropologist, Historian and Museum Pioneer." Rochester History, 17:2:July.

---., (1955b) "Arthur Caswell Parker - Leader and Prophet of the Museum World". Museum Service. 28:18-25.

---., (1959) "Arthur C. Parker: Master of Hobbies". Rochester: Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences. Reprinted from Museum Service, 32, October .

Tooker, E. (1968) "On the New Religion of Handsome Lake". Anthropological Quarterly. 41:187-200.

---., (1983) "The Structure of the Iroquois League: Lewis Henry Morgan's Research and Observations" Ethnohistory, 30:3:141-154.

Trautmann, T. R. (1987) Lewis Henry Morgan and the Invention of Kinship. Berkeley, Cal., : University of California Press.

Turner, F. J. (1894) "The Significance of the Frontier in American History". Proceedings of the Forty-First Annual Meeting of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Madison, Wis.:79-112.

Tylor, G. D. (1975) "Anthropologists, Reformers and the Indian New Deal". Prologue, 7: Fall:151-162.

Wallace, A.F.C. (1952) "Handsome Lake and the Great Revival in the West" American Quarterly , B:Summer:146-165.

---., (1956) "Revitalization Movements". American Anthropologist, 58:264-281.

---., (1972) The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca New York: Vintage Books.

Waltmann, H. G. (1971) "Circumstantial Reformer: President Grant and The Indian Problem". Arizona and The West. 31: Winter:323-342.

---., (1979) "Ely Samuel Parker, 1869-71", in Kvasnicka, R. M. & Viola, H. J. eds., The Commissioners of Indian Affairs, 1824-1977. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Weil, S. E. (1983) Beauty and the Beasts: On Museums, Art, the Law, and the Market Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

White, L. A. (1957) "How Morgan Came to Write Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity". Papers of The Michigan Academy of Science, Arts & Letters, 42:257-268.

Wiley, G. R. & J. A. Sabloff. (1974) A History of American Archaeology. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman & Company.

Wilson, B. R. (1973) Magic & The Millennium Washington, D.C.: Granada Publishing Limited.

Wissler, C. (1917) "The Material Culture of North American Indians". American Anthropologist, 16:447-515.

Yeuell, D. (1934) "Ely Samuel Parker". Dumas, Malone (Ed) Dictionary of American Biography. New York: Charles Scribner & Sons, 772:219-220.

Young, R. (1990) White Mythologies: Writing History and the West, London: Routledge.

Zeller, T. (1987) "Arthur C. Parker : A Pioneer in American Museums" Curator, 30/31:March:41-62.

---. (1989) "Arthur Parker and The Educational Mission of American Museums" Curator, 32/32:June:104-122.

Plays

Zangwill, I. (1908) The Melting Pot: A Drama in Four Acts, 1919. London: William Heinemann.

Newspaper Articles

Dupuy, W. A. (1911) "Looking For An Indian Booker T. Washington To Lead Their People", New York Tribune. Part 3: August 27: 3.

Unpublished Papers

Sullivan, L.P., "Arthur C. Parker's Contributions To New York State Archaeology". Paper presented at the 75th annual meeting of the New York State Archaeological Association. Rochester, April, 1991. In author's possession.

Interviews

Interview with Fenton, W.N. 14th March, 1992. Slingerlands, New York.

Interview with Thomas, Stephen W. March 24, 1992. Rochester, New York.

Interview with Charles, R. 27 March 1992. Tonawanda Community House, Tonawanda Indian Reservation, New York.

