

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Notes from the "Culture Wars": More Annotations on the Debate Regarding the Iroquois and the Origins of Democracy

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8kp1m4nz>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 23(1)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Johansen, Bruce E.

**Publication Date**

1999

**DOI**

10.17953

**Copyright Information**

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

Peer reviewed

COMMENTARY

## Notes from the “Culture Wars”: More Annotations on the Debate Regarding the Iroquois and the Origins of Democracy

**BRUCE E. JOHANSEN**

---

---

*As to our aboriginal or Indian population ... I know it seems to be agreed that they must gradually dwindle as time rolls on, and in a few generations more leave only a reminiscence, a blank. But I am not at all clear about that. As America ... develops, adapts, entwines, faithfully identifies its own—are we to see it cheerfully accepting using all the contributions of foreign lands from the whole outside globe—and then rejecting the only ones distinctively its own...?¹*

—Walt Whitman, 1883

Increased general awareness of Iroquois precedents for democracy (and the continuing debate over them) has not kept a sizable number of people (some of them conservatives bearing household names) from dismissing the idea in a summary manner, often with no knowledge that a genuine debate has been engaged. During the last few years, with a mixture of consternation and awe, I have watched a number of very well-known conservative authors and pundits attempt to turn the idea I have researched into “canon fodder” in the so-called “culture wars” over multicultural education. The idea of Iroquois influ-

---

Bruce E. Johansen is Robert T. Reilly Professor of Communication at the University of Nebraska at Omaha, where he is also coordinator of Native American Studies. Johansen has published extensively on the subject of the Iroquois and the origins of democracy: authoring *Forgotten Founders* (1982), coauthoring *Exemplar of Liberty* (1991), and currently editing a series of reference books in Native American history.

ence (and the sharp debate over it) has spread much faster than the research and understanding of historical circumstances required to make sense of it.

Having researched the question of Iroquois influence in the origins of democracy since the middle 1970s, I began an annotated bibliography of reactions to the idea during the early 1990s. In 1996, roughly the first five hundred of these reactions were published by Greenwood Press as *Native American Political Systems and the Evolution of Democracy: An Annotated Bibliography*.<sup>2</sup> By the end of 1998 the number of reactions was nearing one thousand, and a second volume was being prepared for press.

I have harvested contemporary reactions from various books, academic journals, magazines, and databases at the same time that my bibliography has been enriched by a steady infusion of references on the idea from the past, in some cases, as long as a century and a half ago. Taken as a whole, the proportion of references in favor of the idea is, over time, greater than depiction of it as “feel-good” history, myth, utter falsehood, or an exercise in wishful thinking that an old hippie (“Boomer”) dreamed up.

The outright denials of the idea can be telling of larger angsts in our culture. This is a subject that tempts the willingly ignorant to make rash statements. With mass media attention to the idea of Iroquois influence, the rhetoric of the debate has slipped its historical moorings and been driven into a rhetorical sea by contemporary storms over political correctness and multiculturalism. In the hands of Rush Limbaugh, et. al., the “debate” becomes a muddy porridge of buzzwords and “factoids,” simplified, then blown horribly out of proportion to make the case for Iroquois influence sound ridiculous and vapid. The idea travels much faster in factoid form than the research supporting it. I sometimes close my eyes and imagine the assertions making the rounds of countless conservative cocktail parties like a fearsome plague, with an ideological life of its own to which I have no access and over which I exercise no control. The forging of historical memory on a mass scale can be a very strange process, indeed.

As a student of communication, I have assembled a referential history of the “influence” idea to illustrate how an idea can spread through literate culture at several levels. Aside from its ability to cause numerous well-known conservatives to lose their intellectual lunches, the influence idea has been adapted to debates in several academic fields, most often in law, American history, and Native American studies, but also in English, philosophy, religion, and public administration, along with sociology, anthropology, and ethnohistory.

The idea that the Iroquois helped shape democracy has lost none of its power to evoke horror stories of “political correctness” on the Far Right. Jonathan Foreman, in William F. Buckley’s *National Review*, bemoans his belief that “Baby Boomers” have infected Hollywood movies with liberal values based on their “generational experience” in the 1960s. Collectively, Foreman argues, these “Boomers” are shaping the media with their “delusions.” He moans, by way of letting his conservative audience know just how vapid the Boomers can be, that “We live in a society where some students are taught that the United States Constitution was inspired by the Iroquois, that the Greeks stole science from Africans, and that the Aztecs were sweeties who didn’t really eat people like popcorn.”<sup>3</sup>

"We have already seen this in feminist and Afrocentric studies," writes Robert H. Bork in his 1996 polemic, *Slouching Toward Gomorrah: Modern Liberalism and American Decline*. "But it is everywhere. In New York State it is official educational doctrine that the United States Constitution was heavily influenced by the political arrangements of the Iroquois Confederacy."<sup>4</sup>

Bork has made up his mind in conformance with his own biases that research cannot possibly exist on such a silly subject as how the Iroquois Confederacy helped shape democracy. He writes, with an air of apparent authority: "The official promulgation of this idea was not due to any research that disclosed its truth," but because "the Iroquois had an intensive lobbying campaign."<sup>5</sup>

There you have it in the Book of Bork—"no research," and from a person who has been called a legal scholar, one who has been nominated to sit on the U.S. Supreme Court. Really, it is Bork who has done no research on the subject. One learns very quickly that in the marketplace of ideas some people have big bullhorns, and others have small ones. I have learned that my bullhorn as a scholar sometimes carries a very, very small toot. In the meantime, Bork's book reached the number eight slot on the New York *Times* list of best-selling nonfiction books in the United States.

Bork ends his diatribe against the issue by claiming that he speaks for the 38,000 Iroquois in New York State, "most of whom probably have no interest in the myth of the Iroquois and the Constitution."<sup>6</sup> In one paragraph, Bork indicts the Iroquois for muscling the idea into the New York State educational system, and in another he says they really don't care. Bork supplies no Iroquois support for his assertion.

Bork's is merely one of the more uninformed of several recent reactions to a valid effort to broaden the ambit of our political history. Phyllis Schlafly, for example, grumbled in an opinion piece for the Copley News Service that "A high school social studies teacher told me that three new social-studies textbooks all pay homage to the new gods of multiculturalism by teaching that we got our Constitution from the Iroquois Indians."<sup>7</sup>

I should not, of course, let Schlafly's reference to me as one of the "gods of multiculturalism" go to my head, since she (and Bork) undoubtedly has never read anything I have written on this or any other subject. I have followed the unfolding of this debate for a quarter century, and never cease to be amazed at the fact that I seem to have lucked onto a dissertation subject on which nearly everyone feels compelled to take a political position, including a sizable number of people who know very little about the subject. Count among them (in addition to Limbaugh) Patrick Buchanan, John Leo, and George Will, to name a sampling whose views appeared in the first volume of annotations.

Some of the scions of the American Society for Ethnohistory (ASE) have been just as dismissive, although in a more elegant tone. Beginning with Elisabeth Tooker's 1988 critique of "influence," *Ethnohistory*, the society's journal, has long been a fount of anti-influence rhetoric. Frederick Hoxie, president of ASE during 1997, revisited this ground in his presidential address to the organization's annual convention, titled "Ethnohistory for a Tribal World," condemning what he calls "contributionist" history.

Hoxie is a historian with a penchant for more than simply writing history. He is also a gatekeeper with an interest in instructing other historians what (to borrow Noam Chomsky's phrase) is inside and outside of the realm of permissible debate. Certain "scholarly paths," he tells us, "are no longer helpful."<sup>8</sup>... A path that does not need expansion is represented by books from the 'contributions' school," which Hoxie says are authored by "romantic polemicists."<sup>9</sup> The fact that Hoxie dismisses the whole idea of Iroquois influence on democracy without engaging the historical facts does not seem, to him, to qualify what *he* writes as a "polemic." He saves that word, with all its negative connotations, for those historical tellings he dislikes—Jack Weatherford and his "less able colleagues," including, by name, the compiler of this bibliography.<sup>10</sup> To Hoxie, the "polemical writings" of the "contributionist" approach are "simplistic," wearing "dull academic uniforms," involving "abuses and distortions," to be "set aside." Writers of such histories are said, by Hoxie, to resemble "cabaret pianists who talk about baseball while playing their repertoire of standards ... engag[ing] ... ultimately [in] secondary and superficial conversations with ethnohistorical materials ..."<sup>11</sup> A reader was left to assume that Professor Hoxie plays *his* piano in a renowned symphony, or at least uptown at the Ritz.

Having constructed a narrative that accuses "influence" advocates of having nothing to support their case except mushy polemics, Hoxie himself attempts to dismiss the entire question with a polemical blast of his own. He does not engage a single historical fact in the debate.

William Starna, writing with George Hamell, condemned the idea vehemently in *New York History*.<sup>12</sup> Usually, when scholars' ideas are attacked with such unabashed vigor, journal editors offer rebuttal space, as before, with us, in *Ethnohistory* and the *William and Mary Quarterly*. In this case, Starna and Hamell's piece found its way to us through a chain of friends nearly a year after its publication date, too late for an effective reply.

Starna and Hamell must have spent many hours ransacking footnotes in *Exemplar of Liberty* and other works. They find a handful of factual errors which they admit are minor. The problem here is that Starna and Hamell share a problem with Hoxie: they are so engaged in debunkery that they do not address any of the ideas that were communicated between the Iroquois and colonial Americans. Instead, Starna and Hamell debate, with excruciating attention to detail, whether Canassatego had brawny arms and whether he was known for being unsociably direct after he had had a few drinks. As an elicitation of historical truth, this argument rings rather hollow. The piece is really an ideologically driven argument masquerading as historical criticism. Starna and Hammel find errors the way Senator Joseph McCarthy used to locate communists, blowing a few minor errors into an asserted conspiracy to perpetrate what they regard as an intellectual fraud.<sup>13</sup>

In their rush to condemn, Starna and Hamell fail to extend their ambit beyond the debate over Iroquois influences on the Albany Plan, beginning with the words of Canassatego at the Lancaster Treaty Council of 1744. They ignore most of the case, which takes the influence idea from the early seventeenth century to the end of the nineteenth. They also restrict their inquiry

to New York sources, forgetting, perhaps, that representatives from other colonies (notably Pennsylvania) sent representatives to the important events of the time, who left records in their respective archives. Starna and Hamell did not look for evidence that is available to anyone in the archives of Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Virginia.

Hoxie, Starna, and Hamell aside, anyone who is ready for some *real* academic mudwrestling may wish to consult Alvin J. Schmidt's *Menace of Multiculturalism*. As his title indicates, Schmidt, a professor of sociology at Illinois College, Jacksonville, is a take-no-prisoners opponent of multiculturalism. At the beginning of a chapter titled "The Facts Be Damned," Schmidt lists a number of "facts" that he says multiculturalists have "invented." One of these is that "the Constitution of the United States was shaped by the Iroquois Indians."<sup>14</sup> Schmidt also denies the idea that Crispus Attucks, the first casualty of the Boston Massacre, was black. (Attucks' father was black. His mother was Native American.) Since he has never heard of any of the many books and articles documenting it, Schmidt says that the "influence" idea is "undocumented." Schmidt would rather history stress the cruel and violent aspects of Native American cultures, which he says squishy-soft multiculturalists downplay. Schmidt is barely getting warmed up. Later in the book he argues that American Indian cultures were environmentally destructive and that women in Native societies lived "in virtual slavery." Returning to the Iroquois influence issue, Schmidt calls it a "fabrication," as well as "historical fiction."<sup>15</sup>

As the contemporary debate has raged, one unexpected result of my most recent research has been a large number of older mentions of the influence idea. Many of these references surfaced in the context of reading with other objectives (most of it while writing a number of reference books for Greenwood Press). Strung together, these references reveal an impressive lineage from Lewis Henry Morgan through Frederick Engels, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Matilda Joslyn Gage. The idea popped up in New York *Times* editorials during 1873 and 1893, and in a general survey of American Indian societies first published in 1855.

In a survey of Native American cultures in the Western Hemisphere, first published in 1855, Charles de Wolf Brownell wrote, "The nature of the [Iroquois] league was decidedly democratic; arbitrary power was lodged in the hands of no ruler.... A singular unanimity was generally observed in their councils."<sup>16</sup> Brownell then added, on the same page, "We are told that for a long period before the [American] revolution, the Iroquois chiefs and orators held up their own confederation as an example for the imitation of the English colonies." By whom Brownell was told this, he does not say. It is possible that Brownell read the assertion in one of the early editions of Lewis Henry Morgan's *League of the Haudenosaunee, or Iroquois* (1851). Nearly a century after the pivotal events that formed the United States, Morgan characterized the Iroquois League as a federal model very much like the new nation: "The nations [of the Iroquois League] sustained nearly the same relation to the league that the American states bear to the Union. In the former, several oligarchies are combined within one, in the same manner as [in] the latter, several republics are embraced in one republic."<sup>17</sup>

Sometimes, new information creates historical riddles. For example, someone, very likely an Iroquois (a Seneca in one account, a Cayuga in two), expressed an opinion in 1808 (one account) or 1847 (two accounts) saying that the United States' founding generation stood at the Longhouse door and counted itself lucky to get the sweepings. Was it an unidentified Cayuga chief in 1808,<sup>18</sup> Dr. Peter Wilson, a Cayuga, in 1847,<sup>19</sup> or Ely S. Parker, a Seneca who later served as secretary to General U.S. Grant, in 1847?<sup>20</sup> The record yields three possible authors of what is essentially the same sentence. The reference is said to have appeared in a paper, "Territorial Limits, Geographical Names and Trails of the Iroquois," which was read by Dr. Peter Wilson, a Cayuga, at a meeting of the New York Historical Society during 1847. Wilson said, "Have we, the first holders of this prosperous region, no longer a share in your history. Glad were your fathers to sit upon the threshold of the Long House, rich did they hold themselves in getting the mere sweepings from its door." McLuhan's source for this quotation is Lewis H. Morgan, *League of the Hodelosaunee, or Iroquois*.<sup>21</sup>

At the turn of the century, the noted ethnographer of the Iroquois William N. Beauchamp took up the subject. While discussing the federal structure of the Iroquois Confederacy, Beauchamp writes that "Local affairs were left to national councils, as in our general and state governments." Beauchamp also writes that "... the chiefs do not seem to have worn any distinctive badge.... This is one of the curious resemblances in our national political system and that of the Iroquois."<sup>22</sup>

Early in the twentieth century, Seneca Arthur C. Parker annotated his version of the Great Law of Peace with this statement: "Here, then, we find the right of popular nomination, the right of recall and of woman suffrage flourishing in the old America of the Red Man ... centuries before it became the clamor of the new America of the white invader. Who now shall call the Indians and the Iroquois savages?"<sup>23</sup>

In a survey of American Indian cultures published by the Smithsonian in 1929 (republished in 1934), Rose Palmer undertakes a detailed description of the Iroquois League, including its founding story and political organization. As part of this description, she writes: "It was an extraordinary genius for social organization, which culminated in a confederation that endured through two centuries and in some respects served as a model for the union of the Colonies."<sup>24</sup> Given the contemporary debate over the idea in school curricula, I was surprised to find a curriculum that took up the idea of Iroquois contributions to democracy, dated 1972, in Oakland, California.<sup>25</sup>

Personal anecdotes sometimes help to build an outline of this idea's history. For example, Mohawk John Kahionhes Fadden tells me that his father, Ray Fadden, discussed Iroquois democracy with Felix Cohen, who maintained a cabin at Buck Pond within walking distance of the Faddens' homes at Onchiota in the Adirondacks. These conversations began in the 1940s, when both men were publishing references to the idea. Oral history can play an important role in stitching together a pile of written records, although it only rarely meets the style rules of annotated bibliographies, which are constructed to aid researchers in finding published sources that are widely available in libraries. Following are a few of the more interesting such anecdotes:

- An e-mail from José Barreiro, editor, *Native Americas*, Cornell University, January 22, 1997: "As far as the influence idea, an interesting anecdote is when the big Mayan delegation came to Akwesasne (1981) to learn about the Great Law of Peace to consider as a model for the now-surfacing Mayan confederacy. Influences cut many different ways." Barreiro was working at *Akwesasne Notes* when the Mayas visited in 1981.
- E-mail from Donald Grinde, December 4, 1994. While at an academic conference hosted by UCLA Indian Studies December 3, Grinde met with Tom Hayden. Hayden, a California state senator at the time, bought all copies of *Exemplar of Liberty* (1991) offered at the conference by the UCLA American Indian Studies Center, the book's publisher.
- Personal letter and attachment to Johansen from Eleanor M. Herbert, Independence Park, Philadelphia, May 9, 1988. Ms. Herbert, a park ranger, waged a campaign to have Native American contributions to democracy observed at the national urban park in Philadelphia which includes Independence Hall. She also sought to have *Forgotten Founders* sold in the park gift shop, and succeeded, for a time, until one of her supervisors ordered the book removed. That supervisor later retired, and *Forgotten Founders* was again placed on sale at the gift shop.

I continue to be amazed at the scope of the debate and the many audiences it has reached. Notable skirmishes in the debate have taken place in unlikely venues, such as Canada's *Financial Post*.<sup>26</sup> In Illinois, mention that the influence idea played a role in the state assessment test for public-school students was enough to compel introduction of a bill to change the test.<sup>27</sup> The idea also has been presented to a Japanese audience<sup>28</sup> and has been taken up in French and English newspapers.

The influence idea has even made waves in the U.S. Navy. During the fall of 1995, Washington *Times* columnist John McCaslin ridiculed Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Jeremy Boorda for sending a directive to "all commands on land and sea" honoring Native American contributions to democracy in observance of Native American Heritage Month in November. "And you thought the great genius of our form of government was bequeathed by that race of kings across yonder ocean—the Magna Carta, the common law, and all that? But it wasn't, according to eminent historian and political scientist Jeremy Boorda, who moonlights as chief of naval operations." Admiral Boorda encouraged all commands to "support programs and exhibits, publish items of interest in command bulletins, and promote maximum participation by military and civilian personnel." McCaslin quotes an unnamed "senior veteran" as calling this the silly season of politically correct admirals. The veteran is quoted as saying, "I don't know whether to laugh or cry."<sup>29</sup>

Mary Lefkowitz, a professor of classics at Wellesley College, left me with an intriguing e-mail tidbit that I was never able to confirm with a published source: that the noted feminist Gloria Steinem had talked about the Iroquois role in the origins of democracy in a commencement speech at Wellesley. While I was never able to find a paper copy of that speech, I did learn, through Sally Roesch Wagner, that Steinem was preparing to cite some of Wagner's research on Iroquois foundations of nineteenth-century feminism in an historical anthology.<sup>30</sup> This survey work includes two chapters on the



origins of feminism, one of which includes excerpts from Wagner's work describing how the thoughts of Matilda Joslyn Gage and Elizabeth Cady Stanton were shaped by their association with Iroquois women in the mid- and late nineteenth century.

Steinem's speech provided the gist for part of Lefkowitz' *Wall Street Journal* review of *The Menace of Multiculturalism*:

Does the U.S. Constitution owe more to the 18th-century Iroquois than it does to the ancient Greeks? No, but many younger people may answer yes, because it is what they have learned in school. The history that children learn is not necessarily a record of what actually happened in the past; rather, it is often an account of what parents and teachers believe they ought to know.<sup>31</sup>

Later in her review, Lefkowitz wrote that "However impressive the governmental organization of the Iroquois nation, the inspiration behind the Constitution may once again be credited to the European Enlightenment, and the ancient Greeks...."<sup>32</sup> Lefkowitz, the author of *Not Out of Africa*, a widely quoted critique of Afrocentric education, is much more practiced at protecting the Greeks from purported African influences than shielding the United States' founders from Iroquois ones. Replying to Lefkowitz in the *Wall Street Journal's* letters column April 10, 1997, I said that giving credit to the Iroquois does not demean classical Greek or English precedents for United States basic law, but "add[s] an Iroquois role to the picture." I concluded, "We can have our Greeks, and our Iroquois, too."<sup>33</sup>

A week after this letter was published, I found a message in my e-mail inbox from Professor Lefkowitz, who acknowledged my main point: that we can study the Iroquois system and its impact on subsequent history without packing up the Greeks and the Magna Carta and sending them, along with the rest of Europe's classical history, back across the ocean. She also thanked me for sources on the debate and said that she had modified *Not Out of Africa* in paperback to take account of criticism. "I never doubted that the Iroquois and other Native Americans gave ideas to the European settlers," she wrote. "All I was questioning was the proportion."

During these e-mail exchanges, we seemed to be seeking a middle ground where a consensus of our history may settle, with regard to Native American influences, once the debates have been had and the feathers have flown, at the beginning of a new millennium on the Christian calendar. The middle ground that we seemed to be seeking also has been explored tentatively by Peter D. Salins in his book *Assimilation, American Style* (1997). Salins writes, in part

As Americans were differentiating themselves from their nominal or actual English ancestors in the realm of ideas, attitudes, and values, whatever remained of English cultural influences was also being progressively diluted by their contact with an ever-expanding array of non-English peoples. First, the European settlers were changed by contact with the real "native" Americans ... who introduced them to new foods, new arts and crafts, new modes of shelter, new strategies

for survival in the wilderness, and perhaps even some important civic principles.<sup>34</sup>

Vine Deloria, Jr.'s critique of the debate traces its intensity in our time more to academic power politics than to a search for historical veracity. "This fight over the Six Nations' influence has been a bitter one, and if it had been submitted to a jury for fair deliberation the anthropological profession would now be paying reparations to the Six Nations, for the evidence and the argument weigh heavily in favor of the Iroquois and their supporters."<sup>35</sup>

In *The Journal of the West*, Deloria responded to concerns expressed by Francis Paul Prucha in the January 1995 issue of the same publication that

The gap is widening, I fear, between solid historical accounts and the pseudohistorical or mythical accounts adopted and proclaimed by many Indians and their white advocates.... A good example, which has been around from [*sic*] some years, is the effort to make the Iroquois Confederacy the [*sic*] model for the United States Constitution and American democratic government. Books and articles advancing these claims have appeared, and they have been refuted by knowledgeable scholars ... but the idea continues to get support.... The differences between the Iroquois League and the Constitution are numerous and significant, but even granting similarities, to conclude that one was the model for the other is a simple *post hoc ergo propter hoc* fallacy.<sup>36</sup>

Instead, wrote Deloria, "The truth is that the discipline of historical writing is beginning to move from its centuries-long simplistic doctrinal interpretation of history as a *good white man-bad Indian* scenario." Deloria believes that "The real issue underlying Prucha's complaint is based on authority and status. His examples of revisionist, and presumably inaccurate, history and his descriptive language illustrate what I would call the pitiful complaint and anguish of the old orthodoxy."<sup>37</sup> Deloria told Prucha that he did not refute ideas of Iroquois influence on democracy, but simply attacked them, continuing

The point that the old school apparently misses is that one of the critical issues faced by the constitutional generation was the distribution of sovereign political powers between the new federal government and the colonies.... The Six Nations had long since resolved this problem.... [I]t seems absurd to continue to maintain that the founding fathers choose the course they did out of sheer genius.

He concluded: "Scholars should not worry that pristine historical study is undermined by new ideas or efforts to correct ancient wrongs. *That is the nature of continuing scholarship*" [emphasis in original].<sup>38</sup>

This newest harvest of influence annotations illustrates just how messy (and sometimes bruising) an experience the making of history can be, especially when contemporary politics are thrown into the intellectual stew pot. Despite the best efforts of some gatekeepers to shut down a debate they find troubling, this intellectual pot will continue to boil.

## NOTES

1. Wayne Moquin, *Great Documents in American Indian History* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973), 5–6.

2. See Bruce E. Johansen, "Debating the Origins of Democracy: Overview of an Annotated Bibliography," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 20:2 (1996): 155–172.

3. Jonathan Foreman, "Film I: Big Bad Brits (and Other Myths)," *National Review*, April 20, 1998.

4. Robert H. Bork, *Slouching Toward Gomorrah: Modern Liberalism and American Decline* (San Francisco: ReganBooks/HarperCollins, 1996), 306–307.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., 307.

7. Phyllis Schlafly, "National Standards Mean National Control," Copley News Service, September 9, 1997 (in LEXIS).

8. Frederick E. Hoxie, "Ethnohistory in a Tribal World," *Ethnohistory* 44:4 (Fall 1997): 600.

9. Ibid., 602.

10. Ibid., 603, 605.

11. Ibid., 605–606.

12. William A. Starna and George R. Hamell, "History and the Burden of Proof: The Case of the Iroquois Influence on the U.S. Constitution," *New York History* (October 1996): 427–452.

13. The point of view that the "influence" idea is an intellectual fraud was explored, before Starna and Hammell, by Elisabeth Tooker, "Review of *Exemplar of Liberty* (1991)," *Northeast Anthropologist* 46 (Fall 1993): 103–107.

14. Alvin J. Schmidt, *The Menace of Multiculturalism* (Westport, CN: Praeger, 1997), 43–44.

15. Ibid., 53–54.

16. Charles de Wolf Brownell, *The Indian Races of America: A General View* (Boston: Dayton and Wentworth, 1855), 287.

17. Lewis Henry Morgan, *League of the Haudenosaunee, or Iroquois* (1851; New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1922).

18. Virginia Irving Armstrong, *I Have Spoken: American History Through the Voices of the Indians* (Chicago: Swallow Press, 1971), 42.

19. T.C. McLuhan, *Touch the Earth: A Self-Portrait of Indian Existence* (New York: Outerbridge and Lazard, 1971), 100.

20. Ely S. Parker, "Address to the New York State Historical Society, May 27, 1847," in Ely S. Parker Papers, Reel 1, American Philosophical Society.

21. Morgan, *League of the Haudenosaunee, or Iroquois*, Book 3 (New York: Dodd-Mead, 1904), 104–105.

22. William M. Beauchamp, *Civil, Religious, and Mourning Councils and Ceremonies of Adoption of the New York Indians*, New York State Museum Bulletin No. 113 (Albany, NY: New York State Education Department, June 1907), 342, 347.

23. Arthur C. Parker, "The Constitution of the Five Nations," in *Parker on the Iroquois*, ed. William N. Fenton (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968), 11.

24. Rose Palmer, *The North American Indians: An Account of the American Indians North of Mexico, Compiled from the Original Sources*, Volume Four of the Smithsonian

Scientific Series (1929; Washington, DC: The Smithsonian Institution, 1934), 81.

25. Katie Beals and John J. Carusone, *Native Americans: The Constitution of the Iroquois League* (Oakland, CA: United School District, 1972).

26. David Frum, "Champions of Native Rights Spin Fabrications About the Past: Let's Set the Record Straight on Native History," *The Financial Post* (Ottawa), February 7, 1998, 20; Bill Hipwell, "Apology Should Have Been a Thank You," *The Financial Post* [Ottawa] February 3, 1998, 18.

27. John O'Connor, "Bill That Would Remove 'Subjective' Questions from ISAP Advances," Copley News Service, March 11, 1998, 18:57 Eastern Standard Time (in LEXIS).

28. Jun Hoshikawa, *Pacific Rim Inernet Journeys: Wisdom of the Mongoloid Indigenous Peoples* (Tokyo: NTT Publishing, 1997).

29. John McCaslin, "Inside the Beltway: the Great Pumpkin Speaks," *Washington Times*, October 26, 1995, A-5.

30. Gloria Steinem, Wilma Mankiller, Marysa Navarro, Barbara Smith, and Wendy Mink, eds. *Reader's Guide to U.S. Women's History* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1998).

31. Mary Lefkowitz, "Out of Many, More Than One," *Wall Street Journal*, March 24, 1997, A-16.

32. Ibid.

33. Bruce E. Johansen, "The Iroquois: Present at the Birth," *Wall Street Journal* Letter to the Editor, April 10, 1997, A-15.

34. Peter D. Salins, *Assimilation, American Style* (San Francisco: New Republic/HarperCollins, 1997), 90.

35. Thomas Biolsi and Larry J. Zimmerman, eds. *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria, Jr., and the Critique of Anthropology* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1997), 215-217.

36. Francis Paul Prucha, "Western Forum: The Challenge of Indian History," *The Journal of the West* 34:1 (January 1995): 3-4.

37. Vine Deloria, Jr., "The Western Forum: The Struggle for Authority," *Journal of the West* 34:3 (July 1995): 3-4.

38. Ibid.