FRIENDS LIKE THESE

By

DIANE ROTHENBERG

An Ethnohistorical Analysis of the Interaction Between Allegany Senecas and Quakers, 1798-1823

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Anthropology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1976

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Anthropology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

January 12, 1976
date

Melvin Ember
Chairman of Examining Committee

January 12, 1976
Date

Executive Officer

Burton Pasternak

Eleanor Leacock

Stanley Diamond (external reader)
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the course of this work I have received encouragement, support and assistance frommany people in many places. To all of them I extend my deepest gratitude.

Financial assistance for my studies and dissertation preparation was supplied by a National Science Foundation Graduate Traineeship Grant (1969 to 1971); by a Dissertation Year Fellowship (1972-1973) from the Graduate Center of the City University of New York; and by a Phillips Fund Grant through the American Philosophical Society.

The librarians of the special collections which I=used were invariably helpful and cordial and to all I am grateful. In particular, I wish to thank the kind people of the Chautauqua-Cattaraugus Public Library System who worked diligently to supply my most exotic requests and who offered friendship and encouragement as they did so.

To my Seneca family and friends I say "nya-weh," but this is inadequate to indicate my gratitude and love for allowing me to become part of their lives. A minor gesture of gratitude had been to attempt to cast some additional light on Seneca history.

Special thanks is due my advisor, Melvin Ember, for his patience, assistance and concern.

Without the support and love I received from my husband, Jerome Rothenberg, my son, Matthew Rothenberg, this work would never have been completed. Indeed, it would never have been started. I love and thank them both.

A NOTE ON ORTHOGRAPHY

In order to avoid visual distractions, I have chosen to disregard improper spellings, punctuations and errors in grammatical forms within direct quotations and, so, I do not employ the designation "sic" where errors occur. The authors of the direct quotations must be held accountable for their own errors, and I will take responsibility for any errors occurring elsewhere.

The alternative spellings of Allegheny, Alleghany, Allegany, exist in the real world. Again, I have retained the spelling used by the author of a direct quotation even when this is not consistent with the spelling commonly used. In Pennsylvania, the River is the Allegheny; in New York, it is either spelled that way or either of the other two forms may occur. The Reservation is "Allegany" and the Senecas who live there are "Allegany" Senecas. The differences in spelling are not used to convey any subtle differences of reference, but I attempt to conform to local usage.

PREFACE

"The central theme of a new history of Indians ought to be the remarkable persistence of cultural and personality traits and ethnic identity in Indian societies in the face of white conquest and efforts at elimination or assimilation" (Berkhofer 1971:358).

For the last twenty years there has developed a growing recognition that the American Indian is not disappearing. Contrary to the hopes and endeavors of government and missionaries, and to the predictions of students of these "dying cultures," Indian communities have remained stable or increased in population and have retained a sense of separateness. With an increasing acceptance of this as a reality by both Indians and non-Indians, with a recogniton of cultural pluralism and ethnicity as part of American social structure, and with a heightened political consciousness and level of activity developing within these communities, it may be anticipated that the American Indian will continue not to disappear.

Thus it has become incumbent on anthropologists and other students of social process to reevaluate those factors which have operated to perpetuate Indian communities against all expectation and against conscious efforts to create a contrary state of affairs. What in the communities themselves, in the historical development of Indian-white relations, in the culture, in the psyche, in the genes, or in some combination thereof, has acted to preserve aggregates of Native Americans as functioning social communities living a way of life that is identifiably, albeit perhaps, ephemerally, "Indian", and what

are the defining characteristics of that way of life? It seems inadequate to simply agree with Robert Murphy that "a distinctively American Indian pattern has...arisen that is best explainable by the similarity of circumstances of the many reservations. The pattern is a melange of dependency, discrimination, despair, and poverty - dependency and a sense of paradise lost being the definitive elements" (1971:25). One would like to be able to strike a more positive note.

In an effort to approach these questions, it is necessary to reevaluate the earlier literature and its sources as well as the conclusions derived from that literature. A new bias using old materials may be highly productive. In a period when new data collections has become difficult for practical and political reasons, anthropologists may find themselves increasingly turning their attention to much needed reevaluations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

1. The Problem
2. Methods and Materials

"A true renaissance occurred on many of the reservations in the years between 1799 and 1815." (Wallace 1970:303).

"Now, and suddenly, they embraced the rural technology of the white man and became a nation of farmers." (Ibid.:310).

"The strong feelings generated by (the) division into parties reached their peak between 1818 and 1822. At that time emotion drove many of the members of the pagan party into extremely nativistic positions. Since the missionaries were demanding the abandonment of an Indian identity and calling the conservatives by the opprobrious term 'pagan,' some of those who chose to retain pride in being Iroquois felt forced to oppose everything any missionary proposed - not merely psalm-singing and sabbath-keeping, but also secular schooling and even further material improvements. Although the Quakers themselves opposed the evangelists, they too were resented in the general wave of nativistic feeling." (Ibid.:331).

In 1798, the Philadelphia Quakers established a mission among the Allegany Seneca in southwestern New York, whose reservation boundary lines had been drawn just several months before. After twenty years of almost uninterrupted amiability and claims of success in their mission by the Quakers, a significant number of their Seneca friends turned on the Quakers, rejected their advice and assistance, and even went so far as to physically threaten their persons and destroy their property. The events thus stated are not unknown although usually ignored. Wallace, as cited above, makes brief reference to them in passing and suggests an explanation: that the Quakers were unjustly included within the general category "missionary" by those Indians who were emotionally reacting to a psychological threat to their identity. I suggest that an alternative interpretation

is possible, one not relying on unspecified psychological variables, to understand the event and the context in which it occurred.

Within the course of this work I will discuss some objections and criticisms of the analytic effectiveness of Wallace's revitalization theory for an understanding of Seneca behavior, but it is not my intention to offer a rebuttal to The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca, his recent and masterful summary of Seneca history, psychology and society. Rather, I will reconsider one segment of the large canvas which Wallace paints and attempt to add another dimension to it. Specifically I will examine a twenty year period of Seneca-Quaker interaction within the context of both the micro-environment of the Seneca and the macro-environment of the socio-economic world of which the Seneca reservation was a part. I will examine the contention that the Quakers were innocent victims of a generalized animosity to missionaries, and will question the usefulness of interpreting the process of Seneca adaptation to a changing world as one of "death" and "rebirth", in spite of the literary effectiveness of such a vocabulary. Rather, I will attempt to analyze the Seneca experience as a continual process of adaptation and decision making by the Seneca in a period of rapid social and economic change. A diachronic study of what one group of people did and why they did it should have explanatory value for an understanding of the general dynamic process of adaptation and the constraints

on choice.

A useful conceptual tool may be found in Mary Helms' idea of the "purchase society" (1969, 1971). She has proposed the introduction of a new category of socio-cultural integration to classify societies for which neither "acculturating" nor "peasant" seem appropriate designations. As she sees acculturation studies these "can be said to have centered primarily on the analysis of processes of change involving previously recognized socio-cultural categories, rather than being much concerned with the recognition of possible new patterns of organization" (1969:326). On the other hand, she points out, to classify a society as peasant implies both an agrarian economic base and a special relationship to the state, i.e. that of rent supplier. The societies which Helms wishes to classify separately as "purchase societies" are those which articulate with the outside world through channels of trade and wage labor while maintaining local political autonomy and a stable social organization which is adaptive to the needs of the trade and wage labor base. She explains:

> The term 'purchase society' is suggested because it emphasizes both the economic referent which appears most important from the point of view of the local society, and towards which local adaptations will be directed, i.e., the need to obtain, to 'purchase', through one means or another, foreign manufactured goods which have acquired the status of cultural necessities. To be sure, something must be exchanged or sold in order to acquire these goods, but to the local population, that which is sold is merely a means to the all important end of purchasing (1971:7).

Although the Miskito of Nicaragua and Honduras, the

focus of Helm's analysis, developed as a society only after, and presumably in response to, white contact, she maintains that this societal formation aspect is not a necessary condition for classification as a "purchase society." It is sufficient that social institutions of a previously existing group should be modified to the needs of a cash economy while the group itself maintains some degree of political autonomy. Likewise, although not a defining condition, this is likely to occur where there is economic exploitation of an area by one or several political powers without accompanying pioneer agricultural expansion; where the resources of the land and not the land itself are the object of expansionist interest.

The category of purchase society has, I believe, heuristic possibilities for an effective analysis of the Allegany-Seneca and, potentially, for an understanding of American Indian societies in general, which have maintained social units with internal coherence and cultural characteristics distinct from their white neighbors. The special legal arrangements which Indian reservations have with the larger political units within which they are physically contained have provided at least a de jure, if not a de facto, political autonomy. Indeed, reservation boundaries may offer, again a de jure, if not a de facto and not very secure barrier to pioneer agricultural expansion. Reservations may be legally created models of the naturally created purchase societies that Helms describes, and may be usefully considered from

this point of view. Vine Deloria, Jr. has just this kind of model in mind when he separates the Indians' problems vis-a-vis white society from those of other depressed minorities and advises that Indians work alone for solutions to meet their unique situation (1969).

An aspect of a consideration of the concept of purchase societies, must be a consideration of what has resulted from studies of acculturation. Until the middle of the twentieth century, the explicit assumption of government, missionaries, scholars, and friends of the Indians (cf. Hertzberg 1971) was that a process of acculturation would lead to eventual assimilation into the "melting pot" of the dominant society. The inevitability of this process was seen to have universal application. This "inevitability" has, of course, undergone much rethinking and studies of ethnicity have encouraged a general rejection of the "melting pot" as a metaphor of the realities of American society.

Several alternatives to assimilation out of acculturation are possible. There is the possibility that a social group will totally acculturate but maintain ethnic separation. This is exemplified by the inhabitants of a Guatemalan town which was studied by Norman Schwartz. He concludes that "cultural differentiation is not necessary for the maintainance of ethnic nonassimilation, particularly in small, familistic communities where people know each other's and their own family traditions and ancestry" (1971:309).

Another possibility is that borrowed patterns will be added to, but will not substitute for, those in a previous behavioral repetoire. As Malcolm McFee has pointed out in his study of Blackfoot acculturation, "Some work with 'the levels of acculturation' concept seems to assume a continuum of change and often entails an unintended continuum of cultural loss and replacement...New ways can be learned without abandoning the old. The bicultural reservation community provides a variety of roles and situations for selective use of both" (1968:1096). Thus a Blackfoot can be a "150% Man," retaining Indian patterns and adding to them white patterns in a variety of combinations.

The third possibility is that new cultural patterns and social institutions will arise, coinciding with the purchase society definitional requirement of developing social institutions adaptive to the requirements of a cash economy. This alternative is cited by Schusky in his analysis of the reservation society of Lower Brule, a Sioux community. Unlike McFee, Schusky cites transformation of pattern rather than accretion as a distinct process of Indian reservation societies. He notes that "culture change has occurred in great degree, but has not necessarily been in the direction of the larger society. Indeed, some of the dominant social systems imposed on Indian communities largely for the purpose of fostering assimilation have led instead to the creation of unique cultural forms" (1970:110).

This last alternative seems particularly relevant to the Allegany Seneca, for whom, as I hope to demonstrate, the need to "purchase" was a crucial and determining consideration which led to social institutional arrangements adaptive to that end. White cultural patterns were selectively chosen, as McFee suggests, and both white and Indian patterns were transformed to meet the needs of a changing situation. Although I will investigate a process during a segment of time, this is not meant to suggest that the applicability of a purchase society model is limited to that time. From the period of earliest dependency on trade goods (cf. White 1961; Tuck 1971) to the present day, we can view Indian societies in a continual process of adaptation based on a need to "purchase." Specifically we must consider for the period under investigation how self-sufficient were the Seneca and therefore how pressing was the need to purchase; what were the means by which cash or cash substitutes, i.e. trade goods of foreign manufacture, were acquired; whether and in what way these means changed; and what were the social adjustments which were made to changing economic situations.

Approaching the question of the basis of the process of interaction between Indian and white society, Nancy O. Lurie has recently suggested the term "articulatory movement" to designate "the course and form of modern Indian activities (which) may illustrate a distinctive phenomenon in the field of culture contact and culture change" (1971:418). As she defines it, the characteristics of the movement are rather vague, and

roughly defined as a sharing of goals and patterned behavior but in the absence of clear leadership or spokesmen. Whether this characterizes an Indian movement different from other social movements is, I believe, open to doubt and, on this level, the concept has little heuristic utility.

However, Lurie also specifies some essentials of "articulatory behavior," a term which Helms used too to refer to the connection which a purchase society made with the outside world. Lurie sees the contemporary Indian situation as a process of attempting to resolve the dilemma of the choice between remaining Indian but impoverished in an Indian community, or assimilating into white society in the hope of becoming less poor. She concludes that:

> The solution is seen as successful redefinition of their socio-geographic environment from a condition of marginality to one of productivity in terms of more or less formalized, interactive relationships with the larger socio-economic system. Communities resist pressures to absorb and assimilate them as part of the surrounding culture and society. The larger system is recognized as inescapable and even necessary, but to be dealt with on a contractual basis (1971:419).

In spite of the lack of theoretical rigor in this formulation, the concept of a contractual basis for Indian-White relations provides another dimension for an approach to a study of Indian behavior throughout the post-conquest period. By using this concept of "contract" we are offered a flexibility of analysis away from the restraints of cultural and psychological deterministic models. That the Indian thought he was making contractual arrangements, or approached the

interaction with whites as if he were making contracts, suggests a conscious evaluation of the variables of a situation, a recognition of behavioral options and consequences of action, and the development of decisions and strategies to cope with the exegencies of changing situations.

A fundamental problem for students of human behavior is the degree to which man, as a member of society, is free to make choices. Although this is a fundamental philosophical question, it can be studied on a behavioral level as well. Whether culture is defined in behavorial or normative terms, or whether the term "culture" is discarded entirely in favor of "social institutions" or "social structure," it is generally agreed that humans existing within social groups derive some measure of guidance in decision making, consciously or unconsciously, through the fact of their participation in that social unit. As Eric Wolf points out:

> The problem of understanding culture is not exhausted by the concept of coding (using a normative definition of culture), because men are not 'caught upon the hook of socialization' or 'broken upon the wheel of culture'; they are capable of using the materials of culture to respond in alternative ways to the challenges of a given situation. Yet...these alternative responses are not limitless. They represent alternative strategies in the face of necessity (1964:46).

My bias with respect to the deterministic nature of culture coincides with that of Wolf and follows Depres' statement that "in the action dimension individuals are more than units related to one another in time and space. They may be this, but they are also conscious agents capable of calculated action

with respect to themselves as well as the universe around them. Thus, individuals weigh the alternatives available to them, plan strategy and select the means to implement strategy" (1964:1074). This idea obviously underlies Lurie's notion of "contract."

Ideally, a study along these lines would specify the socio-economic environment of action and would analyze the behavior of individuals making decisions in response to changes in it. For a study of nineteenth century Allegany Seneca behavior and decision making this is practically impossible because of the temporal hiatus between actors and analyist and because of the nature of the surviving records. The refinement of data which a decision model analysis requires is probably not possible for any study which relies on historical documentation. Thus, although I subscribe to the value of an analysis of choice, of decision rather than of structure (cf. Izmirlian 1969), my approach must be ecclectic and analyze both behavior and structure.

****

2. Materials and Methods.

Among North American Indian cultures there is probably none so well documented as the Iroquois. By the early 16th century Europeans had encountered Iroquois groups, and the documentation and descriptions begin with the initial European intrusion into North America. Extensive archaeological work in the Northeast has both extended the record back in time

and supplemented written accounts of the historical period. Insofar as the interaction between Europeans and Iroquois was complex and intensive and concerned religious conversion, political manipulation and economic interchange, the documentation is extensive and touches on most aspects of Iroquois culture.

Certain aspects of that culture have been particularly attractive as subjects of study and discussion. Early attention and admiration was given to Iroquois political structure and the process by which their confederacy articulated its parts, and the techniques for arriving at consensus formed, tradition has it, a model following which the founding fathers organized the government of the United States. The ability to devise such a political structure was early attributed to some special genius which the Iroquois, alone among American Indians, possessed. This "genius" has been put into more realistic perspective and shown not only not to have been a confederacy unique among American Indians (Lurie 1959), but better attributable to economic and political circumstances (Hunt 1940) than to special endowment. That such explanations are not to everyone's taste, however, is illustrated by William Fenton's comment that "the image of the Iroquois as 'economic man' or even as 'middle-man' has never appealed to me as being at all consistent with his character or his culture" (1971:142). And, as justification for this rejection of the idea that wars were fought by the Iroquois to satisfy material demands and secure economic advantages, Fenton adds,

"The Iroquois warrior could be a homicidal maniac" (ibid.).

Twentieth century research into the political life of the Iroquois has tended to focus on factionalism, that omnipresent condition of American Indian reservation life (cf. Linton 1936). William Fenton, whose major professional focus has been Iroquois, and more specifically Seneca, society and history, has been the major documentor and commentator on the subject of Iroquois factions (cf. Fenton 1952, 1957). Following Fenton's suggestion that Seneca politics has passed from a stage of factionalism into real political parties, Thomas Abler studied the formation of the Seneca Nation in the mid-nineteenth century and analyzed the emergence of what he defines as real political parties which are legitimatized by the acceptance of the election process, out of a condition of prior factionalism (1969). Robert Berkhofer (1965) has also written on Seneca factionalism from an historical perspective and challenged Wallace's analysis of the rise of the Handsome Lake movement as inadequate to explain the emergence of alternative and contemporaneous movements.

Although not a focus of theoretical dispute, Iroquois religious beliefs and practices have always been a subject of interest. The Jesuits, who first encountered them in the sixteenth century (Thwaites 1896) condemned them, but Morgan (1851) saw admirable aspects in the religion. Much twentieth century field work attention has involved the recording and preserving of details of ceremonial activity, and it is frequently precisely this activity for which anthropologists have

been lately most resented by the Iroquois. Finally, Wallace (1970) has focussed on the Handsome Lake prophetic movement as a special, and exemplary, case of a revitalization movement.

The position of women among the Iroquois has received ongoing attention, in the nineteenth century because they were given as the typical case of a matriarchy, and again, currently, with the growth of the women's movement. Cara Richards (1957) challenged the appropriateness of the designation "matriarchy," but went on to demonstrate a pattern of increasing power for women in Iroquois society during the seventeenth century. Judith Brown (1970) has suggested an economic base for the high status of Iroquois women. One aspect of my discussion will concern the responses of women to the socio-economic restructuring that the Quakers advocated.

For the period 1798 to 1822, the documentation for the world of the Allegany Seneca is both ample and flawed. With the exception of a handful of letters and the Blacksnake memoirs, reported by an Indian but written down by white men and concerning Indian activity during the American Revolution, we must rely on the reports of white observers for data on Indian action and cognition. This problem has been a fundamental one for historians whose analysis suffered as a consequence for, as Berkhofer suggests:

> Even when the historian thought he was portraying the Indian 'side' in his writing, he adopted

> implicitly either the white view of his sources or, equally invidious, the assumption that the outcome of his story was determined more by the white side than by the Indian side...In brief, the historian treated Indians as passive objects responding to white stimuli rather than as individuals coping creatively in a variety of ways with the different situations in which they found themselves (1971:364).

Anthropologists focussed on Indian culture or society and formulated processural discussions in terms of theories of acculturation. "Anthropologists," Berkhofer adds, "used evidence gathered in the field from live informants, for their assumption about cultural persistence justified the use of present-day information to describe past events" (ibid.:359). Fenton, who invented the term "up-streaming" (1941, 1949) as a technique of historical analysis, illustrates what Berkhofer is condemning. Fenton explains:

> The functioning present society becomes the model for critically examining the past. It would appear that the internal structure of a society remains relatively stable over long periods of time. And so when the ethnographer turned cultural historian - or social historian, if you will - finds the same basic culture patterns functioning at both ends of the time-stream, and his own observations confirmed by earlier observers, he knows that he has found stability and he trusts the sources (1953:170-171).

We may note, in passing, Fenton's basic commitment to an equilibrium theory as well as a stress on the deterministic nature of culture.

Although, as Berkhofer indicates, anthropologists have changed their theoretical bias from studies of acculturation and "by fragmenting the unity of tribe, culture, and society (have) increased the complexity of interpreting Indian life

at the same time as they opened the way to study better the actual individuals and groups involved in the struggle over change and persistence" (1971:364), nevertheless there remains the same problems of reliable empirical data. It was very handy to believe "up-streaming" could be used as a technique for reconstructing the past. It allowed the anthropologist to function in a field situation with living informants, and to project back into history beyond the life span of any possible informant. If you had a contemporary situation, let us say, of virilocality and a reference in a seventeenth century account to a similar residential pattern, you could just assume that everything inbetween was stasis, and that a condition of cultural stability existed in a residential pattern. Unfortunately, analysis of process must depend on observations of that process, and cannot be derived from the testimony of living informants, except in most general ways. My own investigations were initiated by a chance remark of an informant, which led me suddenly to question whether the commonly accepted picture of nineteenth century Iroquois men as farmers indeed corresponded to reality, but I could not test the question for the early nineteenth century except through written records. And so we are forced to turn back to those records kept by whites for our empirical data, whatever the primary orientation for our study may be.

Thus it is a necessary first premise that one must view with suspicion the contents of the documents upon which one depends. This is a truism to which all students would subscribe,

but it is frequently neglected. It is easy to identify judgments and eliminate them from analysis; it is more difficult to evaluate the bias which underlies the presentation of those "hard facts" and descriptions of behavior which are often scarce enough in the archival literature.

In attempting to consciously evaluate white biases, another dimension of analysis becomes available. As Jennifer Brown remarked in her study of the British actors in the social field of fur trade society, "Anthropologists have searched these documents primarily for hints of social and cultural realities lying beyond the traders themselves, to reconstruct Indian societies and ways of life before and at the time of white contact, and as they have changed thereafter," (1973:1) but the documents can be used to get at the society of the authors themselves. In the Quaker-Seneca relations, the Quakers have been all too often accepted at face value. Their claims and judgments have been taken as empirically accurate data to evaluate the Indian, but have rarely been used to evaluate the Quakers themselves. Berkhofer (1965) is exceptional in his insistence that Quakers be understood as products of their own society. A useful corrective, then, would be to analyze the behavior of the Quakers within their own social field and in interaction with the Seneca and, in the process, to attempt to correct the bias built into the Quaker primary documents.

The Quaker reports contain useful information to fill out

the picture on the expanding white society in the period under consideration, although here too the judgments have to be used with care. Information for this aspect of the dynamic interaction of Indian-missionary-white settler is derived largely from the accounts of local historians and reminiscenses of settlers. The presence of whites is noted in Quaker letters earlier than local histories would lead us to believe. Permanent settlers are accorded recognition; transients seldom are. Insofar as these earliest settlers were often among the first wave of whites who cleared the land and then moved on, opening the way for the second wave of settlers who would remain, they purchased no land and thus land company records of settlers may be as misleading as local histories.

Information on the natural environment would seem to be a fairly straightforward set of data to collect. In fact, although general reconstructions are possible, the activities of human inhabitants modified the natural resources of the area in a process of sequential exploitations, and these modifications included even so apparently fixed features as the degree of soil acidity and waterway flow. (Kuhl: Personal interviews.) An understanding of available resources is necessary to understand Indian strategies concerning them and to evaluate white judgments about them (e.g. availability of game, suitability of the area for farming and for specific crops, etc.). Thus an effort will be made to describe the environment, as well as to indicate the direction of its modification,

realizing that what we are seeking is an understanding of the "niche" occupation of the Allegany Seneca rather than the "habitat" occupation, as Hardesty (1972) differentiates them. He cautions us that an analysis of "habitat" as "place" is inadequate for an anthropological understanding of the interaction of man and environment and that, instead, we must focus on the "niche," the functional level of this interaction. Thus, not only the modifications in natural features are relevant, but also the changing technology available to the Seneca to understand the strategies they selected.

Finally, although I concur with contemporary writers who complain that Indian history has always been written implicitly or explicity from a white point of view and who urge reconsideration of that history taking the Indian as the active shaper of decisions (e.g. Spicer 1969, Berkhofer op.cit.), it would be the height of folly to suppose that we can understand Indian strategies without reference to the actions of the white world. Precisely as Berkhofer has indicated, it has been very useful to eliminate those boundaries which have delimited the spatial or social unit under consideration. It would then be most unfortunate to reimpose a boundary around Indian action which excludes a consideration of the policies and actions of the white world. Thus attention must be given to the national level of white society, its relationship with local white society, and the Seneca understanding of their own relationship to both these levels in order to understand Seneca behavior.

In summary, the study to follow attempts to analyze the behavior of the Allegany Seneca during the period 1798 to 1822 as a series of strategies to cope with socio-economic adaptation within an environment containing both natural and social features. The Seneca reaction and rejection of Quaker missionary activities in 1820 will be analyzed as one of a series of such strategies and an attempt will be made to ascertain the causal factors leading to the attack on the Quakers.

It may be true that this is a particularistic step backwards from Wallace's laudable nomothetic approach to an interpretation of Seneca behavior. But the present study is made in response to a need to reassess the material for elements which may contribute to greater understanding of the factors underlying adaptive processes. To use the Seneca material as a special case of the revitalization process required selection of specific details and discardance of others. It further required special interpretation of those selected details shaped by the special interest of the interpreter. Although this is an absolutely necessary and unavoidable process in analytic interpretation, a reexamination of the details can produce other insights applicable to additional or alternative understanding.

Eric Wolf provides the justification for yet another particularist study of the Allegany Seneca when he writes that:

> We are in fact learning not to sacrifice the general for the particular, nor the particular to the general. Particularism often has a special appeal to Americans raised in an empirical intellectual tradition. Its special danger lies in the propensity

> to accumulate facts like so many grains of sand to produce bigger and bigger sand piles. Generality without particularism, on the other hand, tends to abstract from questions of mechanism, and thus to fall into the opposite danger of imputing autonomous cumulative motion to phenomena that can propel the intellectual enterprise straight into Plato's cave (1964:30).

Stress and Senecas Reexamined: A Survey of the Literature

The religious movement among the Iroquois which developed from the prophetic visions and teachings of the Seneca, Ganiod'yo, otherwise known as Handsome Lake, has received more recent attention than any other aspect of post-reservation Seneca life, and seems to force a continued consideration of ideological issues to the detriment of other approaches of analysis. The result has been an oversimplification of the events of the period, and of the variety of factors that influenced Seneca behavior. Because my interest is in the analysis of such other factors, I have decided to consider the Handsome Lake movement outside of the context of my own presentation. I will critically discuss here some of the major formulations concerning the rise and influence of the Handsome Lake movement, but do not propose to offer a systematic alternative to any of them. In general, I believe, the movement offered an indigenous system of values adaptive to the circumstances and alternative to, but congruent with, Christian models of behavior. It provided the possibility of an Indian identification through a formalized system of beliefs and practices

which paralleled Christian ones, but which emanated from the Indian locus, and thus offered an assurance of a basis for the continuation of the Indian community as a distinctive social unit while endorsing behavior which might otherwise signal assimilation. Perhaps its great appeal, however, was in the behavioral flexibility, particularly within economic areas, which it allowed, a flexibility which the Senecas needed and which the Quakers disapproved.

In 1905, Arthur Parker collected the first written version of The Code of Handsome Lake, the Seneca Prophet (1913) prepared by Edward Cornplanter, one of the approved preachers who, as Fenton explains, was eager to correct the "process of drift" (1968:32) to which the oral recitation was subject. This is the only version in writing available for study and thus forms the basis for analyses, supplemented by documents prepared by white observers, mostly Quaker journals and letters. Parker presented an analysis of the movement in the introduction to the text in which he concludes that "whatever may be the merits of the prophet's teaching, they created a revolution in Iroquois religious life" and eliminated the older religious system (1913:11). This is, in fact, not true (as Fenton (1940b) and Wallace (1956) both demonstrate), for, although Handsome Lake tried to supress and eliminate the medicine societies, he merely drove them underground, and the Longhouse Religion which now exists is a syncretic phenomenon of the old and the new. Parker believed that Handsome Lake

offered hope to a demoralized people because, in response to a situation of despair, "he created a new system, a thing to think about, a thing to discuss, a thing to believe" (ibid.).

Merle H. Deardorff analyzed the origin and development of the movement and stressed its success as stemming from a fortuitous syncrenicity of Quaker and older Iroquois elements which was an attempt by Handsome Lake to accommodate to, rather than wishfully predict, the disappearance of the white man. Deardorff takes the position that Handsome Lake "did little more than give a certain ethical content to the old Seneca beliefs" (1951:102), and places heavy emphasis on the presence of the Quakers as teachers of an acceptable value system which was inspiration for Handsome Lake's formulations.

The best known and most fully developed analysis of the origins, developments and results of the Handsome Lake movement is that of Anthony F. C. Wallace (1956, 1970), who discusses it as a prototypic example of a case of his formulation of a revitalization movement, a deliberate and creative cultural response to cultural disorganization and despair. Such a movement is predicated on the presence of a condition of stress and has as its object the reduction of stress. As Wallace explains it, "the effort to work a change in mazeway and 'real' system together so as to permit more effective stress reduction is the effort at revitalization; and the collaboration of a number of persons in such an effort is called a revitalization movement" (1956:267). He suggests a number of stages through which a revitalization movement

passes; mazeway reformulation, communication, organization, adaptation, cultural transformation, and routinization (ibid. 1956:279), stages which he both develops from, and demonstrates using, the Seneca evidence.

Elizabeth Tooker has taken issue with Wallace's revitalization formulation insofar as it depends on a concept of "stress" for its trigger. Quite properly she maintains that "in the absence of good indices for socio-cultural organization and disorganization, the standard often used has been that of our own society" (1968:189fn.). With this important objection in mind, we can reexamine Wallace's arguments and evidence which purport to demonstrate a prior condition of "stress" and some of the theoretical problems which using such a concept creates.

Wallace's hypothesis depends on a prior condition of stress for the revitalization process to be initiated. He attempts to present evidence that the conditions of defeat, depopulation from disease, warfare, and communal dislocations led to a set of symptomatic conditions among the Iroquois appropriately defined as socially pathological and which led to the social disorganization which evoked the responsive revitalization movement. Among these social pathologies are included a change to habitual use of alcoholic beverages leading to chronic alcoholism, increased violence, increased incidents of witchcraft accusations, and a lack of unity within the community. For Wallace's evidence to demonstrate what it purports to demonstrate it must be shown, on the one

hand, that these conditions are symptoms of social pathology, and, on the other, that they had a greater incidence prior to the corrective institution of the revitalization movement than at "normal" periods in the past. The presence of the effective movement, such as the Handsome Lake movement is asserted to be, should then initiate a period when the reduction of social pathology is measured by a reduction in the incidence of its symptoms, always, of course, assuming that these symptoms are appropriate measures of societal, rather than of individual, pathology, are a measure of pathology at all, and, further, that they exist.

The evidence which Wallace presents to support his argument is subject to some question. It is difficult to judge the estimates of depopulation, as Wallace himself points out (1964:354), but he feels that an estimate of two hundred warriors killed, about ten percent of the adult male population, during the American Revolution is probably conservative, and he estimates probably one half of the population was lost as a result of war, famine and related disease (ibid.). In this regard, it is interesting to note that Kirkland, in his census of 1788, counts 423 adult females to 409 adult males among the Seneca which, as Wallace notes "suggests that there was no very significant underproportion of males resulting from combat losses: (op.cit.:194). Insofar as recruitment of males by adoption, the customary way of instantaneous demographic readjustment during warfare, was no longer available because it depended on the taking of captives which the defeated

Iroquois had not done during the American Revolution (ignoring the issue of white captives), we must wonder whether the estimates of casualties were too high, whether females were more subject to decimation from disease or loss into the white population, or if some device such as female infanticide was being used to balance the population. This last is never suggested, although from the Code of Handsome Lake, we know that abortion was practiced and that Handsome Lake regarded it as a great evil (ibid.:30), but abortion would not adjust a disproportionate sex ratio. By 1788 (approximately 5 years after the conclusion of hostilities), however it was effected, the Seneca population was normally distributed and, although the loss of loved ones may certainly have had a psychologically depressing effect, the reduction in population was actually adaptive to the constricting land base and the balanced sex ratio suggests that no structural adjustments were necessary.

The cumulative evidence that Wallace presents indicates that the Iroquois were having their troubles, but there is nothing to really demonstrate that these troubles were relevant either to the time or the place of the prophetic visions of Handsome Lake, or significantly different from the troubles suffered by white populations in eighteenth century America (cf. Wallace 1952b:149-165 for his discussion of the parallelisms to be found in the religious revival of frontier whites). To illustrate, for instance, on the issue of depopulation from

disease, Wallace notes that in 1795 there was an outbreak of measles among the Oneida (1970:195), in 1776-7 the Onondaga had a smallpox epidemic and 1781-2, a similar outbreak of smallpox occurred among the Seneca on the Genesee (ibid.). In 1798, a western delegation returned infected with dysentary from which forty Oneida died and many other people were sick (ibid.). Conditions around Fort Niagara, which was a refuge for displaced Indians in 1779-80, led to sickness and some deaths at that time, but it seems to me tenuous to relate the events of illness in 1779 as causal of prophetic visions in 1799.

The evidence for an increased incidence of what Wallace construes as socially pathological symptoms are even more subject to question. He asserts that suicide (cf. Fenton 1941) is such a symptom, but is totally unable to substantiate, either an increase in incidence or really any incidence at all, during the period in question (ibid.:201). Similarly for witchcraft accusations and executions, Wallace cites Mary Jemison (Seaver 1824) to indicate that witchcraft accusations were made, but indeed his very citation indicates that they were regularly made, and Mary Jemison asserts that roughly one witch a year had been executed during her entire stay among the Senecas, which went back to about 1763. The incidence of witchcraft accusations increased sharply and seriously under Handsome Lake's direction during the very period that Wallace specifies as the Seneca "rennaisance."

We must keep in mind that Wallace is setting up the evidence to prove that the situation was ripe for a culturally creative movement which would restore equilibrium to a disrupted society, interprets the Handsome Lake movement as such an example of creativity, and suggests that successful stabilization resulted. Therefore, we must wonder, when he cites among his evidence to show Seneca demoralization, an extended comment from a missionary at Buffalo Creek. Wallace neither names the missionary nor the date of the observation on the page on which it appears nor in the note referring to it, but a little checking shows that the missionary in question was Jabez Hyde "who come to Buffalo Creek Mission in 1811 (and wrote) in 1820" (1903:239) as follows:

> Indians, as has been observed, bear suffering with great fortitude, but at the end of this fortitude is desperation. Suicides are frequent among the Senecas. I apprehend this desondency is the principal cause of their intemperance. Most of the children and youth have an aversion to spiritous liquor, and rarely taste it until some trouble overtakes them. Their circumstances are peculiarly calculated to depress their spirits, especially those contiguous to white settlements. Their ancient manner of subsistence is broken up, and when they appear willing and desirous to turn their attention to agriculture, their ignorance, the inveteracy of their old habits, the disadvantages under which they labor, soon discourage them; though they struggle hard little is realized to their benefit, beside the continual dread they live in of losing their possessions. If they build they do not know who will inhabit" (ibid.:245; quoted in Wallace 1970:239).

This, then is 1820, and post rennaisance. If it is argued that the situation at Allegany was different than at Buffalo Creek, which was in some respects true, then we must counter

with the query as to why this quotation is used as evidence to support a condition of "stress" which we are to understand as causal of a revitalization reaction.

Finally, there is the question of the use of alcohol as a symptom of social pathology. Reports of intoxicated Indians are frequent, but these go far back into early contact days, and neither a real estimate of relative increase in use nor a differentiation between sporadic versus regular use leading to chronic alcoholism seems possible from the anecdotal material. What does seem certain is that, as regular contact with white settlements increased and access to liquor increased, alcohol use increased. The Quakers stressed the use of alcohol as a primary social evil and Handsome Lake did too, whether because of his own experience with its disruptive influence, because of the Quaker emphasis, or because it reinforced a decision already arrived at by the Allegany Seneca community we cannot judge. But it should be clearly understood that his admonitions against the use of alcohol followed, rather than preceded, the community's decision to abolish it and the assignment of two warriors to insure that alcoholic beverages be kept out of the settlement. Indeed the ability of the community to decide and then act on its decision indicates a lack of that kind of "pervasive factionalism" which Beals and Siegel assert as characteristic of a society in a condition of great stress (1960,1966), and serious factionalism did not really develop among the Allegany Senecas until the end of the second decade of the nineteenth century, again, after and

not before, Handsome Lake's visions.

Tooker's objection to the utilization of the concept of stress is well-taken and touches on an issue of general significance to anthropology. We are cautioned by psychologists such as Richard S. Lazarus "that stress cannot be defined exclusively by situations because the capacity of any situation to produce stress reactions depends on characteristics of the individual. Similarly, stress reactions in an individual do not provide adequate grounds for defining the situation associated with it as stress, except for that individual or individuals like him" (1966:5). Thus not only an explication of events is necessary, but a clear meshing of these events with psychological characteristics of the individual must be made to demonstrate that these events were stressful for that individual. Because, as anthropologists, we are not concerned with the individual level of response, we must then assume that a culture produces "individuals like him" to justifiably extrapolate a rather precise psycho-physiological concept to a social situation. Wallace, with his primary interest in the interrelationship between culture and personality, seems reasonably satisfied in assuming culture to be determining in relation to personality, but it is difficult to see how to evaluate this level of shared personality factors in relation to response to stress producing factors in an individual. The "modal personality" (cf. Wallace 1952b), as we know, is a very poor approximation to functioning people.

Spradley and Phillips (1972) point to some of the implicit assumptions made by anthropologists when they rely on a concept

of stress, assumptions which the authors emphasize need verification rather than continued utilization. Included is the egocentric assumption referred to by Tooker that a situation which the researcher would find stressful, is stressful, that a response interpreted as a response to stress is sufficient evidence that stress preceded the response; that stress is always a negative condition, leading to responses designed to reduce or eliminate it; that stress is an either/or phenomenon, apart from consideration of magnitude; and that stress could be defined by observing an individual's effort to make a readjustment in behavior in response to a given situation (ibid.:519-521).

As I pointed out at the beginning of this discussion, I am more prepared to note problems and offer criticisms than I am to propose solutions. If we are to use concepts such as "stress," we must either refine and test cross-culturally the variables we include, or acknowledge the "folk" level of our definition and avoid using the concept at all. It seems apparent that Wallace is working backwards, from a convenient vantage point of the manifestation of a movement to postdict the factors causal to the inception of the movement. Unfortunately, the factors add up to a hodge-podge of diffuse occurences in time and space, which neither alone nor in combination seem directly causal, in any precise way, to the form or content of the movement under consideration.

In her analysis of the Handsome Lake movement, Elisabeth Tooker specifies three basic deficiencies which she finds in Wallace's approach: 1. The difficulty of the identification

of societal disorganization either cross-culturally or cross-temporally; 2. with reference to Wallace's hypothesis regarding the selection of strategies for catharsis and control within society (1959), his assumption that the "need" for control will thereby produce means for satisfying that "need;" and, 3. that a religious system acts as an equilibrilizing mechanism balancing an opposed socio-cultural system, a kind of see-saw mechanism, rather than being consistent within and as a part of the total system (op.cit.:189-190).

She suggests that the specific content of the Handsome Lake teaching offers the most productive and instructive focus for understanding the development and success of the movement. According to Tooker, it was the need for a new set of values, consistent with the change to an agricultural economic base, stressing individual restraint and responsibility, a stable nuclear family, and, particularly, a high degree of "impulse control" (ibid.:198) contrasting with the formerly highly evaluated individualistic behavior patterns associated with warfare to which Handsome Lake directly spoke. She traces a consistency in the teachings addressed to all levels of activity; familistic, societal, and ritualistic which advocates "Apollonian" characteristics and condemns previously adaptive "Dionysian" ones (using the terms as they are used by Gouldner and Peterson to refer to relative levels of impulse control (1962)).

To the extent that Tooker's argument calls attention to

the economic imperatives of the development of a value system, it is an attractive argument. But her stress on content is a, perhaps, accidental strategy to avoid diachronic problems of etiology, and the analysis lacks a temporal dimension and provides an extremely simplified version of a changing economic situation. Her main source of reference is the codified version of Handsome Lake's teaching in Parker's Code of Handsome Lake (op.cit.) from the oral version of Edward Cornplanter, which was one of the several variant versions recited during the ceremonial year. Deardorff correctly calls our attention to the cumulativeness of the Code in terms of both the biography and the teachings of the prophet, as well as the variations in the versions presented by different speakers (1951). We can recognize references in the Code to events which took place as late as the 1840's included as part of the prophetic visions (e.g. Parker op.cit.:64), a not surprising synchronicity in an oral history. In fact, the teaching developed along with a changing system and, if ultimately they formed a coherent system of values conducive to an agricultural community and consistent with white values appropriate to the same kind of community, this does not mean that the teachings were so from their beginning. To understand them this way would suggest a support for the Quaker missionaries within the Seneca community based on a native introduced value system which was systematic at its inception and in agreement with the Quakers' teachings; which was not in fact, the case. The Quakers found Handsome Lake as often a hindrance as a help at the beginning

and precisely because he advocated behavior antithetical to a successful white agrarian community model based on capitalist economic theory; specifically, he advocated reciprocity in economic behavior and non-separation of settlements. We may agree with Tooker that "a consistent theme runs through his religion; the condemnation of individual autonomy and glorification, and the advocacy of restraint in social affairs" (op.cit.:188), but this is a theme that is perhaps not really reflective of the economic or, indeed, social behavior of white frontier agrarian society of the time. The main point I wish to emphasize here is that it is historically inappropriate to use the text of the Code of Handsome Lake, a production of the middle of the nineteenth century at least, to reconstruct the early teachings and their congruence with the goals of the Quaker missionaries at the end of the eighteenth century (although Wallace asserts that he finds a consistency between the earliest visions and the Code (1951:144fn). Insofar as we are interested in the development of economic alternatives and the responses of the community to these alternatives, Handsome Lake, as a community leader, is of interest to the discussion and Tooker's observations are useful within the specified limits.

It is essential to point out, however, that Tooker's attack on Wallace is in some ways spurious and that her economic observations closely parallel those which Wallace made (ibid.:143-148). Specifically Wallace emphasizes the teachings

of Handsome Lake as appropriate to and derived from a desire to accommodate to a white agrarian model of society. My objections, specifically, are to the distortion of the real economic behavior, as the documents elucidate that behavior, of Handsome Lake's followers.

Yet another problem arises, for, if in the process of revitalization a new stable state was reached, then how do we theoretically account for the success of the missionary movement among the Senecas? The historian, Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr. (1965) considers the problem of how to account, not only for the rise of the Handsome Lake movement, but simultaneously, for the rise of the movement of missionary followers, and then for the perpetuation of both groups as continuing factions, if they were such. He suggests that Neil Smelser's Theory of Collective Behavior (1963) offers a useful "framework for both normal and abnormal social activity, and this means that both sides of American and Seneca culture conflict can be comprehended in the same set of determinants" (ibid:104). Again, unfortunately, the analysis depends on the acceptance of a condition of "stress," but Berkhofer reduces "stress" to a single, and therefore presumably testable, variable when he indicates that "all analysts agree that the consolidation of control represented by reservation-formation constitutes a stressful situation" (ibid:105), which, because of the elimination by governmental repression of other possible forms of expression, such as mobilization,

must take the form of value reorganization. For the Senecas, values as the area of reorganization is further reinforced because the missionaries emphasize the superiority of their own value system. Thus both the followers of Handsome Lake and of the missionaries are mobilized behind movements "which had new value-orientations for the demoralized Senecas" (ibid.). Berkhofer remarks that, however, "in the Seneca case...it seems that while strains were felt by all, the adoption of solutions, hence perception of solutions, differed. Obviously, the adherents of both sides sought social salvation" (ibid.: 106). On this most crucial question of differential choice, Berkhofer suggests that only unavailable psychological evidence could clarify the issues involved, which may be giving up the question too easily although he is probably right.

Berkhofer introduces an interesting consideration when he points out that, within the context of governmental control of warfare and of Indian spatial distribution (i.e., they were on reservations), persuasion rather than compulsion was the policy of the dominant society; for the Senecas, some choice was possible. He remarks that "although they were no longer permitted to kill the agents of the alien culture, they were not forced to heed their requests to farm, to read, or to pray" (ibid.:108). On the other hand, racial barriers to assimilation prevented Indians from seeking total absorption into the dominant society. Thus, he concludes, "strain would be greatest after initial military defeat and placement upon

reservations" (ibid.) and would naturally lead to messianic movements. The nature of these movements, he believes, would depend upon the two additional factors of the type of continuing governmental control, and the previous experience with aspects of acculturation.

Factionalism is Berkhofer's main interest and he points out that within the context of Seneca development through the nineteenth century, factions were extremely fluid, regrouping around current issues with no firm continuity of personnel. "Thus," he concludes, "historians of the tribe should not casually conclude that the continuance of factionalism meant the continuity of factions, for new issues and new personnel would indicate the contrary. That factionalism continued probably shows more about the nature of the American society and its framework for contact than about the nature of Seneca society and its tendency to factions" (ibid.:111).

This is a very important observation for it counteracts the obvious but in fact incorrect, assumption that the division between Handsome Lake followers and Christian missionary followers provided institutionalized factions for dealing with issues as they arose. This incorrect position is reflected in Wallace's remark that "the upshot of the affair was...the splitting of the nation into a Christian, proremoval faction, and a pagan, antiremoval faction..." (1951:140). Thomas S. Abler extensively documents the factional divisions among the Senecas and demonstrates a lack of consistency in the

positions assumed by Senecas which would correspond to a Pagan-Christian division, including their positions on the issue of removal, the retention of a chief system versus an elected system of representation, and issues of a similar nature (1967, 1969).

Berkhofer's and Abler's studies are significant for the position I am advancing, for they call attention to the responsiveness of the Senecas to the imput from white society without reference to the boundaries which some sort of consistent ideological commitment to the Handsome Lake movement would suggest took place. Thus, we do not have to interpret Seneca behavior as determined by their identification as Handsome Lake followers or missionary followers, but rather as rational actors within a fluid socio-economic environment, with ideological alternatives which were similar in the values they espoused, but offered the possibility of identifying either strongly as Indian or preferentially as supporters of a white system, while allowing a flexibility of behavior.

CHAPTER II

The Natural and Social Environment of the Allegany Seneca

A single socio-environmental theme pervades the history of the Allegany region and influenced the behavior of its inhabitants, both Indian and white, throughout that history. The theme is isolation and marginality and it is produced by those natural environmental factors which both enclose and exclude, the mountains, forests and rivers which, for a time, supplied the Indians who lived there with a varied and ample subsistence and, for a longer time than in other areas of the Northeast, protected them from the intrusions of land-craving whites. But this isolation created problems of access to markets. Much of the Indian history of the region, including those relationships with the Quakers upon which this paper focusses, is involved with the problem of access to markets, and with the exploitation of those natural resources which were for sale and not used directly for subsistence.

This chapter will consider the historical background and the natural and social environment of the Allegany Seneca through time as a preparation for understanding the dynamic interaction of the Senecas and the Quakers during the early reservation period. Temporally the material in this chapter will parallel discussions which will follow insofar as Seneca economic adjustments which will be described in succeeding chapters were dependent on the activity of incoming white

settlers and the latter's sequential economic exploitation of the area. This, in turn, was dependent on the specific resources available in the local area and the opportunities and limitations on their utilization. Thus it is necessary to consider the physical and the biotal environment and its potential for economic exploitation, and the social environment which includes the background and activities of the white settlers, their interaction with the Senecas and the relative influence of local, state and federal level political action.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Iroquois Frontier

Indian occupation of the lands along the Allegany River, as evidenced by the archaeological remains, is historically deep and can be traced back through the Archaic of the Northeast. When an agricultural complex and an associated settled village life entered the northeast in about 1000 A.D., the Allegany region was occupied by people whose archaeological remains are indistinguishable in any significant way from other Iroquois peoples (M. White: personal communication 1974) whose in situ development in the Northeast was advanced first by MacNeish (1952) and then supported by other students (e.g. Ritchie 1965).

The extent to which Iroquois developments were causally connected to European trade is unclear, but indirect evidence

would suggest that some connections are likely. Ritchie (1965) identifies a period of Iroquois Florescence between the years 1450 to 1600, during which a major population expansion increased both the number and the size of settlements (ibid.:316). Although 1450 A.D. is prior to permanent mainland settlements by Europeans, it corresponds to that period during which the fishing industry of Europe was exploiting the rich waters off the coast of both Newfoundland and the northern mainland and was creating a pattern of an Indian trade which would intensify throughout the sixteenth century. Thus, Hunt points out, the first Europeans who settled on the mainland found already well established trade routes and hostilities among Indians competing for access to European goods (1940:16). Further, the effects of this trade was such as to significantly modify Indian societies and "the Indian world had in many respects already vanished before the white man saw it" (ibid:5). Were we merely to consider the effects of depopulation resulting from European-introduced diseases, the validity of this conclusion seems unmistakable.

It should, however, be noted that extensive trade existed in America before the introduction of European goods and the Huron, for instance, who supported a prehistoric dense population estimated at 30,000 to 35,000 did so, Hunt asserts, on the basis of a well established and developed commercial enterprise, acting as middlemen within the network of an internal Indian trade. The material content of the Hopewell culture is an illustrative case of the extensiveness of the

trading networks in which "copper from the Upper Great Lakes region, mica from the Appalachians, fancy flints from various sources, obsidian from the Rockies or from the Southwest, large conch shells from the Gulf Coast, various sea shells from the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts, Grizzly Bear canine teeth from the Rockies, silver, meteoric iron, and fossil shark teeth, to mention only a few - seem to have been crucial components in the material maintenance of the Hopewellian idea system" (Prufer 1965:132).

Ritchie's suggested date of 1450 A.D. for the beginning of Iroquois Florescence takes on a new dimension when brought together with the findings of James A. Tuck whose archaeological investigations were concerned with tracing the movements of Onondaga settlements. Tuck finds evidence to suggest that during the period of 1425 A.D. to 1450 A.D. there took place a merger of two previously separated village groups, whose movements from site to site within a twenty-five mile by fifteen mile area can be traced from its pre-Iroquois beginnings before 1000 A.D. This evidence not only supports MacNeish's "in situ" hypothesis of Iroquois development, but corresponds to the Iroquois tradition of 1450 A.D. as the founding date of the Iroquois Confederacy (a date which P. Wallace (1968:41), following Morgan (1851) has supported in contrast to the more current thinkings which prefers a 1570 A.D. date of inception (Fenton 1940:199 and 1961:271)). Hunt rejected the idea of the formation of the Confederacy as an effective political organization before the second half of the seventeenth century,

but Hunt is specifically thinking of its effectiveness as an offensive organization against external competitors for the fur trade. An earlier date linking the Confederacy to peacemaking efforts among the tribes, not in order for them to act with unity against outsiders, but in order to free the local groups from the constant threat of internal warfare and thereby allow men to more freely engage in activities connected with trade seems consistent with tribal tradition and economic possibilities.

From Tuck's material it seems possible to suggest that a form of organization which could be called tribal, that is some kind of amalgamation of more than a single locality coming to be identified as a single unit and institutionally enmeshing, developed among the Onondagas and probably the others of the five Iroquois tribes (Seneca, Cayugas, Oneidas, Mohawks) at around 1450 A.D. Sometime after that, and possibly by no later than 1570, the advantages of agreements of non-belligerence among local groups expressed itself in the formation of the League of the Iroquois, a decision making body, established on a principle of unanimity, and on the metaphor of the longhouse, the matrilocal residential structure of the Iroquois.

Although earlier writers tended to stress the effectiveness of the League in running a "tight ship" among its constituent tribes and in representing those constituents as a sovereign state vis-a-vis other sovereign states, the evidence suggests a need to modify the picture of unanimity of action. Fenton has continually stressed the importance of localism

as the primary organizational and operational level among the Iroquois (1951a and 1951b) and Graymont recently observed that "the League had actually been built on a foundation of localism, and the superstructure of centralism as personified by the Grand Council always rested somewhat uneasily upon this foundation" (1972:103). William H. Sears, commenting on the sociopolitical importance of the clan system, suggested "the Iroquois share, and have shared for a lengthy portion of their prehistory, a Southeastern type of organization in which the town, and locality, are the dominant factors, with a politically subsidiary clan-structured kinship system" (1961:42-43).

Whether decisions were unanimously arrived at or not, the League had no machinery to enforce decisions on its constituents whose differential access to rival markets more frequently decided allegiances. The Mohawks at the eastern "door" had strong ties to the English and, at the western "door," the Senecas' trade connections tied them to the French. Enforcement of decisions on those Senecas in the Allegany region and further west into the Ohio area, for practical purposes quite out of reach of the western "door" from which they had existed, was especially difficult both because of the distances involved and because these Seneca colonies had interests frequently more coincidental with their western neighbors than with their eastern brothers. In general then, because of the strategic power of the League, concurrence of its members in most decisions was common not only because it was expected, but

because it was advantageous. When it was not advantageous to a local group to abide by a decision, separate and contrary action would be taken in spite of a principle of unanimity.

Both the strength of the League and the development of Seneca colonies west of the Senecas' Genesee homeland are directly related to the economic activities and rivalries of Europeans, and to the changes in natural resources which these activities effected. The thirty years following 1603 was a period of great Atlantic seaboard settlement development by Europeans who wanted furs, particularly beaver skins, for export. As Hunt remarks, probably correctly, "competition for trade was, or soon became, a struggle for survival" (ibid.: 19) as Indians quickly became dependent on metal tools and firearms desired for their greater efficiency and lost skill in the manufacture and use of the older technology. Furthermore, it is apparent that the group with metal weapons and firearms had a military advantage which required equalization by any other group which hoped to survive.

Trade goods appear in Iroquois archaeological sites as early as 1570 A.D. in the Niagara Frontier area (White 1961) and Tuck, discussing archaeological remains before 1654, the date of the initial direct contact between Onondagas and Europeans, says:

> A steady decay in native arts and crafts provides a measure of the growing importance of European trade goods. Stone axes, knives and arrow points disappear and metal ones take their place. By the

time of the first recorded contact between the Onondagas and Europeans the native manufacture of pottery had become virtually a lost art" (op.cit.:40, italics mine).

By the 1670's European trade goods totally dominated the archaeological record and "virtually the only items of native manufacture found there are tobacco pipes" (ibid.:41). It is precisely this kind of involvement in the dynamics of the trade to acquire items of non-native manufacture that would influence the Senecas not only through the period of their expansion, but into the early reservation period as well.

Initially the requirements of the fur trade could be supplied from local resources, but the beaver was never abundant in New York and by 1640 the Iroquois local beaver supply was exhausted. The steps to depletion are demonstrated in the following figures of the supply of New York furs by the Iroquois to the Dutch in New Netherland (from Hunt op.cit.:33). In 1625, 5295 beaver and 493 otter pelts were supplied; in 1626, 7250 beaver and 800 otter; in 1627, "still more" with no figures available; in 1628, 10,000 skins, and in 1633, 30,000 skins. In 1640, the director of the trade in New Netherland was informed that the supply of furs had completely changed and had been cut off; the Iroquois had exhausted their own local fur resources and were not permitting more northern groups, notably Hurons and Algonkian groups, to come through to trade with the Dutch.

The situation of the Hurons was similar in respect to local fur exhaustion. By 1635 the beaver was virtually wiped

out and "the Hurons, who have not a single beaver, (are) going elsewhere to buy the skins they bring" (ibid.:34 quoted from Thwaites 1896; Vol. 8, p.57). That the Hurons, tradesmen back to pre-Columbian days, could go elsewhere to acquire skins was precisely the difference between them and the Iroquois of New York whose economy previously had depended on a farming rather then a trading base. But now the Iroquois needed access to the same sources of supply of fur, i.e. the Northwest, as did the Hurons, but were being prevented by the Hurons from attaining this access.

As early as the 1620's the Mohawk in particular made attempts to gain access to Canadian sources of fur by negotiating treaties with the Hurons. Through 1646, aggressive military action was interspersed with attempts at peace negotiations with the Hurons, Algonians and the French to gain access to these sources of supply; Iroquois aggression was particularly marked between 1640 and 1645. In 1645 a treaty was negotiated but it was broken in the fall of 1646 and attempts at peace collapsed. From that time until approximately 1688 when they controlled or had free access to over a million square miles of territory (Wallace 1970:28), the Iroquois pursued a policy of conquest through military action and the total destruction of previously distinct tribal units through decimation or absorption (e.g. the Hurons in 1648, the Petuns in 1649 and the Neutrals in 1651). The Erie whose territory "lay west of the Genesee from the mouth of the Cattaraugus

westward along Lake Erie and southward beyong the Alleghany" (Parker 1926:45-46; cf. also Mau 1944:13-15) fell to the Senecas and Onondagas in around 1653, although it is curious to note that Jacobs (1972:88) suggests that Eries may have taken part in Pontiac's Uprising in 1763. It is this area previously occupied by the Erie which became the location of western Seneca colonization and eventually that location of the Allegany Senecas. Parker remarks that "the old Seneca town of Cattaraugus may have had as its original nucleus these defeated Erie people, and many of the Ohio Seneca settlements may have been naturalized Erie captives" (op.cit.:48). The Erie were probably a sizable group to so incorporate for Parker notes that they had a population of more than 14,000 occupying a number of villages.

Although the Allegany and Ohio communities were permanent settlements, it has been suggested that they originated as temporary hunting camps established by those participating in the fur trade. "This necessitated long absences from their home villages;" writes Houghton, "and because they were inherently a village people, it also made inevitable the establishment of colonies, far-flung tiny villages to be used as bases for the hunting parties" (1920:43). The Senecas in these communities maintained connections with their relatives in the eastern Genesee region, as the adventures of Mary Jemison illustrates. Captured in 1755 on the Pennsylvania frontier, she was adopted by Senecas living on the Ohio River. She

observed:

> The family to which I belonged was part of a tribe of Seneca Indians, who lived, at that time, at a place called Genishaw...which is now called Genesee... Those of us who lived on the Ohio, had frequently received invitations from those at Genishu, by one of my brothers, who usually went and returned every season, to come and live with them, and my two sisters had been gone almost two years. While we were at Yishahwana, my brother arrived there from Genishu, and insisted so strenuously upon our going home (as he called it) with him, they my two brothers concluded to go, and to take me with them" (Seaver 1924:59).

"Home" was where the older generation was residing, illustrating another aspect of these western Seneca colonies as frontier areas for independent, enterprising young people, away from both the decisions of the Grand Council of the League at Onondaga and from the supervisory control of an older population. It seems likely that an Indian frontier area would offer many of the same attractions to Indians that a white frontier would offer to whites, among which is action independent from centralized control and responsive to local conditions.

The interaction with and amalgamation of conquered people was another aspect of the frontier character of the area (cf. Forbes 1968, for a discussion of population interaction on frontiers). The precise identification of the "Mingo" has always presented a problem. Parker suggests that this became a tribal designation of those groups of wandering Andastes who had mingled with defeated Eries and bands of wandering Senecas and Cayugas (op.cit.:50). James L. Swauger points out that the uncle of Cornplanter and Handsome Lake, Guyasuta, is

alternatively identified as Mingo or as Seneca (1949), although Deardorff tells us that Guyasuta was on the Allegany in the middle of the eighteenth century in an official capacity as the representative sent by the Grand Council to maintain their hegemony over the western colonies (1956).

The process of incorporation and "Senecazation" of captives was ongoing throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Morgan cites adoption as an example of the humanitarianism of the Iroquois. He says, "Adoption or the torture were the alternative chances of the captive...If adopted, the allegiances and the affections of the captive were transferred to his adopted nation...(and) he was received into the family by which he was adopted with all the cordiality of affection, and into all the relations of the one whose place he was henceforth to fill" (1851:341-344).

Whether we agree with Morgan that the practice of adoption as an alternative to horrendous torture demonstrates "the most generous traits of character" (ibid:343), it is clear that adoption served to keep the group in a state of population stasis or even growth when population depletion was a particularly severe problem. It is an instantaneous and absolutely flexible solution to the problem. "Upon the return of a war-party with captives," Morgan writes, "if they had lost any of their own number in the expedition, the families to which these belonged were first allowed an opportunity to supply from the captives the places made vacant in their households" (ibid.:342). The decision was always made on a one to one,

vacant place-single captive basis, with the residue of captives either executed or adopted as the needs of the moment dictated. The result of this practice was demonstrated, for instance, in 1656 when, it is said, there were more foreigners than natives in Iroquoia with representatives of eleven different nations living among the Seneca alone (Hunt op.cit.:7). "Adoption was so frequent during the bloody centuries of the beaver wars and the colonial wars," notes Wallace, "that some Iroquois villages were preponderantly composed of formally adopted war captives" (op.cit.:29).

The composite nature of the population along the Allegany and upper Ohio during the middle of the eighteenth century was recorded by the missionary Zeisberger who observed refugee Indians of all kinds under the protection of the Genesee Senecas, including various Algonquians, "Cherokee, Fox, Mohican, Shawnee, Missisauga, Nanticoke, Chippewa..." and, Deardorff adds, "even a baptized Jew from New England" (1946:7). In his discussion of "Refugee Fox Settlements Among the Senecas," William A. Hunter concludes that Fox settlements kept their own identity in both the Genesee and Allegany regions and that Proctor, in 1791, reported the presence of Fox Indians at Hiskhe (Eghsue), later to be known as Olean, who "were in fear of our white people, and about to leave their settlements and repair to Buffalo" (1956:17). Deardorff quotes Zeisberger as reporting that Venango where "a Seneca chief was stationed to see that the rules were obeyed" (op.cit.:7) was where "the country of the western Indians begins! The

main body of the Geneseo did not live down so far on the Allegheny... and the Allegheny towns above, from and including the one at Warren, were Iroquoian. Those on the river below Franklin were entirely Munsee..." (ibid.).

THE IROQUOIS AND THE EUROPEAN BALANCE OF POWER:

The French and Indian War

The power of the Iroquois during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries depended in large part on their ability to prevent either the French or the English from achieving total control over the Northeast. Hence the Montreal Treaty of 1701 between the Iroquois and the French "came about," Paul Wallace writes, "as a result of the uneasiness felt by the Five Nations at the phenomenal growth and expansion of their English allies" (1956:24). Wilbur Jacobs (op.cit.) documents extensively the competitive wooing of the Iroquois through gift giving by both European powers in their attempt to swing Indian support and thus control of the continent to their own side. But the French, in particular, could not afford to woo the Iroquois at the expense of other Indian allies. When the Seneca, with Miami assistance, went to war with the Illinois after 1677 to acquire that source of fur, the Illinois sought and achieved French protection and thwarted the Seneca plans (Parker op.cit.:53). Parker remarks that in 1685 the Marquis Denonville "had royal orders to assist the Illinois and to humble the Iroquois" (ibid.:54) which resulted in that first

decimation of Seneca villages and the total destruction of fields and crops in 1687 which would be replicated by General Sullivan during the American Revolution. Few lives were lost, but over a million bushels of corn were destroyed. To further complicate the story, the French were in this action assisted by the Mohawks, traditionally rivals of the Seneca although theoretically brothers within the League.

After the humbling of the Senecas, Denonville built Fort Niagara as a stronghold of French control over Lake Erie and the Senecas retaliated by turning, in November 1687, to the British for protection, assisted them in attacking Fort Frontenac in 1689, and in 1699 allowed the British to build a fort in territory which the Seneca controlled (ibid.:56-59). Hunt believes that 1688 marks the end of the true period of "The Wars of the Iroquois" (op.cit.:158), i.e. of their expansion through military conquest, but their strategic position in the balance of power between Britain and France did not end before 1760 when England defeated France for control of the New World.

The Indians were aware that their well-being depended upon the presence of both the British and French as competitors. Macleod, in his discussion of the Indians of Ohio remarks:

> The geographical and political relationships of these northwestern tribes were chiefly with the Seneca tribe of the Iroquois Confederation. The northwestern tribes were friendly to French interests; the Senecas, although neutral along with the rest of the Iroquois tribes, always had inclined towards the French rather than the English... Naturally enough, then, these tribes as well as the Iroquois hesitated to see French power, as a counterbalance to English power, pass from the continent. Some of them, the Shawnese for example, would have preferred to trade with the English for the same

> reason as did the Iroquois, because English industrial products were cheaper, but yet they took up arms for France in order to keep the French on the Ohio (1928:405-406).

The Five Nations of the Iroquois, on the other hand, chose to maintain their official policy of neutrality during the conflict between England and France in the French and Indian War, although unofficial participation was active.

The defeat of the French and the end of the need to win Indian allies resulted in a period of economizing by the British which Jacobs sees as the direct cause of Pontiac's Rebellion, which he parenthetically remarks "should be considered a war for Indian independence rather than a 'conspiracy'" (op.cit.:185). There has been a lack of clarity about the role that the Seneca played in this uprising. As members of the League whose policy was pro-British and advocacy was neutrality, and as near neighbors to the western tribes who were fighting, the Senecas manned a delegation advising peace which was sent by the Grand Council in the Spring of 1761. Their reward as Peckham describes it, was that "they found that Amherst would give them no presents, nor allow them enough ammunition. He also restricted their movements and even now was giving away their land" (1961:73). Peckham asserts that the response was a Seneca proposal to the northwestern tribes to make a simultaneous attack on posts at Detroit, Pittsburgh, Presqu'Isle, Venango and Niagara. Although the plan was discovered by the British and thwarted, it indicates the sympathies and the mood of the Senecas. It is of special interest that

the two Seneca chiefs implicated in this plan were Guyasuta and Tahaiadoris of the Allegany region (ibid.:73-75). Jacobs points out that it has been estimated that Senecas in Pontiac's Uprising numbered more than all other Iroquois tribesmen together (op.cit.:183 fn.) and I would suggest that it is likely that these warriors came from the Seneca frontier areas around the Allegany and Ohio rather than from the older communities further east. As a confirmation of this possibility, Deardorff emphasizes a long standing split within the Seneca community between those to the east, around Seneca Lake, whose interests were tied closely with the League, and those settled on the Genesee, whose connections, as in the Mary Jemison story previously quoted, were frequently more westerly. Guyasuta, although the League internuncio, came from the Genesee branch, as did Cornplanter, Blacksnake, Handsome Lake, and many of the others who would settle on the Allegany after the American Revolution and whose sympathies and alliances were focused west, not east. "The attachment to the League," Deardorff writes, "was nominal only. Occasionally their chiefs were seen at the meetings in Pennsylvania or New York; but they could be counted on for nothing" (1946:4). This becomes even easier to understand if we note Deardorff's explanation that "a strong reason for the lack of cordiality between the Genesee-Allegheny Indians and the League Iroquois who headed in at Onondaga was the League's arrogation to itself of exclusive right to sell land to the white's and to keep the proceeds" (ibid.:7).

The Proclamation of October 7, 1763, which fixed the

"Appalachian Mountains as the line of demarcation between white and Indian settlement" was, Jacobs says, "only a palliative" (op.cit.:185). The vagueness of the boundary which was established apparently disturbed William Johnson, the English liason with the Iroquois, and at his urging the Treaty of Fort Stanwix was held in 1768 to firmly fix a boundary (Graymont op.cit.:2-3). At this treaty, at which "lavish presents" (ibid:3) were given, the Six Nations (now including the Tuscarora who had migrated to New York around 1715 and had been admitted to the Iroquois Confederacy) ceded enormous tracts of land in central New York, Pennsylvania and further south. The clarification of the boundary greatly aided land speculators, among whom were William Johnson, by pushing the border further west than it had been and thus opening the area to white settlement. Deardorff rejects the idea that this treaty really clarified the border questions and he says, "the boundary line between whites and Indians was finally drawn on a map - but on a map so poor and in terms so vague that a good many years were to pass before everyone knew exactly where the boundary was. All the Allegheny Indians knew was that the east bank of their river might go white; while they were likely to be safe on the other" (1946:7).

Following Jacobs' thesis, presents were the deciding factor in this instance and would be again, not merely to satisfy Indian vanity, but for pressing economic necessity. Jacobs tells us that "after the long wars the natives faced especially grave economic problems. Crops had not been cared for;

tools were needed; women demanded the old French finery; and, worst of all, there was no ammunition. Fierce young warriors would 'tear the heart out of trader' to get these prizes" (op.cit.:185) and presumably land would be ceded from the same necessity.

On the whole, however, in spite of the pressing economic problems, the unreliability of gifts and the agitation over the uncertainties of land sales, the period from the end of the French and Indian War to that of the American Revolution was one of comparative calm and prosperity. MacLeod remarks that "their power as an independent state was broken after the clearing of the French from Canada (but) they settled down to peace and development" (op.cit.:355). Mary Jemison, as an eye-witness and active participant in the Seneca life on the Genesee at that period describes almost an idyll:

> After the conclusion of the French war, our tribe had nothing to trouble it till the commencement of the Revolution. For twelve or fifteen years the use of the implements of war was not known, nor the war-whoop heard, save on days of festivity, when the achievements of former times were commemorated in a kind of mimic warfare, in which the chiefs and warriors displayed their prowess, and illustrated their former adroitness by laying the ambuscade, surprizing their enemies, and performing many accurate manoeuvres with the tomahawk and scalping knife; thereby preserving and handing to their children, the theory of Indian warfare. During that period they also pertinaciously observed the religious rites of their progenitors,...and practiced in various athletic games ...
>
> When the Indians were thus engaged in their round of traditionary performances, with the addition of hunting, their women attended to agriculture, their families, and a few domestic concerns of small consequence, and attended with but little labor... Their lives were a continual round of pleasures.

> Their wants were few and easily satisfied; and their cares were only for to-day; the bounds of their calculations for future comfort not extending to the incalculable uncertainties of to-morrow... (Seaver op.cit.:71-72).

Mary Jemison pointed out that relationships with white neighbors during this period were cordial, but the almost total absence of whites rendered the cordiality theoretical. Further west, on the Allegany, the absence of whites was even more marked, not only because of the 1763 demarcation line, nor lack of white interest in the area, but also from a longstanding deliberate policy of exclusion of whites by Indians from the area. Deardorff documents a "sort of quarantine against whites maintained by the branch of the Seneca, and their allies, who lived on or controlled the Genesee-Allegheny...and maintained a sort of sanctuary for refugee Indians from all quarters" (op.cit.:3). Maps and records prepared by white men for the area above Warren, Pennsylvania were totally lacking until David Zeisberger, a Moravian missionary, came to convert the Indians on the Ohio in 1767. Furthermore, "as late as 1767, Zeisberger's two Indian guides who came with him to the river from the East were lost from the time they struck it... John Montour, who guided Brodhead (1779) to Warren, knew nothing about the country above Ft. Niagara via the Allegheny, his intelligence had to resort to Indians for information. The whole project was abandoned because there was so little to be had" (ibid.) Although Deardorff believes traders must have gotten through the "cordon sanitaire" (ibid.) no record of this exists.

The isolation of the Upper Allegheny was possible because there were alternative routes, mostly by water and with some portage, joining the lower Allegheny, Ohio, Mononghela system with Lake Erie either by a short portage from Lake Erie into Lake Chautauqua, down the Conewango Creek which flowed into the Allegheny at what is now Warren, Pennsylvania; or, alternatively, from Lake Erie and utilizing portage, one might sail down French Creek into the Allegheny at the present Franklin, Pennsylvania. These alternative water routes conveniently allowed the isolation of the upper Allegheny when such isolation was desired, but also created the possibilities of a commercial traffic on the Allegheny system which could bypass the upper part of the river system in the nineteenth century, when such isolation was no longer sought.

THE IROQUOIS IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The involvement of the Iroquois in the American Revolution has been recently and extensively documented by Graymont (op.cit.) and does not require elaborate treatment here. In general, the colonies were eager to secure a promise of Indian neutrality and the British were eager to procure their assistance. As Graymont explains, in 1776 the colonies were reluctant to really take the Indians on as allies because of the expense involved and "already, as Indian commissioner, Schuyler was 'daily tormented' by parties of Indians applying for clothing, ammunition for hunting, and other necessities" (ibid.:87).

In fact, the American suspected that the British were urging the Indians to make these demands in order to embarrass the colonial government. At a conference in Niagara in May of 1776, Guyasuta, speaking for the Six Nations rejected John Butler's request that they follow the British (ibid.:98). Flying Crow "who was the head war chief of the Allegany Senecas" (ibid.:99) reinforced this stand. Th Senecas, however, along with other League members were divided in policy and those from the eastern branch who more vigorously favored joining with the British, did so by removing to Canada.

Had Jacobs temporally extended the explication of his thesis of the determining influence of gift giving on Indian policy, the history of the period of the American Revolution would have further confirmed it. In July, 1777, a conference was called by the British with the Seneca at Irondequoit. Governor Blacksnake was there and reported that many women had come to prevent the men from getting into a trap. The Senecas, Cornplanter and Sayenqueraghta, expressed themselves opposed to breaking their treaty with the Americans, but, as the account goes, an abundance of gifts finally persuaded the Indians, including the wary women, and the reluctant Sayenqueraghta (Old Smoke), now seventy years old, and the twenty-five year old Cornplanter were chosen as the Senecas' war chiefs (ibid.:121-123 from Blacksnake Memoirs).

Mary Jemison again provides the eye-witness details of the conversion of the Senecas from neutrals to combatants.

After the British commissioners invited the participation of the Indians in fighting the enemies of the king, and had been rejected by the Indians who referred to their treaties with the Americans:

> The Commissioners continued their entreaties without success, till they addressed their avarice... and added, that the King was rich and powerful, both in money and subjects: That his rum was as plenty as the water in Lake Ontario: that his men were as numerous as the sands upon the lake shore; - and that the Indians, if they would assist in the war, and persevere in their friendship to the King...should never want for money or goods...
>
> As soon as the treaty was finished, the Commissioners made a present to each Indian of a suit of clothes, a brass kettle, a gun and tomahawk, a scalping knife, a quantity of powder and lead, a piece of gold, and promised a bounty on every scalp that should be brought in. Thus richly clad and equipped, they returned home, after an absence of about two weeks, full of the fire of war and anxious to encounter their enemies (Seaver op.cit.:74-75).

However reluctant they were to give up their neutrality and to assist the British, the Senecas figured prominently in many of the famous massacres of the American Revolution, including those of the Wyoming Valley in the summer of 1778 and in Cherry Valley in November of that year, in which they were probably led by Cornplanter (Graymont op.cit.:184). The war, however, did not affect their own settlements until the summer of 1779, when Washington's strategy for reducing Seneca strength and for punishing them duplicated that of Denonville in 1687. Rufus Stone explains that Washington believed it impossible to construct forts along the frontier to defend the settlers against the Indian incursions; they were not stopped by the garrisons already there. Thus, Washington decided, "the country should

be much more certainly protected by offensive than by defensive war. His plan was to penetrate by a rapid movement into the heart of their settlements with a force competent to the destruction of their towns" (Stone 1924:91).

Wallace summarizes the "roster of destruction (which) earned Washington the name of Town Destroyer" which resulted from the three-front attack. Although few casualties were inflicted or captives taken, the damage to that property which had resulted from the years of "economic development" was heavy:

> Three towns on the Chemung River; three towns on the Tioga River; all of the dozen or so Cayuga and Seneca towns on Cayuga and Seneca Lakes; the half-dozen Seneca towns on the route westward to the Genesee River; and the complex of settlements at Geneseo itself. The army missed the towns on the upper and lower Genesee and several small settlements west of the Genesee Valley. Meanwhile Colonel Brodhead, with his force of four hundred men, was marching from Pittsburgh toward the Seneca settlements on the upper Allegheny. He burned the Town at Jenuchshadago and the smaller settlements (already deserted) below it, but did not reach the large villages on the oxbow (1970:143).

Sullivan's raid on the Genesee settlements were totally disasterous for the Seneca, both because of the devastation wrought and because it introduced to the invading Americans a promising area for settlement which, according to Graymont, showed "that the Indians were living in a state of civilization equal to, and often better than, that of the frontier whites" (op.cit.:220). It is estimated that Sullivan's forces destroyed "165,000 bushels of corn and extensive orchards of apples, pears, peaches and plums, one of which contained fifteen hundred

trees" (Stone op.cit.:100). These raids further reinforced the Indian commitment to the British to whom, at Fort Niagara, the Seneca refugees fled, establishing a line of refugee camps around the Fort which accommodated an estimated 5036 Indians in September of 1779 (Graymont op.cit.:220). The British, who could not handle the vast numbers of people, encouraged the Indians to disperse and establish settlements at a distance from the Fort. An estimated 3678 people were resettled in October and an additional 2900 in November, indicating a swelling of September's number in the two following months. These resettlements formed the basis for the later Cattaraugus and Buffalo Creek communities, the former containing many Genesee Seneca and the later being largely composed of those from around Seneca Lake (Deardorff 1951:84).

The course of Brodhead's expedition which left Fort Pitt on September 11, 1779 and the identification of the villages he destroyed in the Allegheny country has been argued by local historians (e.g. Deardorff 1944; Russell 1930; Fenton 1945), with a general agreement that Brodhead did not advance as far as Mary Jemison claimed, i.e. up to Olean Point. He did, however, encounter many villages and claimed to have destroyed eight towns on the upper Allegheny (Graymont op.cit.:218). Brodhead reported to Washington the existence of large settlements which appeared to be new and in the process of expansion. The houses "were larger than common, and built of square & round logs & frame work" and "the great quantity of Corn in new Ground" led him to conclude "that the whole Seneca & Muncy

nations intended to collect to this settlement which extends about eight Miles on the Allegheny River..." (quoted in Fenton op.cit.:93). Fenton estimated from the evidence of large houses probably inhabited by multiple families and from Brodhead's report of a minimum of five hundred acres of corn destroyed that the population of the eight towns was in excess of one thousand people and may have been upwards of fifteen hundred (ibid.).

Eber Russell (op.cit.) argues, uniquely and from local Indian tradition, that Brodhead met Indian opposition led by Guyasuta in his advance, that the village inhabitants hid in the hills for several days, and then returned to their villages where some provisions had been hidden. It is, in fact, extremely unclear whether large numbers of inhabitants of the Allegheny region joined the victims of Sullivan's incursions at the settlements at Fort Niagara. It is certain that the Seneca population was redistributed as a result of the American Revolution and the Allegheny region gained a group of influential men, after 1780 and including Cornplanter, Handsome Lake and Blacksnake, which would make the area a center of Seneca affairs, rather than an Indian frontier. But it remained a white frontier for many years. Unlike Sullivan's men, Brodhead's forces were not tempted back to the rugged terrain that they invaded and, in spite of the successful Indian development of the area, apparently did not see it as promising the golden harvest of the Genesee.

TREATIES AND POLITICS

In spite of the massive destruction of their villages, the relocation of their population and the hardships which they suffered during the winter of 1779-1780 which was an unusually hard season when crops were destroyed by frost in the fall, the deep snow made hunting difficult, and the refugees around Fort Niagara were dying of cold and starvation and suffering severe intestinal problems from the poor food, the fighting capacity of the Iroquois seems to have been unaffected. On the contrary, their attachment to the British solidified, and apparently a spirit of revenge against the colonists incited them to attacks against the frontier settlements which "devastated settlements in a great arc from the Mohawk Valley south to the Catskills and the Delaware and Susquehanna Rivers and west to the Ohio" (Wallace 1970:145). The total destruction of the Schoharie Valley settlements and those up the Mohawk Valley, Wallace equates with Sullivan's campaign against the Seneca. In general "a thousand Iroquois warriors and five hundred Tory rangers were able to lay waste nearly 50,000 square miles of colonial territory" (ibid.:146) and to inspire in the frontiersmen both terror and rage against the Indians.

The success of their campaigns did not prepare the Iroquois for British surrender nor for Britain's ignoring of its Indian allies in the negotiations of the Treaty of Paris in 1783 which marked the end of the colonies' war for independence. On the other hand, although the United States regarded the Indians

as a conquered people effectively falling within federal jurisdiction with Britain's relinquishment of control of the land south of Canada and east of the Mississippi, the Indians regarded themselves as a sovereign people who had their own arrangements to make.

One of the major problems of Indian-white negotiations following the Treaty of Paris until at least the establishment of the New York reservation boundaries at the Treaty of Big Tree in 1797 was the lack of clarity about jurisdiction and authority. I have already indicated that the unity of action within the Iroquois Confederacy was probably never as solidly based as older accounts would have us believe and that the localities led by local headmen had always acted with some degree of independence from the authorized and legitimate leaders, the sachems of the League. This independence of action seemed to intensify after 1783, with figures such as Cornplanter, Joseph Brant and Red Jacket emerging and claiming the power to speak for the "Nation," but either without nation authority to do so, or so limited that some segment of the nation could later claim that they did not have such legitimate power. The attack on the legitimacy of the authority of such leaders forms the basis of many contemporary Indian land claims in the Northeast. Warriors, such as Cornplanter and Joseph Brant, did not have the institutionalized authority of sachems, but frequently it was a warrior, often falaciously called a "chief" by white men, lacking the societal controls structurally associated with sachemship, who spoke and negotiated

for the group.

A similar complexity of jurisdiction existed on the other side of most negotiations, with the claims of the states frequently conflicting with each other and with federal jurisdiction. The Articles of Confederation of August 20, 1776 put the regulation of Indian trade and Indian affairs within the jurisdiction of the United States Congress, but this was on the condition that such jurisdiction did not infringe on state's rights. Prucha (1962:30-31) observes that James Madison pointed out the contradictory situation which such a conditional control set up, whereby federal jurisdictional control was really effective only in the absence of a state, i.e. only in Indian Country. Whatever nominal control the federal government had, real power remained with the states and the independence of action of the states vis-a-vis the federal government parallels the independence of action of individual Indian leaders vis-a-vis the Confederacy.

The real defeat of the Iroquois came through the Treaty of Fort Stanwix in 1784 at which Cornplanter, opposed by Red Jacket, emerged as a major spokesman and thereafter carried the burden of condemnation from the Indians who knew what they had lost through this treaty. The posture of the Americans was that of victors dictating the terms of peace, but it was a peace which they craved to facilitate the easy expansion west to the Ohio River in order to pay the huge national debt which had been incurred during the Revolution. Although the Americans could probably have won a war with the Indians, they could not

afford it. The Indians who came to make a peace treaty found they were being forced into land concessions which would fix the western boundary of New York as the limits of Iroquois land, and the land lying to the west of that open to American settlement.

Cornplanter was also instrumental in selling to Pennsylvania the lands lying west of the line which had been established in 1768, and for this too he was condemned. Graymont remarks that it was warriors not sachems who acted at Fort Stanwix (op.cit.: 280) and, however binding the actions of warriors may have been for the Americans, they did not carry such weight for the Senecas. In 1786 the official body of the League renounced both the action of those warriors who had made the treaty and the treaty itself. Not only for the sake of the Six Nations, but for their western allies to whom the League had offered protection, the sachems declared that they would rather continue to fight than to settle for the terms of peace of 1784. This professed intention was not acted upon, and the treaty remained intact although many Iroquois joined with the more westerly Indians in continued raids against frontier settlements which "ravaged the frontiers of the United States (and which) was to continue until Wayne's decisive victory at Fallen Timbers in 1794" (Harder 1963:10). It is possible that the consequences of the sachems' "ultimatum" was that the American "conquest" policy of acquiring Indian lands was laid aside in favor of a policy of purchase and the encouragement of "civilization" for the Indians.

The following extended quotation is offered as a commentary on the role that Cornplanter is seen to have played in these and other negotiations from a white point of view. Actually the remarks exaggerate Cornplanter's unquestioned loyalty to the Americans and Adlum, in 1794, reported that the Allegany Senecas under Cornplanter were about to go to war to support the western Indians, and desisted only when they got word of Wayne's victory (Kent and Deardorff 1960). But Stone's plaudits give us some idea of how the Indians as well must have interpreted his actions, and the ambiguous position within the Indian world that he after filled. It is worth remembering, too, that in the "Code of Handsome Lake," it is Red Jacket who Handsome Lake encounters on his trip into hell, ever pushing a wheelbarrow filled with earth for the sin of having sold Indian land (Parker 1913:68). R. Stone writes as follows:

> Red Jacket and Brant were ready to revolt and urged their followers to join the uprising of western Indians...But Cornplanter, the most distinguished warrior, the noblest Roman of them all, the most far-seeing as well as the most influential, resisted the movement...So he, almost single-handed, held in leash the angry Senecas until General Wayne...achieving a decisive victory at the battle of Fallen Timbers in 1794, put an end to the insurrection...It was followed almost immediately...by the immigration of settlers from the east into the county of McKean and ten other countries of northern and western Pennsylvania... Meantime, the chiefs of the Six Nations, yielding to the powerful influence of Cornplanter, had acceeded to the treaties of Fort Stanwix and Fort Harmer. The status of the Indian as a child of the republic was fixed...The smile that no one ever saw must have leaped to the eye that shone when he touched the hand of Washington and knew that the Great White Father leaned on him for support (1924:100-101).

To that same "Great White Father" Cornplanter later complained about the Treaty of Fort Stanwix:

> You told us that we were in your hand, and that by closing it you could crush us to nothing, and you demanded from us a great country as the price of that peace you had offered us, - as if our want of strength had destroyed our rights. Our chiefs had felt your power and were unable to contend against you, and they therefore gave up that country. What they agreed to has bound our nation, but your anger against us must be by this time cooled, and though our strength has not increased nor your power become less, we ask you to consider calmly, were the terms dictated to us by your Commissioners reasonable and just? (W. Stone 1841:29).

Cornplanter had occasion to "touch the hand" of many people in power and be rewarded for his cooperation. With the seat of the United States government in Philadelphia from 1790 to 1800, Cornplanter could make contact with the federal and state governments and private groups, particularly the Quakers, at a single visit. His appeals to the Governor of Pennsylvania resulted in the acquisition of fee simple title to fifteen hundred acres of land, in three parcels. Two of these he later sold, but the last was retained and was thereafter known as "the Cornplanter grant" (cf. Deardorff 1941 for the complete history of Cornplanter's real estate negotiations). It was on this piece of property, the title to which was clear, that the Quakers found the majority of the Allegany Senecas living in 1798, apparently clustered there until the reservation which has been allotted to them in 1797 was surveyed.

The Treaty at Fort Stanwix was an occasion upon which the conflict between the state and federal level of government

emerged, and the authority of Congress to sole and exclusive rights to treat with the Indians was challenged by the New York commissioners who were engaging in separate negotiations. Prucha, whose reputation among historians is as the pollyanna of American policy in regard to the Indians, optimistically remarks that "the federal power was vindicated by the treaty" (1962:34) but later instances of the inability of the federal government to control the treaty making activities of New York belies this contention. In a letter of April 4, 1791 from Washington to Hamilton, the president complains that, by entering into private negotiations with the Indians, the New York legislature was surely weakening the federal image (O'Reilly collection). In an extended discussion of Indian-white relations during the period 1815 to 1824 when Indian removal became a serious program urged by the states, Horsman (1970b:5-20) demonstrates that the federal inability to prevent undesirable behavior by whites to Indians does not so much reflect covert federal acquiescence as powerless against the greater strength of state and local level action.

In 1795 New York was actively engaged in treaty negotiations with the Oneidas, Onondagas and Cayugas for the acquisition of their lands. In June of that year, the Attorney General of the United States gave as his opinion that such treaties were not constitutional (O'Reilly Collection). In a letter of the same month, the Secretary of War, Timothy Pickering writing to Chapin, the Indian Agent for the Six Nations in New York confirmed the state's obligation to accede to the federal government.

Chapin was instructed to inform the Indians that any agreement made between New York and the Indians would be void (ibid.). Chapin, as evidenced by his letters, appeared to feel himself helpless to interfere and reported that the only thing holding back the sale of the Oneida lands was that the Oneidas were demanding more money than was being offered by the state (ibid:August 19, 1795). On August 26, 1795, Pickering again and finally wrote to Chapin that beyond indicating the illegality of the procedure, nothing more could be done. In apparent resignation, he wrote "having done this much, the business might there be left" (ibid.).

In the conflict between federal and state jurisdictional authority, the Indians frequently found themselves relying on the weaker side. James Young quotes an English diplomat writing in 1811-12 on the relative power of federal and local government, to wit:

> The links of connection formed by Congress, whatever may be their effects in giving union to the country in its collisions with foreign powers are too little felt in the ordinary concerns of life to view in any considerable degree with the near and more powerful influence produced by the operations of the local governments (1966:32).

Unlike white citizens who spoke to local level politicians, the Indians, regarding themselves as sovereign nations and thus one of those "foreign powers" talked to the President and to Congress, frequently to no avail, even when the federal power was inclined to be most sympathetic to Indian causes. Washington, a failure as the capitol of a country until Jackson's

time, attracted Indian delegations. "Far more in evidence than citizens," Young tells us, "among the delegations who visited early Washington, were Indians, come to present grievances or to pay respects to the white father" (1966:25).

The preference of influential men for state level rather than federal level positions continued throughout the period when the Senecas were looking to the federal level for protection and redress of grievances, and when the real determination of their affairs was being conducted on the local level. Young remarks that "even those who came to Washington as elected persons must have found the places of power dubiously rewarding, for they resigned in extraordinary high numbers to continue their office holding career elsewhere than in Washington (ibid.:28). Robert R. Livingston found his duties as Secretary of the Department of State and Foreign Affairs interfered with his responsibilities as Chancellor of New York in 1782, so he resigned the federal post. DeWitt Clinton resigned his Senate seat in 1803, to become mayor of New York City, and as late as 1828, Silas Wright resigned his congressional seat to become New York State Comptroller (Kass 1965:66-67). "Considerations of state and local affairs between 1823 and 1828," Kass writes, "were unquestionably treated as matters of much greater importance than national ones" (ibid.:67) and again, "One of the most striking aspects of government in New York during the first three decades of the nineteenth century was the primacy of state over national politics..." (ibid.:162).

The relevancy of the power of local control becomes particularly significant in Seneca affairs when we realize that it was the land company administrators who controlled local level politics and were precisely those people with whom the federal government was presumably mediating as guardians of Indian interests. Quoting again from Kass' study of the politics of New York State, he states:

> To keep their finger on the pulse of local political happenings in the outlying areas of the state, the parties maintained contacts in the large land companies. For example, Joseph Ellicott...naturally assumed the post of leader of the Bucktail Party on the Holland Purchase. Although he personally occupied no public positions, he influenced all political appointments throughout that area of the state. On all subjects pertaining to the western sector of New York, political leaders on both the state and national level conferred with him and frequently advocated public policies in accordance with his proposals (ibid.:58).

It should be noted too that public positions, many of which later became elective offices, were in this early period appointments, again controlled by the local leader. Thus postmasters, justices of the peace, sheriffs, county clerks, and many others depended for their appointments on the favor of the leaders of local politics which was in the hands of the land companies. The interests of Indians were not likely to be well protected when they came into conflict with the interests of local whites.

The conflict between local and federal levels of government was not primarily an abstract argument. Mostly it was about acquiring land for sale and settlement, and this land

hunger, speculation in land and the drive to spatial expansion is another theme which runs throughout the period. Because the British had attempted to control inland settlement by colonists, as demonstrated in the Treaty of 1763, and because so much of what had been settled and developed by frontiersmen had been destroyed and abandoned during the Revolution, a burst of expansion immediately followed the conclusion of hostilities. One writer describes the process in the following terms:

> Such a prolonged disruption of the process of settlement expansion...could not help but build up pressures which, once relieved, were likely to burst forth in unprecedented strength, radically extending the old bounds of settlement... independence gave new local political powers and prompted or accelerated numerous forces which, together, would initiate a breaking up of the big landed estates in the older areas, and in the new areas would facilitate dealing with the Indians, negociating the conflicting territorial claims of neighboring colonies, and pave the way for a rapid disposal of public lands (Thompson 1966:137).

The federal government was extremely eager to acquire public lands for rapid resale and quick settlement, but in this they continually met Indian resistance. The British in Canada continued to encourage the Indians to oppose United States expansion, and all of the Indian leaders, including Cornplanter and Brant, apparently had dealings with representatives of both the British and the Americans. Although they probably would have won, the impoverished United States could not afford a war with the Indians, both because they could not stand the expense, nor could they postpone the sale

of those Ohio lands which they were counting on to pay off the huge national debt. The application of the "conquest theory" to negotiations with the Indians was a dismal failure and merely aggravated Indian hostility which vented itself in frontier raids which virtually made the areas under consideration uninhabitable and thus unsellable. Some effort was made to provide protection for settlers; for instance, the building of Fort Franklin in Venango in the Allegheny area in 1787, where "on many occasions the settlers were obliged from the turbulent disposition of the Indians and the unsettled state of affairs to return to Fort Pitt or gather close to other forts" (Albert 1896:594). This was clearly no way to run an economical expansion program.

The alternative to the "conquest" theory of acquiring Indian lands was provided by Henry Knox whose term as Secretary of War, under whose jurisdiction Indian Affairs fell, extended from 1785 until January 1798, at which time he was succeeded by Timothy Pickering whose policies towards Indian affairs were identical to those of Knox. On a practical basis he was given the responsibility of formulating a policy which would facilitate the rapid and peaceful acquisition of Indian lands. To confirm again Jacobs' thesis of the importance of gifts, Knox's first step in his plan of conciliation was to urge the presentation of gifts, supplies and food which "would hopefully attach the Indians to the United States" (Harder op.cit.:22). Further he suggested the appointment of Indian Agents for the frontier tribes and specifically one

for the Six Nations. The reasons given for the creation of such a position are interesting as an indication of the sapping of Indian sovereign power, however humanitarian the motive because Knox proposed that the agent "should act as a buffer between the Indian tribes and Congress. The presence of this individual would help to prevent unauthorized persons making application to Congress for aid and advice. Furthermore, the agent could be used as a vehicle of propaganda to the Indians, encouraging them peaceably to relinquish their lands to the United States: (ibid.:21). On the other hand, the agent was instructed to serve the Indians and Israel Chapin, who was appointed by Knox as the temporary Deputy Agent to the Six Nations was told:

> In the meantime I observe it is the firm determination of the President of the United States that the utmost fairness and kindness shall be exhibited to the Indian tribes...That it is not only his desire to be at peace with all the Indian tribes, but to be their guardians and protectors against all injustices (O'Reilly collection).

When the chiefs of the Six Nations repudiated the actions of the warriors at the Fort Stanwix treaty of 1784, Knox responded with a proposal to hold a new peace treaty negotiation and with the recommendation that Indian lands henceforth should be acquired by purchase rather than as a right of conquest. In January 1789, a the Treaty of Fort Harmer, this proposal was put into effect and payment was made for those lands which had been acquired at the Treaties of Fort Stanwix and Fort McIntosh.

In the summer of 1789, Knox began to advance his ideas for the civilization of the Indians. In letters to President Washington he pointed out several reasons why this policy would ultimately be the best one for the United States to pursue. First and above all, conciliation would be far less expensive than conquest: Knox estimated that $200,000 would be necessary to wage a war against the Indians and the United States could not afford the cost. Furthermore, the international reputation of the United States would be enhanced by a humanitarian policy. Providing funds for missionary teachers, he pointed out, would be far less expensive than waging war, but would result in the same goal of acquisition of Indian land, for as the Indians were converted to an agricultural way of life which required far less land than a hunting economy did, they would be willing to sell their surplus land to the United States (American State Papers 1832: June 15, 1789; July 7, 1789). The offer by the Quakers to expedite this policy at their own expense was gratefully received.

In spite of his preference for a civilizing policy, by 1789 Knox was firmly committed to military action against the western Indians and the defeats of General Harmar in 1790 and General St. Clair in 1791 encouraged the Indians to continue fighting towards what they saw as a real possibility of victory and forced Knox to continue to support military action. Although all the Seneca leaders had been utilized by the Americans as emissaries of peace to the western Indians,

and had been well recompensed for their services, by 1794 even Cornplanter was being persuaded by these victories that his advancement of the American cause was perhaps putting him with the losing side. Fort Franklin was put into a state of readiness "when there was a very general apprehension that Cornplanter would break with the whites, and fall on the settlers of northern Pennsylvania" (Albert 1896:595).

With Wayne's victory at Fallen Timbers, the power of the western confederacy dissolved, the Senecas thought no more of armed resistance against the Americans, and the civilization policy was reactivated. It was reactivated, however, with a budget cut for whereas originally Congress appropriated "not more than twenty thousand dollars to be used by the President to promote his civilization policy" (Lambrecht 1967:19), military victory convinced Congress that it could reduce the amount to $15,000 (ibid.:22fn.).

The Treaty of Big Tree in 1797 reduced Seneca land holdings but provided the opportunity for the final establishment of clear reservation boundaries, and was the beginning of what is called "the early reservation period". New York and Massachusetts both claimed title to the area and had negotiated a compromise agreement in 1786 whereby New York would hold jurisdictional rights to the land in western New York and Massachusetts, in crucial need of money, would hold the preemption rights to this same territory, rights which they expected immediately to sell. In 1788, Massachusetts sold all

of this land to Phelps and Gorham for one million dollars, but the land west of the Genesee reverted back to Massachusetts because of non-payment by the land company (Chazanoff 1970:19-21). These pre-emption rights to four million acres were then sold to Robert Morris of Philadelphia in 1791 for $1,333,333 (Mau 1944:71), and he, in turn and within the widespread practice of "turning a fast buck" in land speculation sold 3,300,000 acres to a group of Dutch bankers in 1792-93, which became known as the Holland Land Company (formed in 1795), but on the condition that he mediate the Indian claims and arrange for reserved land for them and clear title for white settlement of the remaining land. The company was extremely anxious to get the title settled and agreed to the distribution of large gifts as part of the expense of the negotiations (Chazanoff op.cit.:21).

By the time of the treaty meetings itself, Robert Morris was under house arrest for debt and the negotiations were carried out by his son Thomas under the United States supervision of Jeremiah Wadsworth. Over one thousand Senecas attended the proceedings (ibid.). Wallace has vividly described the events of that treaty (1970:179-183), but this treaty was not really different in form from others that had come before. Gift-giving, liquor, and the private arrangements, otherwise called bribes, were part of the established procedures of Indian treaty making. Leaders such as Red Jacket, made speeches condemning the treaty during the day, and accepted promises of private cash on the line at night.

The greatest benefitors from the bribery process were Indian-associated whites, mainly the three interpreters who were part of the Indian community, and Israel Chapin, the Indian Agent. Theordore Cazenove reported back to his employers in Holland as follows:

> Mr. Thomas Morris had conditioned a gratification of $4000 to be divided between the three interpreters, Johnston, Jones and Parish, but your agents perceiving that it was necessary to animate them further - promised an extraordinary gratification on the part of the Holland Company of $1000 to each of the three above named interpretors and one of $2000 to Captain Chapin, agent of the federal government to the Six Nations, gratifications which were not to be paid if the Indians reserved to themselves more than 200,000 acres. This stimulus had a great effect, and as Mr. Chapin and the interpreters could be for a long time useful to the Holland Company in these quarters it was one reason the more for Messrs. Bayard, Lincklaen and Boon to conciliate the attachment of their influence (Evans 1924:194).

To focus on the events as a picture of corruption by whites feeding on Indian weakness is to miss an essential aspect of what the cash promised meant to the Indians. The women who were present in large numbers, as they must have been as "true owners" of the land, presumably were persuaded by the advantages that a steady income which a yearly annuity would bring, particularly to free them from a dependence on men for cash. The leading men were being persuaded less by outright cash grants, of which Red Jacket, as a measure of the importance of his acquiescence got a disproportionately large share, but rather by private annuities which would provide a steady income in the future. The $100,000 to be

paid to the Senecas was to be invested in bank of the United States stock (Kappler 1972:1027) from which they were promised, therefore, a guaranteed yearly income far in excess of any money previously given at treaties. Previous treaty negotiations never involved such amounts of money. In the treaty of 1792 an annuity of $1500 "which shall be expended yearly forever, in purchasing clothing, domestic animals, and implements of husbandry, and other utensils suited to their circumstances, and in compensating useful artificers who shall reside with or near them, and be employed for their benefit" (ibid.:34) was supplemented in 1794 by an additional $3000 annuity to be used for the same purpose. The purpose clearly fitted the civilization policy, but it allocated the use of funds and left none to be used by the Indians at their discretion. The interest on the $100,000 was to come in cash to be used at the discretion of the Indians, and the promise of a yearly income must have been very persuasive, particularly coupled with a promise of perpetual retention of their own lands which amounted to 311 square miles, unevenly divided among eleven reservations. In fact, the interest on the money came to less than four dollars a year per capita which did not significantly satisfy anyone's need for cash, and it tied them inextricably to the United States; the President of the United States was the custodian of their stock and the payment of the interest was received through the Indian Agent. Any future hostilities with the United States would ever

after carry the additional threat to the Seneca of the loss of a sizable amount of money. However it might work out in the future, at the time the provisions met the dual needs of the Seneca for protected lands and for steady cash.

Although the amounts of land to be contained in each reservation were established with the signing of the treaty in September 1797, the boundaries of each were not, and it became the responsibility of Joseph Ellicott as surveyor and representative of the Holland Land Company to negotiate those boundaries so as to maximize saleable land for the company. Cornplanter proved a most difficult person for Ellicott to deal with and a shrewd protector of his group's interests, and it was the gift of an additional two square miles of land (presented as communal, not private property) that persuaded Cornplanter to relinquish his original demand that the reservation be laid out exclusively along the banks of the Allegany and along its tributary streams, thus reserving for the Indians all the bottomlands of the area. In the summer of 1798, Ellicott reported to his superior Cazenove and described the situation in the following terms:

> In respect to the Alleghany reservation I have given directions to lay the towns out in that quarter without paying any attention to it for the present. I am very sorry the quakers interferance in this business is likely to give us much trouble with this reservation when ever it shall be laid out. They have advised the Indians to take a strip on each side of the river, of only 1/2 mile in bredth which will just take in all the low ground and Bottom land, and inclose the river for the whole distance it runs through this State; and occasion work for one Surveyor

> nearly six weeks and in the event prove more hurtful to the Indians than if it had to be done or laid out in a compact body, and also be very detrimental to the proprietors of the land adjoining this ridiculous reservation (Ellicott 1937:Vol. I, 37).

In September, Ellicott was able to report that the business was settled, partly thanks to the help of Farmers Brother, a Seneca leader from Buffalo Creek, "to whom I took the liberty to make some small presents" (ibid.:41) and the agreement for the reservation boundaries was that "the Surveyor should begin on the line that devides the State of Pennsylvania from New York, on each side of the Allegany River, at the distance of half a Mile therefrom, and run up the river on both sides keeping the same distance off, and Parallel thereto, until the Survey...should extend Four Miles above Tunnanguandt Creek; and if that distance should not include the quantity of 42 Square Miles, he would then direct where the residue should be laid off" (ibid.). In another report, Ellicott added with apparent satisfaction the following comment:

> Yet norwithstanding the most favorable manner of laying out this Reservation that could be obtained, it still does considerable injury to that part of the Company territory, by excluding them from the benefit of Establishing Settlements immediately on the river. However the reservation is now so laid out that at the smallest Estimate five Sixths of it consist of inaccessible uncultivatible mountains (ibid.:90).

THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

"This rediculous reservation" was a most fortunate

accomplishment from an Indian point of view. From the white side, Everts remarks that "there is no doubt that the chance which located them upon the best lands in Cattaraugus was an unfortunate one for the growth and prosperity of the county" (1879:73). Before Brodhead's raid, the Indian villages had been strung along the river, and although most of them had been abandoned before the reservation boundaries were set, the new lines followed the old lines of occupation. Although the archaeological evidence of the Iroquois indicates that, by general orientation, they were not a riverine people, the topology of the Allegany region with "those hideous Mountains along the Allegany River" (Ellicott:317) forced them, deep in the prehistoric period, to settle along the banks of the river. And riverine people or not, the presence of the river throughout its length had a profound influence on the course of the reservation life insofar as the river was the thoroughfare along which whites travelled westward and the commercial life of the area depended on this transportation as it fed into markets along the Allegheny-Ohio-Mississippi system. There was no place on a reservation of this shape where Indians could retreat entirely from whites; it was, in effect, all boundary, with no interior. The only factor, besides the cultural ones of language differences and prejudices against Indians by whites, to mitigate against intense Indian-white interaction was the small number of settlers who came into the region and the even smaller numbers who stayed. It has been remarked that the river was an unfortunate aspect of

the environment for white settlement as it provided an easy way out.

The following is a concise and general description by an unidentified Quaker visitor written sometime shortly after 1804 of the physical aspects of the reservation and some of the potential resources observable then:

> The Seneca reservation on the Allegany River in the State of New York contains forty two square miles, including one mile square near the source of a branch of the same River. The Southern extremity of the Reservation is bounded by the north line of Pennsylvania in the L.42N and about 3.1,5 from Philadelphia... It extended up the river meandering to the eastward somewhat in the form of a semi-circle about 35 miles, its most northern part being about 12 miles within the State of New York. The River in this distance in the general is from 190 to 200 yards wide. The navigation for Boats & Canoes is good, but the channel in many place (illegible) divided islands, and some others of considerable extent on which the Indians raise corn and other vegetables in great abundance.
>
> On passing down the river the land is beautifully diversified with hill & dale and the River alternately washing the southern & Northern hills. The bottoms along the River are generally a rich soil producing abundance of luxuriant herbage and coer'd with a great variety of Timber--The most fertile abound with (White Walnut) and Butternut), Sugar Maple, Wild Cherry & some hickory. That of a more inferior quality - but well adapted for cultivation, is covered with high towering white pine - Whiteoak & black ash, beech and a variety of other kinds, with which also the hills in general are well covered, and though many of them are not eligible for cultivation, yet laying convenient to the River from whence timber can be rafted down the Water of the Ohio - they may in time become a valuable acquisition... (Indian Committee Collection: Reel I, Box 2).

Our evaluation of the natural resources of the area must take cognizance of the expectations of the exploiters of those

resources. If we are to judge the feasibility of the Quaker program for an agricultural economy for the Seneca community, we must understand the agricultural potential, as well as the economic alternatives. In this assessment of the environment we are somewhat hampered by the changes which sequential economic exploitation, particularly of the forest, produced in the early nineteenth century. Not only the availability and distribution of wood changed, but deforestation produced erosion which probably contributed to heavier flooding which, among other effects, also changed the chemical composition of the soil. Deforestation further changed the distribution of wild animals by altering their habitats, and reduced the availability of harvested wild resources such as maple sugar. Devastating forest fires later in the nineteenth century completed the work of the early lumbering, thus modifying again the distribution of wood resources and of animals. The natural environment which exists in the area now is significantly different from what it was in the early nineteenth century; the apparently wild area of the Allegany State Park in New York and the contiguous Allegheny National Forest in Pennsylvania is all at least second growth.

When the agricultural potential of the soil of the flood plain is spoken of as good, it is always with the proviso that good management be used. The pockets of alluvial plain and the islands in the river on which the Indians planted, and which were constantly being cut and reformed, are composed

largely of Unandilla silt loam which has a low natural fertility and is very strongly acid (Pearson 1940:36). Both conditions can be modified for the better with animal fertilizers and lime, neither of which were, of course, used by the Seneca, although the Quakers, with their experience in soil restoration in Pennsylvania strongly encouraged the use of manure. A local soil expert pointed out that these soils are "beautiful for hoe agriculture" (Kuhl: private communication). The already acid condition was intensified by the dropping of conifer needles, but flooding tended to leach out the surface acid, producing a three to ten inch layer of bleached subsoil of low fertility and high acidity. Shallow hoe cultivation would not likely disturb this acid layer, whereas plow cultivation might (ibid.).

How much the condition of the soil along the river benefited from silting depends on how much flooding the area was subject to at the time. In response to my inquiry, Don Dragoo who has directed extensive archaeological excavations along the river, responded:

> I would think that much of the silting of the Allegheny Valley came after the 1820 date and can be attributed to deforestation and a certain amount of farming. Flooding became a much more serious problem after that time, but it did occur prior to the 1800's since we have found evidence of flooding in the pits on several sites that we have excavated. However, the amount of silt laid down during the earlier floods was much smaller and it accumulated at a slower rate (Private Communication May 13, 1974).

Although silting may have reduced the need to rotate fields which was part of the traditional agricultural practice, the

evidence is lacking to clarify this point.

Drainage along the river was frequently poor, but the squaw corn, that variety planted by the Indians, is not adversely affected by either dampness or coldness of the ground (Mason 1936:51). Squaw corn is also early to mature, thus avoiding some of the problems created by early frosts in the late summer, which were also offset by protective fogs which rise off the river and create microenvironments with a one to two week longer growing season (Pearson op.cit.: 32). The average growing season closely approaches the minimum number of days set by Kroeber as necessary for an agriculturally based society (1939) insofar as "the average frost-free season as recorded at Franklinville extends from May 21 to September 25, a period of 127 days" free of frost, but the frost-free period within Cattaraugus County "ranges from 99 days at Allegany State Park to 171 days at Perryburg" (Pearson op.cit.:5). The higher elevations on the reservation would approximate the range of Allegany State Park which the reservation adjoins.

The continental climate of the region produces wide seasonal extremes of temperature with maximums and minimums recorded at 99 degrees F. and minus 45 degrees F. The result of the short growing season, the cool nights and the very wet and cloudy winters, is a limitation on the feasibility of raising such crops as field corn, winter wheat or alfalfa. Buckwheat, on the other hand, does well in the wet soils and

became an important crop for Indians and whites alike. Adams remarks that "one important physical feature of this county seems to have been ignored by the early settlers, and that was its elevation above the ocean...After vainly trying to make this a winter wheat country, many moved away clinging to the notion that the trouble was wholly in the soil" (1893:50). The elevation on the reservation ranges from 1284 feet to 2000 feet above sealevel and the higher elevations, within a farming complex, were suitable only for the grazing of cattle. Although the flood plains and terraces are narrow, Kuhl estimates that the reservation itself probably includes only about ten percent highlands, an entirely favorable ratio of highly potentially productive land to low.

A variety of trees grew in the area, and their locations depended upon drainage, elevation and their orientation on the mountainsides, i.e. facing towards or away from maximal potential sunlight. An oak-hickory complex grew on the flats along the river and included the white pines which were frequently commented on and which played such an important part in the early lumber trade. In areas of poor drainage elm, hemlock and black ash predominated and on the slopes, because they required good drainage, grew beech, birch, maple, hemlock and basswood. Elm bark was extensively used by the Indians for the manufacture of containers of various sorts; birchbark was of minor importance, and canoes were made of elm, not birch bark. When the white pines had been largely eliminated by lumbering activities, hemlock bark stripping became a major industry to supply the

associated tanning industry and the dead hemlocks left behind was the fuel on which major forest fires fed in the nineteenth century.

Variations in altitude and terrain encouraged a variety of animals, although the best hunting was further south, into Pennsylvania, and seasonal hunting camps were established there which also put Pittsburgh, the primary market for the sale of the products of the hunt, within easier travelling distance down the Allegheny (cf. Sloan 1902:226; Tome 1854). Moose were in the swamps, elk on higher elevations (but rare in New York area), bear, raccoon, opossum, woodchuck, squirrels, and it is said, bison (Schenck 1887:17). Wild birds such as turkey, pheasant, and the seasonally harvested passenger pigeons were abundant as were fur bearing animals such as beaver, otter, mink, muskrat, marten, red and grey fox, lynx, and wildcat. At an early settlement "game abounded. Deer were numerous and valuable" (Reynolds 1938:49) and the area is depicted as a veritable garden of animal plenty.

Wolves were common and made impossible the raising of sheep in the area. To eliminate them as both a danger and a nuisance, bounties were offered for their heads ranging from $5.00 to $60.00 a head. From 1808 until 1845, 1746 wolves and panthers were certified as killed at a total bounty cost of $26,679.70 (Doty 1940: Vol.I:16). Indians as well as whites participated in this extremely profitable bounty trade.

Agriculture was hampered by the presence of the dense

virgin forests of western New York, and the most desirable lands were the few open spaces which did not require clearing. The white pines are estimated to have grown to as much as seven feet in diameter and to a height of 250 feet. "It has been estimated that this region as a whole had about fifteen thousand board feet of lumber to the acre. In the upland area it was not uncommon to get one hundred thousand board feet to the acre" (ibid.:18). McNall tells us that both girdling and chopping were the customary methods used by whites of clearing land but that "the clearing process was long and gradual. One writer estimated that a settler could clear and enclose thirty or forty acres in ten years" (1952:84). Another observed that "the work of opening a farm consumed a life time, wearing out at least one generation" (ibid.:85). Against this appraisal, it is interesting to posit Schoolcraft's estimate of forty acres as the minimum requisite to support a family, an estimate which led him to reject the feasibility of removing all the Senecas to the Allegany Reservation in 1846 (Ely S. Parker Papers: May 7, 1846).

The utilization of the timber for commercial purposes varied depending on access to water transportation, and this second variable determined what the primary emphasis of an area would be in terms of initial white economic activity. Where water transportation was not readily available, cut timber was converted by burning into "black salts" of lye or pearl ash which was sold and produced a steady, if minimal (from

$2.50 to $3.00 per hundred pounds or approximately $10.00 per acre) source of cash. Where water transportation was available, as it was along the Allegany River, early activity focused on lumbering and only after that resource was exhausted was the cleared land seriously put into agricultural operation. Adams observes that "the early settlers here, as in other new counties, were without means, and the offer of remunerative wages in the mills and lumber woods offered quicker pay than could be realized by the slow and laborious process of clearing and the waiting for a crop to grow. Besides, no bright young man thought himself accomplished until he had mastered the intricacies of river navigation of rafts and was known as a expert pilot (op.cit.:58). I am anticipating my later discussion when I here remark that the Senecas were known as the most expert pilots of all (McMahon 1958:81) and it seems likely that the combination of profit and prestige would have been as appealing to Indians as it was to whites.

Sawmills were an essential part of the development of any settlement to provide the lumber needed for the construction of homes, but in the Allegany region, particularly in 1804 around Olean, there was particular pressure for such lumber to construct housing and rafts to accommodate and then transport the steady stream of emigrants passing through on their way down the river to lands in the Ohio and further west. Although 1807 is frequently given as the date for the opening of the first mill to produce lumber which would be rafted downriver

to Pittsburgh, in fact Cornplanter was cutting and rafting such lumber at his own mill in 1795 (Sipe 1927:465) and the Quakers were in the lumber business before 1807.

I will discuss the lumbering industry in great detail when I consider its impact on the Indian economy. At this point we need but note that its seasonal variation depended on the seasonal changes of the river itself with rafting only possible during high water periods. The following passage, included at such length because of its grotesque literary character (the series of which it is part was edited by Bliss Carmen) which I trust will provide some comic relief, sums up, graphically indeed, the seasonal variations in question:

> The Allegheny River, for the bulk of its length, has never been classed as 'an excellent waterway of commerce.' This is not surprising when you examine the very nature of the stream - for it is a river which is likely to be frozen solid from December until March, with ice piled in great packs and jams at perhaps thirty localities - piled mountain high with great ice blocks thrown into the most jagged contortions by reason of the grinding pressure brought to bear; then comes the annual 'spring thaw' in which the Allegheny rids itself of this frozen constipation in one vast bowel movement. It is a frightening spectacle to behold - urged by an enema of melting snow and drizzling rains which pile all the creeks to flood tide and cause a never-ending roar from each gully and ravine. The river stirs uneasily at first, winces, then with no warning whatever delivers itself of ice, drift, flotsam and jetsam, trees, logs, houses, barns, haystacks, cornshocks, barrels, dead pigs, bloated horses, boses, barrels, packing crates, and other impedimenta which it has warehoused during the winter - all of this hodge-podge starts moving to the tune of thunderous cannonading of ice jams breaking, and one jam swoops down upon another, and with a continued crashing and rending the mighty discharge is on its way, now

taking out bridges, piers, sometimes whole villages, with the natives of the bottom lands fleeing for the hills and terrified livestock jumping fences and racing away for Egypt or anywhere, so as to be shed of this cataclysm. "The Allegheny's bust loose!' This cry is passed from mouth to mouth, and hurries over the telegraph wires...

Now comes the 'spring flood' brought about by abnormal rainfall over the watershed, and it is March or April. In the course of forty-eight hours the Allegheny has boomed up from a nominal stage of perhaps three feet to 22 feet, or 30 feet - Monday March 18, 1936, at Pittsburgh to 46 feet...After this fanfare, the Allegheny River settles down to a 'fair boating stage,' which means, usually a slowly falling river, mildly bolstered every week or so by early summer rainfall, and kept at such a state that the gravel bars and shallow places have from three to ten feet of water over them. This may last until June, but more frequently it doesn't, and wares out by the middle of May.

All summer long, with a few notable historic exceptions, the Allegheny River is a big, over-grown creek...totally useless for navigation purposes.

At some unpredictable date in the fall, ranging anywhere from the middle of September until Thanksgiving, the fall rains set in and bolster the Allegheny back to a navigable stage which, if luck is good, may last until the first 'northwester' sings through the tall pines and freezes everything up again right as a clam (Way 1942:96-99).

THE WHITE SETTLERS

Settlers were late coming to the southern tier section of the Holland Land Purchase, although not as late as land purchase records would lead us to believe. Ellicott was never convinced of the saleability of these southern lands, was late in surveying them, which inhibited sales, and particularly was slow in recommending the construction of roads through the area, without which emigrants could not enter, or ship goods to and from markets. Again the river made a difference

but, as I have indicated, the settlers who came in to use the river as a highway, often went out by this route when the ice broke in the spring. Olean, the earliest recorded land purchased in Cattaraugus County, a purchase of 20,000 acres by Adam Hoops, a land speculator, in 1804, experienced a rapid early growth and prosperity from these westward emigrants, but in 1825, the population of Olean was only 404 persons and had increased to 561 by 1830 (Adams op.cit.:855). Even more northern areas which had been favored by Ellicott for early settlement had similar late starts with Buffalo (then New Amsterdam) having a population in 1800 of from 20 to 25 people. Again the area was a way west, through Lake Erie and Fort Niagara, rather than a place to settle.

Cross, in his discussion of the religious revivals of western New York which was called "The Burned-Over District" points out the special quality of the area with reference to its settlers:

> At the (lowest) end of the prosperity scale was the part of the southern tier between the Canisteo Valley and the Lake Erie watershed. This sector had been pioneered as lately as 1825 and advanced only slightly in the quarter century. Except for the relatively narrow upper Genesee and Allegheny valleys, it contained the poorest land in western New York, and was in addition virtually isolated. It was the only part of the Burned-over District which can fairly be called frontier after 1825. It likewise exhibited the most complete indifference to the religious and social excitement of the time (1950:70).

Although settlements in the immediate area around the reservation were late, a little further west and south settlements developed earlier, and particularly as the river

flowed south, they provided the markets which the Senecas needed for the sale of their goods and the purchase of their essentials. Meadville was first settled in 1788 and General Mead wrote that "we had kept up a friendly intercourse with the Senecas on the Allegany River" (Reynolds op.cit.:32), so friendly, in fact, that the settlement was counting on Cornplanter's Indians to warn them of attack by hostile Indians during those troubled years. South of the state line there were no permanent settlements in Warren County until 1796-97 (Scheck op.cit.:131), which had a population of 8000 by 1815 (Horsman 1970a:153).

We know, from the Quaker letters, that settlers arrived in the immediate area of the reservation earlier than land company records would indicate, and that these settlers were disapproved of by the Quakers on the whole. Several factors would account for the lack of records of these early whites. Insofar as the land along the river was the best around, early settlers frequently settled on Indian land itself, either leasing from the Indians or just squatting. The problem of squatters finally became a pressing one for the Indians who legally could demand that the local sheriff remove them, and a little farce was frequently carried out whereby squatters would be removed to the boundaries of the reservation only to reoccupy their homes an hour or two later. But this was a development of the next two decades and posed no early problem for the Indians. Then, too, as Everts points out concerning the development of Carrolton, a story repeated

throughout the area, "The early settlers of the town were led hither by the lumber interests, and came and went as their business required. They did not come to open farms or yet to build mills, but simply to cut down the finest trees for saw-logs, which were floated away to be manufactured" (op.cit.:399). Lumbering was the first and primary activity of whites in the area, providing, I would suggest, a market for Indian agricultural products, but also a model of a much more efficient way of acquiring cash, a point which I will develop in detail later.

The character of the early settlers, or semi-settlers has frequently been pejoratively described, although Horsman has recently challenged the image of early settlers as unusually violent and brutal (op.cit.:127). By missionary standards they were a bad lot, unstable, hard drinking and generally undesirable. In their defense, however, we may note that Hedrick remarks that "drinking was a universal custom of the whole country...down to the middle of the nineteenth century" (1933:224) and that there were probably more breweries and distilleries than there were gristmills in New York until a decade or two after 1800. The problems of transportation were crucial here, because even though liquor prices were low, it was much less costly to send a crop of grain to market in the form of whiskey than it was to transport grain itself where transportation was difficult and costly (ibid.: 158). It does seem likely that the activities around the

lumber camps and among rafting crews would have encouraged a level of hard drinking and violence greater than in the agricultural communities.

New Englanders from the depleted farms of the hill countries dominated the migration to western New York until about 1845 with an influx of Europeans joining them after 1825 (Cross op.cit.:4). An analysis of the origins of settlers to the towns in Cattaraugus County before 1825 shows that most came from the states of Vermont, Massachusetts and Connecticut. About an equal number, however, came to this area from eastern New York and probably represented that continuous movement pattern of settlement making, the selling out and moving on, so common to frontier areas which produced in effect a class of "professional settlers." Everts notes that a majority of the settlers of Portville came in from the next county east, to which they had originally come in a single generation from eastern New York and New England. The low prices of land were undoubtedly an attraction to come, but the inability to acquire enough cash to meet even the lenient terms of sale was a reason to move on.

Towns were frequently settled by groups of former neighbors or by extended families, thus providing a minimal social organization needed to accomplish cooperative tasks. "Bees" were frequent to raise buildings, husk corn, dry apples and accomplish farm tasks which needed the labor of many and which had to be cooperatively provided in the absence of both money and availability of hired laborers. It is worth

remarking that the Senecas had an on-going organization to accomplish these communal activities which settlers had to improvise to meet their needs, and which Quaker social restructuring endangered.

The kinds of agricultural practices which the Quakers condemned among the Indians were duplicated by white settlers, almost exactly and deplored, in turn, by European visitors. With respect to cattle, no attention was paid to selective breeding and farmers would sell off to roving drovers the best of their herds. Pasturage was inadequate, cattle ranged for their own food in the forest and they generally went untended without winter protection (Gates 1968:200). "English farmers, visiting the country, thought the want of grass to be the greatest handicap and privation of the American farm" writes Hedrick. "No root crops were grown for the sustenance of livestock" (op.cit.:69).

Although there was cattle, their manure was not used as fertilizer and no land enrichment was employed. Gates remarks that "in 1815, American farm practices were indeed primitive and destructive although generally rewarding to the first generation who used the land" (op.cit.:3). In a country where land was abundant and relatively cheap, but labor was scarce and very expensive, labor intensive practices were impossible and land abuse the rule.

Although wheat was grown in most of New York and proved the cash crop that paid off the land, this was, for reasons previously described, not really possible in the southern tier

and the farmers had to depend on corn, which Gates points out was a universally grown crop for home consumption even where wheat was grown (ibid.:169). It is interesting to realize that the Indian technique of corn cultivation was that most commonly employed by white farmers according to Hedrick who claims that "long after the Civil War most of the corn planted in New York and the northeast was dropped by hand and covered with a hoe" (op.cit.:295).

During the historical period which is the focus of this paper, the activities of white settlers in the area centered on lumbering. The products of such minimal attempts at farming as there were lacked facilities to transport them to market, but the presence of emigrants and lumber camps provided small local markets for the sale of corn, oats and buckwheat, which were feasible crops for local cultivation. As an agricultural area, the southern tier never amounted to much, but with the coming of the railroads in the 1850's and the better access to markets which this offered, the emphasis on dairying increased and with sufficient acreage to support a large grazing herd, commercial dairy farming became a viable activity.

The implications of the activities of settlers for the Seneca community, which will be developed in another chapter, may be briefly noted here. The Senecas had reserved the best land in the area both from an agricultural and from a lumbering point of view. The utilization of this land brought them into contact with the settlers on a variety of levels, as

landlords, as dealers in products and standing timber, as employees in the lumber business. The whites with whom the Indians dealt behaved in ways directly contrary to what the Quakers were suggesting as appropriate behavior for the Indians; their agricultural techniques were no better than the Senecas, and in general probably much less productive. The focus was not on agriculture, but on lumber, and it brought a profit to the whites which agriculture without markets could not do. But the Quakers continued to insist that it was agriculture, not lumbering which would preserve the Indians and transform them into a "civilized" society like the white men. The dynamics of this situation will be considered after we analyze the Quakers and their special role with relation to the Indians.

CHAPTER III

Friends Like These: The Quakers

Anthropologists cannot have helped but notice a growing hostility among American Indians towards the anthropological community and towards those studies that, they claim, have exploited the Indian while contributing nothing to his life. Whatever truth anthropologists may find in these accusations, the Indian proposal, usually facetiously advanced, that anthropologists turn to their own society for the subjects of study obviously has merit and is being implemented to a degree about which the Indian community seems largely uninformed. Be that as it may, a reexamination of Indians at any point in post-contact history must seriously include an examination of those white men who were the culture brokers of white society in its interaction with Indians in order to elucidate the interaction process and the consequences of that process. If we are to "discover the various frames of reference in terms of which Indians view themselves and the people with whom they are in contact," as Spicer (1969:3) suggests, we must understand the people with whom they were in contact. Such investigations not only add a new dimension to ethnohistorical studies, but could help Indians to understand some of the forces which have shaped the contemporary manifestation of what they experience as Indian culture.

With the notable exception of Berkhofer's study of missionaries and their American Indian contact groups (1965),

there has been no attempt to examine the Quakers as an important variable in the Quaker-Seneca interaction process; Quaker attitudes and motives have gone largely unexplored. Writers have favored the image of the Quakers as an unselfish group of benevolent do-gooders and have explained their success as deriving from the fortunate combination of providing those services which met Indian needs within the context of Christian charity, but without forcing Christian doctrine or practice. The Senecas, on the other hand, constantly suspected the motives of the Quakers and frequently requested written confirmations of a lack of Quaker intention to make future claims on Indian land or resources in payment for the favors they were extending. Unlike contemporary commentators, the Senecas could not believe that benevolence alone made the world go around.

Quaker benevolence does provide, however, a convenient concept by which to understand Quaker behavior, insofar as it became highly instrumental and institutionalized within the Quaker movement. Thus the etiology and function of benevolence itself offers a focus for study. This chapter will be devoted to an examination of the development and changes in Quakerism which led to the institutionalization of benevolence and its instrumentality, particularly as it applied to Indian affairs. Further, I will examine the characteristics of the mission that was established among the Allegany Senecas and the relationship to these Indians of both the field missionaries and the members of the Philadelphia Committee directing

affairs. A processual discussion of the interactive process of the Quakers and the Senecas within the context of the dynamics of a changing economic situation will be elaborated in the following chapter.

Quakerism arose in England in the seventeenth century, "in the trough of the Puritan's wave" (Ziff 1973:138), and Park remarks that "Puritans and Quakers were so much alike that we think at once of the old saying: there are no enemies so bitter as varients of the same species" (1954:73). Quakerism was one of the early radical offshoots of Puritanism and when George Fox began to preach in 1647, he drew his audiences from those who had not benefited by the Puritan rise to power under Cromwell. But, from an economic point of view, Quakerism shared with Puritanism the "suitability to the opportunities of a post-medieval world in which credit was the basis of trade, fellowship the basis of growth, and unremitting labor the basis of personal advancement" (Ziff op.cit.:303).

Although Quakers are associated with the principles of "quietism," which became characteristic of the movement in the eighteenth century, early Quakers were agressive and energetic. The followers of Fox were associated with the Radical movement in England and Quakerism developed rapidly in the period which began with Cromwell's rejection of the Radical movement until the rise of the Country Party at the end of the 1670's. It then suffered a decline with the defeat of the popular movement and the consequent political compromises of 1688 (Cole 1965:358). But its decline was

relative. It is estimated that by 1660, there were between thirty and forty thousand Quakers in England. By 1680, those figures had doubled, and Quakers came to more than equal all the Roman Catholic and other Protestant Dissenter groups combined (ibid.:372).

Not only had its number increased, but its socio-economic composition had changed during this time. The early appeal to the less economically successful rapidly broadened to include middle and upper class converts who began to join the movement by the 1660's. William Penn was converted in 1667 and "represents the reach of the movement into the upper classes at home" (Barker 1970:139). Although Penn suffered the disapproval of his family, his religious affiliation did not negate the upper class status which gave him access to the king and the court; he had sufficient influence to persuade Charles II to grant him land in America to found a colony. This may have been less a function of Penn's acceptability to the court, however, than it was for Charles "a unique opportunity to rid himself of some of his most troublesome subjects at a moment of political crisis" (Cole op.cit.:374). The boundaries of the new province of Pennsylvania were drawn in 1681, and, by 1682, Quaker emigration to America began in full force.

Quakers had emigrated to America before the founding of Pennsylvania, however. In Massachusetts, the stronghold of Puritanism in America, they were received with an intense lack

of enthusiasm and Ziff remarks that "the Massachusetts Puritans looked over their shoulder to see that a hideous Doppelganger was dogging their steps" (op.cit.:139). Kai Erikson suggests that the Quakers were spurred on to their wave of emigration to Massachusetts by the desire for martyrdom (1966: 125), a dramatic assertion which he supports by the fact that they continued to arrive in a steady stream between 1656 and 1661 when severe penalties were imposed on them and those who assisted them, and the emigration ceased in 1661 when Charles II, under pressure from English Quakers at home, ordered Massachusetts to discontinue using capital and corporal punishment in Quaker cases.

But whether persecuted as they were in Massachusetts, or accepted as in Rhode Island, Quakers came to American colonies during the seventeenth century and prospered there. Frederick Tolles, in his analysis of the merchants of colonial Philadelphia, documents that the earliest Quaker emigres from England were in low socio-economic position and were largely urban artisans (1948:40-42) with one-third of the total coming from London and Bristol (ibid.:31). Many of these artisans became master craftsmen and rose in both economic and social position, but the center of upper-class Philadelphia society was composed of a group of Quakers who arrived in Philadelphia as already established and prosperous merchants. These men had come to the American colonies in the seventeenth century and had established themselves in the West Indies (primarily Barbados and Jamaica), in New York, Maryland, New Jersey and

Boston. It was they who dominated the economic and social life of the early Pennsylvania colony (ibid.:42-44).

The province of Pennsylvania, as William Penn envisioned it, was to be the site of a "holy experiment" of a reconciliation of spiritual and material development. By the middle of the eighteenth century, when material concerns had apparently come to far outweigh spiritual ones, the Quakers reformed their movement and became an inward directed society advocating a separation from worldly interests and ostentation. This period of Quaker reformation corresponded to that of the Great Awakening throughout the colonies, a period of general religious reformation, as would the next Quaker reform movement, the Hicksite or Separatist Movement, correspond to the Second Great Awakening fifty years later. The process of reformation which began in 1756 with the withdrawal of the Quakers from active political life was completed by 1777 when preaching stressed plain living and plain speech, religiously guarded education, abstention from the use of alcoholic beverages and the manumission of slaves (ibid.:239).

But until 1756 the energetic pursuit of worldly activities had produced a Philadelphia society of rich Quaker merchants. Tolles writes:

> The strongest proof that this reputation for commercial sagacity and success was justified can be found in the Philadelphia tax list for 1769. Although at this period the Quakers probably constituted no more than one-seventh of Philadelphia's population, they accounted for more than half of those who paid taxes in excess of one hundred pounds. Even more

> striking is the fact that of the wealthiest seventeen persons in Philadelphia eight were Quakers in good standing and four were men who had been reared in the faith. Only five were non-Quakers, and one of these...owed the basis of his fortune to his Quaker grandfather (ibid.: 49).

The commercial attitudes and successes of the Quakers are here explicated not merely to establish their commitment to a Protestant work ethic which saw economic activity as a fulfillment of duty to God. This idological factor undoubtedly colored both their judgments of Indian economic activities and their recommendations for the restructuring of Indian society. But that these mercantile fortunes were built on the basis of a trade dependent in large part on the Indian fur trade suggests considerations apart from humanitarian ones which may have influenced Quakers to advocate policies to maintain peace at any price on the frontiers of the colonies. Hagan's observation supports this suggestion for he remarks that "the wealthy Quaker merchants of Philadelphia were not as ruthless as the Scotch-Irish on the frontier; however they were a far cry from George Fox and William Penn, as their behavior in the intense rivalry for the Indian trade indicated" (1961:16).

Quaker fortunes were built on trade and this trade depended on credit. The Quakers protected and maximized their reputation for scrupulous honesty to keep credit flowing. Further, the internationalism of their movement provided a network of commercial and communicative ties which enhanced

Quaker opportunity in the world trade market. The bulk of their export trade was based on the products of sub-tropical areas, particularly the West Indies, where Quakers had long been established. They exported to the West Indies and to Portugal and the Wine Islands mostly grain, flour, pork, beef, and wood products. From the West Indies they imported such exotic items as tar, pitch, turpentine, ginger, sugar, indigo, cocoa and rice. But it was the commerce in furs, Tolles explains, which became "increasingly important towards the middle of the century, (and) provided virtually the only major channel of direct commerce with Great Britain" (op.cit.:86). To Britain they exported furs and from Britain they brought in those textile items and hardware in which British industry specialized and for which Britain's overseas colonies provided a necessary outlet. Hardware and fabrics, such as buckram, linen, fustian, garlix and calico were then frequently sold to "back country traders" (ibid.:89), those men in direct contact with Indian fur suppliers. Further, these items were included as part of all gift exchanges which were an intrinsic part of treaty negotiations with the Indians (Jacobs 1950).

Wilbur Jacobs (ibid.) has extensively documented the political and economic importance of gift giving to the Indians, and particularly the competition between England and France to gain Indian support through the use of gifts. It is his contention that Pontiac's Rebellion in 1763 can be directly related

to England's new policy of economizing after the French and Indian War. He explains:

> The conquest of Canada in 1760 brought a parsimonious policy with regard to presents. The Indians, with no supplies, no munitions, and worst of all, no French finery for their women, sought a solution in rebellion. The conspiracy of Pontiac was, therefore, to a surprising degree, a direct result of the lack of presents after 1763 (ibid.:12).

Although the reference to French finery is probably a frivilous one, it is altogether proper to emphasize the dependency upon trade goods of the Indians which had been created by the competition between England and France in their struggle for empire in America, and to which I have already made reference in the previous chapter. While buying strategic Indian support with trade goods, they reduced Indian self-sufficiency, created tastes for luxuries which came to be necessities, and by thus doing, profoundly modified Indian societies. At the same time, Britain maintained and expanded markets for the products of a growing textile industry, which produced a much less expensive product than did the French and thus gave Britain a strategic advantage in being able to inexpensively provide this essential ingredient of the gift-trade. As the Indian appetite for such goods increased, so did the markets for these items expand, and a process of "civilizing" the Indians not only reduced their threat, but also made them good customers. In the center of the exchange of goods, which was part of every Indian-white transaction, was the Philadelphia merchant who "certainly must have profitted by the constant purchase of this merchandise. Thus it is not improbable that

these merchants actually encouraged the giving of large presents" (ibid.:100). From its inception, the policy of Pennsylvania was to deal with the Indians through peaceful means, to purchase rather than confiscate land, and to give generous presents. However enlightened and humanitarian these policies were, they also directly supported the prosperity of Philadelphia's leading citizens.

Pennsylvania was issued to William Penn as a propriety. As Parry explains, "the proprieties differed from the crown colonies in that in them the person of the proprietor was interposed between the crown and the colonists. The proprietor was both landlord of his territory and head of its government. He appointed the governor and higher officials, and they took an oath of loyalty to him, not to the king" (1961:137). This kind of grant, which had been common before the middle of the seventeenth century, became increasingly rare after that time, with Penn's being one of the last. "The growth of population in the colonies was making proprietary government an obvious anachronism, and the few proprieties which survived into the eighteenth century became bywords for corruption and incompetence" (ibid.:145).

It was just such changes as these which the Quakers leveled at the sons of William Penn, themselves no longer Quakers, who became the proprietors at their father's death, and who, the Quakers contended, violated his humanitarian policies towards the Indians. The infamous "Walking Purchase" of 1737, at which the Delawares were tricked into selling more land to

the Penns than they had any intention of doing, was seen as particularly aggravating the hostility of the Delaware to the white settlers and provoking border raiding. Further, as the Quaker John Parrish wrote:

> From 1733 to 1751...eighty-three hundred pounds ...had been expended out of the provincial stock, to defray the expenses of treaties designed to promote a good understanding with the Indians, thus paving the way for obtaining more of their land. This outlay, while burdensome to the people, materially enhanced the value of the proprietary estate, for by statute, Thomas and John Penn monopolized the right of purchasing land. These degenerate sons of the great founder of our Commonwealth, although reaping the largest benefits from treaties, persistently declined to bear an equitable share of their costs (1877:8) (Italics his).

Although the Quakers could hardly object to the expenses of the treaties insofar as they were the merchants from whom the goods were bought, they obviously objected to contributing to the fund for paying for this merchandise. It seems likely, too, that they objected to being excluded to access to the purchase of new lands. Whatever the issues, however, from the time of William Penn until 1756, the Quakers formed a Whiggish opposition to the proprietors.

From the inception of the province until 1756, when they withdrew from formal participation in provincial politics, the Quakers dominated the legislature and shaped its policy. In 1756, although constituting only one-fifth of the population, the Quakers held twenty-six of the thirty-six seats of the Pennsylvania Legislature. But Quaker pacifism in the face of increased Delaware raiding of the frontiers lost them popular support and, in the elections of 1756, Quakers

were returned to fill only seventeen seats. When, immediately after the election, the Governor and his Council announced their decision to engage in border warfare and to offer bounties for Indian scalps, six of the seventeen remaining Quaker legislators resigned.

Tolles summarizes the subsequent political activities of the Quakers during the colonial period in a concise way:

> A few Friends continued to serve in the legislature...but henceforth the Quakers were to make their influence felt chiefly through their activities as private individuals. As such they labored through the Friendly Association for Regaining and Preserving Peace with the Indians by Pacific Measures to bring an end to the war and to restore amicable relations with the Delawares...The Anglo-French imperial conflict, which had precipitated their withdrawal from political life, presently gave way to a struggle within the British Empire which was to culminate in American independence. Quaker merchants participated in the early non-violent phases of that struggle, but when it eventuated in a clash of arms, the pacifism took precedence over their Whiggism, and most of them adopted a position of neutrality which caused them to be generally regarded as Tories (op.cit.:28).

Although the Quakers withdrew from the Pennsylvania legislature, they did not withdraw from active intervention in governmental affairs and "benevolence" offered the instrument by which to effect the participation. At a meeting of Friends on July 20, 1756, they declared that it was necessary to raise and maintain a fund for privately negotiating with the Indians. Twelve hundred pounds was immediately subscribed (Parrish op.cit.:17) and applied to the purchase of gifts for treaty negotiations with the Delawares at Eaton, Pennsylvania. The Quakers declared themselves innocent of any intention to

interfere with the official negotiations, but the governor wrote that "he should treat them...as his Majesty's enemies, if they held any conference with the Indians on any matter relative to the government (ibid.:19). A year later, after a series of treaty negotiations which had been attended by Quakers bearing large gifts, William Denny, the governor, wrote to Israel Pemberton and others on the Indian committee:

> As you know I am desired and most strictly enjoined, not to suffer any particular body or society to concern themselves in treaties with Indians, or on any pretense to give presents to them, it is out of my power to permit your presents to be given. I shall once more repeat my advice: - You would do well to decline appearing at the ensuing treaty in a body, your attendance at treaties as a distinct society, having given great offense to the Ministry (ibid.:74).

The Quakers neither desisted attending nor ceased giving presents and advocating that the government give them. As the treasury of Pennsylvania was depleted, the government borrowed money from the Quakers (who demanded prompt repayment) to buy those gifts which the Quakers advocated. Wherever possible, Quaker gifts at negotiations were kept separate by them from those presented by the government. When the latter would not permit separate presentation, the Quakers insisted that their part be listed separately for the Indian's information. Under no circumstances did the Quakers allow their image as benefactors to be diminished or submerged. Although the generosity of their behavior and commitment to an ideology of pacifism cannot be denied, they were at the same time insuring their own continued access to the Indians and the markets which they

represented by maintaining a reputation which facilitated future contacts.

The first formal Quaker organization for treating with the Indians was the Friendly Association for Regaining and Preserving Peace with the Indians by Pacific Measures. It was established on November 2, 1956, as a private action group separate and unauthorized by the official Quaker organization. Parrish explains that:

> The Indian question had been brought up to the attention of the Yearly Meeting, by a few zealous Friends, but that body considered any interference with 'public affairs' as beyond its jurisdiction and declined action. This decision, although unexpected to the Friends who had undertaken to aid the government, in all measures calculated to promote peace with the natives, was not disheartening, and the meeting on the 2nd of Eleventh Month, was an endorsement of their labors (ibid.: 24).

Insofar as the Friendly Association was an action group organized to effect short range goals, it had a brief duration. Although its Minute Book ends in April, 1759, indirect evidence leads Parrish to conclude that it continued its operations "until the definitive treaty of 1764" (ibid.:18).

The functions of the Friendly Association were largely fund raising. In 1758, for example, a total of three thousand six hundred and eleven pounds was subscribed from Philadelphia and the surrounding communities (ibid.:99-105). The management of the Association was dominated by wealthy men and an aspiring trustee was required to contribute ten pounds. Even the privilege of voting for a trustee required a contribution of forty shillings (ibid.:46). Of the sixteen trustees on

the governing board, at least ten are mentioned by Tolles as belonging to the mercantile hierarchy of Philadelphia.

The period of the activities of the Friendly Association coincided with that of the reformation of Quaker society, with a rejection of the "holy experiment" and the decision to emphasize spiritual values and deemphasize material ones. As James V. Sydney explains:

> The moral reform, with its primary aim the restoration of distinctive traditional Quaker ways, was to bring solidarity against the seductive errors which political responsibility, social leadership, religious freedom, and wealth had nurtured (1963:325),

but

> The Society of Friends was torn between two views of its basic nature: a social entity with hereditary membership united in love of God and one another, and a group defined by agreement on religious principles and standards of conduct (ibid.:326).

Sydney suggests that humanitarianism, as a consciously chosen course of behavior, served to reconcile, although did not solve, some of the Quakers' basic ideological problems during the second half of the Eighteenth Century. Exclusivity of membership by birthright rather than conversion, was a fundamental tenet:

> Humanitarian ideals could support the inner strength of the church provided the benevolent activities which they inspired did not tend to introduce disruptive elements. Consequently, Friends began to use their Meetings to promote projects for the good of outsiders only after they came to believe that practical demonstrations of the love of mankind could be divorced from making new converts for the religious fellowships (ibid.:327).

Hence, we discover, it was not Quaker wisdom which led them to advocate civilization rather than conversion in Indian missionary work; it was Quaker exclusivity which so directed.

The rich Quaker merchants did not disappear after the period of religious consolidation. Some left the religious community, but most remained within it, but were no longer free to display through ostentatious luxury the wealth which they had. Benevolent contribution, therefore, became an acceptable and institutionalized substitute for luxury as a way in which to display wealth, through which to derive prestige and by which to remain influential both within the community and in the outside world. In effect, Quakers were trying another "holy experiment," this time with benevolence as a mediating device between spiritual and material success, and as a symbol of the evidence of successful mediation.

The period of the American Revolution created enormous problems for the Quakers. One small group, the Free Quakers, actively supported the Revolution, but most chose pacifism and thus incurred the animosity of the colonists. Whether their position was determined by pacific ideology, by an evaluation of the potential success of the colonial cause, by loyalty to Britain, or by a concern for the maintainence of their international trade networks cannot be determined here, but the repercussions of their choice required deliberate ameliorative steps after the war, and benevolence provided the means. Sydney says that:

> The public hostility and political harassment which they encountered between 1755 and 1783

> gave them a choice between withdrawing into an isolated world of their own, giving up their distinguishing 'testimonies,' or meeting the challenge by making their sect important to the rest of the nation. By following the third of these policies, they responded creatively to the most serious emergency in the history of American Quakerdom...Accepting the demand of Revolution patriots that they take a positive part in the new republic, the Quakers chose to act as a lobby for virtue and to some extent as a philantropic organization...By benevolent activities they found a way to win a place for themselves in American Society (op.cit.:33).

By assuming the task of civilizing the Indians as a private philantropic enterprise, they released the impoverished United States from financing a policy which it wished implemented. By such activities, and without compromising themselves on the issue of political participation, the Quakers were able to achieve not only public recognition and praise, but a certain degree of control of policy, and a direct line of communication with government. It has been remarked that the Quakers "never seemed to lack connections in London that could help make their wishes known to the government" (Craven 1968:277). Not only did the international character of the movement keep these lines open, but probably even more so, the internationalism of their trading connection, which brought rich men in touch with rich men and which facilitated the American Quakers' direct line of communication to the heart of the British government. When these channels no longer led to the agencies of policy making, it became necessary to establish other connections. The presence of the government of the United States in Philadelphia from 1790 to 1800 provided

easy access to officials, and benevolent concerns offered reasons for keeping communication ongoing.

Quakers were always in the forefront of movements to achieve peace with the Indians and continued these efforts after the Revolution was concluded. The ideological commitment was probably supplemented by practical considerations at this period again, for, as Davis writes:

> Philadelphia supported a great number of artisans who supplied many of the manufacturing needs of the region. Philadelphia merchants financed country stores in the back country of Pennsylvania, encouraging the growth of such subsidiary trading centres as Trenton, Wilmington, Charles Town and Elkton; and pushing on through Lancaster into Virginia, maintained trading connections with Pennsylvania migrants in the far west of Virginia and the Carolinas (1973:276).

With the elimination of British curtailment of inland migration, settlers advanced westward, meeting Indian resistance at every turn. Quaker traders and new markets for the products of Quaker artisans followed the advancing frontier and the economic viability of the Quaker community, upon which benevolent charity depended, required a free movement of trade goods which, in turn, required peaceful borders.

Late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Quakers were not only interested in trade, but also in land speculation and in the means by which American expansion was taking place. When Thomas Stewardson died, he left not only $61,000 in commercial papers, but also 26,000 acres of land which he owned in Western Pennsylvania (Doherty 1967:67-68) and when Indian committeeman William Allinson set out in 1809 to visit the

Seneca mission in southwestern New York, he was accompanied by Moses Brown, a Quaker, who was going for the purpose of investigating new lands for purchase (Allinson 1809:17). Doherty writes that "the nature of the holdings of Orthodox Friends also suggests a strong interest in the economic revolution going on in early nineteenth century America. Thomas Stewardson, Thomas P. Cope, and others were active in manufacturing and turnpike, canal and railroad construction (op.cit.: 68).

Although Henry Knox as Secretary of War for the United States and in charge of Indian Affairs, began to advance a policy of civilizing the Indians in order to pacify them as early as the summer of 1789 (Harder 1963:43), this had little effect on Indian-white relations. The Indians north of the Ohio River, aided by Iroquois allies, terrorized the frontier, and continued to do so until their defeat in 1794. In January 1795, when Timothy Pickering succeeded Knox, he renewed the policy of pacification through civilizing means and received immediate support from the Quakers.

The second committee specifically organized to handle Indian affairs was established on September 30, 1795 under the title of The Committee Appointed by the Yearly Meeting of Friends of Pennsylvania, New Jersey &c for Promoting the Improvement and graduate Civilization of the Indian Natives. Forty-three prominent Quakers, many of whom had been active in the Friendly Association, were appointed to the committee and directed to study and advise on "whether a fund might not

be fitly appropriated for the desirable purpose of promoting the Civilization and well being of the Indians" (Indian Committee Minutes, Book 3:267-275). This Committee recommended that a subscription to raise money for the purpose be initiated. Further, they recommended that their intentions be fully conveyed to the United States government and to be published throughout the community. As Deardorff and Snyderman have remarked, "these early Quakers fully understood the value and necessity of good public relations" (1956:586). A delegation from the Committee visited the President who approved their plan and directed that in the future they deal directly with Timothy Pickering. Pickering supported the Quaker's privately funded plan to accomplish what the government wanted but did not have the resources to effect, and he wrote on the Quakers' behalf to the Six Nations of Iroquois tribes on February 15, 1796, urging them to accede to the Quaker plan to teach white farming techniques, fence their land and raise livestock, and he indicated that the federal government supported and endorsed the Quaker plan. He further reassured them that the Quakers would ask for no payment from the Indians, neither in goods, lands, nor services (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 1:February 15, 1796).

To the Seneca interpreter, Joseph Parrish, Pickering addressed the following communique:

> The great object is not to teach peculiar doctrines but useful practices; to instruct the Indians in husbandry and the plain mechanical arts and manufactures directly connected with it. This is beginning at the right end and if so much can be

> accomplished, their further improvement will follow of course (ibid.: March 15, 1796).

Pickering's letter accompanied a circular letter sent by the Quakers to the Six Nations offering them assistance. Although the Quakers had received requests for assistance from the Allegany Seneca Chief Cornplanter as early as 1790 and 1791, and had been recommended to the Senecas as appropriate instructors by Washington in 1790, only the Oneidas responded to the circular letter.

The Oneidas were a likely group to seek assistance from a white agency of the American government. Their long missionary experience under Samuel Kirkland, who first came to Oneida in 1770, had both Christianized them and inclined them to be partial to the Americans during the Revolution (Graymont 1972: 36). Thus, Oneida, the first and only responding Iroquois group, became the site in June 1796 of the first Quaker effort at technical assistance and social restructuring. In fact, the mission seemed to have been a disappointment to the Quakers. They had expected rapid transformation in work attitudes and patterns, the elimination of alcoholic beverages and, particularly a responsiveness to the concept of "distinct property" (I.C.C. op.cit.: September 2, 1796). None of these expectations were met. Oneida, in fact, was not a good choice for the first Quaker trial. Their area in central New York was rapidly filling up with a white population eager to have Oneida land and the Oneidas were responding by leasing and selling land. The need and desire for immediate cash and the

distractions offered by surrounding white communities made the Oneidas a poor choice for an experiment in agrarian idealism. To further depress the Quakers, the Oneidas were suspicious of their motives and disinterested in what they were prepared to teach.

The Allegany Senecas were a better group to receive Quaker attention. Cornplanter, in his own moves to achieve power within the Six Nations, had frequently sought the assistance of whites in general and the Quakers in particular. The Quakers respected and got along well with Cornplanter. The isolation of the Allegany area and the by-passing of that area by white settlements was seen by Cornplanter as a problem which he sought to correct by the sale to Pennsylvania of the Erie Triangle. In his negotiations with the Governor of Pennsylvania, he stressed that he wanted the area settled by white farmers, traders and teachers (McAllister Collection: March 2, 1790). It seems likely that the distance to markets to sell furs and acquire trade goods was a major problem for the Allegany Senecas. This point will be developed in detail elsewhere, but it is important to note that this isolation made them an excellent experimental community, least subject, as the Quakers saw it, to the pernicious influence of white settlers. The decision to assist the Allegany Senecas was actively implemented with the arrival of a delegation on May 17, 1798 to establish a mission.

The background of the Quaker community's interest in

peace with the Indians and their motives for engaging in missionary work has been examined in some detail, and the establishment of the mission at Allegany serves as a convenient terminus for that direction of discussion. The continuation of support for the Committee and its activities were self-perpetuating. The initial financial investment and the ongoing expenditures of money encouraged a commitment to continue the activities of the mission even when they seemed to be producing few results. A constant theme of Quaker communication during the years of involvement in Indian work was that abandonment of the mission would mean an investment wasted, and an example of failure which would discourage further Quaker efforts to participate in projects of social manipulation.

Although I have stressed some of the underlying political and economic benefits which Quakers, particularly those serving administratively on the Indian Committee, might have derived from peace with the Indians, an ideological commitment to abstract principles of love, justice, equality and goodness certainly motivated individual Quakers to participate in humanitarian efforts. Doherty, who is interested in socio-economic explanations, admonishes us to remember the ideological factors:

> However much Orthodox Friends may have departed from some facets of Quaker traditon, they did not become irresponsible entrepreneurs. They put both their time and their wealth to good use. They were deeply committed to the idea of stewardship. All the wealthy Orthodox leaders willed some of their estates to benevolent purposes, and most

> of them were generous contributors to the public welfare before their deaths. They were active in civic affairs. Orthodox leaders saw themselves as able, intelligent men and felt it their duty to lead society - not just Quakers - along proper paths. Their sense of responsibility and duty was admirable in an age when these traits were all too often missing (op.cit.:69).

Ideological commitment rather than material advantage seems to have motivated those who served in the field missons, answering the call of their "inner light." The Quaker field missionaries were the "peace corps" of the early nineteenth century, bringing a variety of skills to their task and dedicated to social and material change for Indians in the direction of the dominant society, the basic values of which they endorsed. On the whole, they deemphasized spiritual restructuring, believing that:

> Though hidden to various degrees by superstition and formality, the universal Inner Light which gave a uniform morality to all who heeded it and which provided the valid essence of all faiths, enabled people outside as well as inside the Society of Friends to benefit from Quaker preaching; the right-hearted among any religious 'people' would recognize a divinely inspired message and could make use of it within the framework of their particular denomination (Sydney op.cit.:328).

Although the attitudes expressed by different Quaker missionaries demonstrates a wide variation around this theme, by and large this belief, coupled with the policy of a rejection of conversion to Quakerism, allowed the missionaries to focus on Indian society and not Indian spirit.

Undoubtedly a range of interests and motives impelled the various missionaries to volunteer to serve, but the kind of confessional writing which would clarify what these interests

and motives were is not available. We can guess that the novelty and the adventures which the experience offered must have played a part in attracting young people. Halliday Jackson's journal of the years of his residence from 1798 to 1800, which is written in an astonishing and laborious pseudo-Biblical style, suggests something of the mission he felt and indicates, as Wallace explains, "a certain romanticism in his attitudes, which a Quaker gentleman of the day could only express in the idiom of that Book which, unlike most of the contemporary literature, has always dealt with strong human emotions" (1952:120). We can only agree with Wallace that "Jackson certainly viewed his sojourn in the wilderness as a great adventure, implicitly comparing himself with the prophets of old who carried the word of the Lord amongst the heathen" (ibid.).

The prospective missionary had to be an acceptable Quaker (even though he may have been a "closet" romantic), and the process of selection insured community control of candidates. The candidate passed through the hierarchal structure of the Quaker religious society and his suitability for service was assessed at each step. A candidate's willingness to serve was indicated to his local meeting, the immediate community with which he was affiliated and within which he lived, which had to endorse or reject his candidacy. The application, if approved on the first level, was then sent to the Indian Committee which was associated with the higher organizational level of the Yearly Meeting. Approval from the local meeting

was tantamount to acceptance by the Indian Committee, although a subcommittee went through the motions of checking credentials before they passed on a candidate. There is no indication that candidates were ever rejected by the subcommittee, although applications were occasionally withdrawn. In fact, applicants were few and appeared usually only in response to requests from the Indian Committee to fill field mission vacancies. The process and phraseology of the application is examplified by that of Halliday Jackson who, on March 17, 1798 "presented a minute from the New Garden Monthly Meeting...by which it appeared he has felt his mind Religiously drawn toward some of the Indian tribes, with desire to spend some time amongst them to render them such aid as he may be capable of and with which the meeting freely united" (Snyderman 1957:568).

Resignation from service was directed by that same "inner light" that first impelled service. Visits home to conduct business, to marry, to see families, were made. The announcement of an intention to resign was usually made so as to give time for a replacement to be found and, on the whole, recruitment was a smooth operation.

Of the first group of three missionaries sent to the Allegany Senecas in 1798, only Henry Simmons was experienced in residence among the Indians, having spent September 1796 to October 1797 at the Oneida mission. The association of experienced with inexperienced missionaries formed a pattern for staffing the mission with a new recruit being in the

company of at least one other already resident missionary. This gave a continuity to the field mission which the frequent readjustment of personnel would otherwise not have had. From 1798 through 1822, and including those who served at the associated Cattaraugus mission, three missionaries served more than fifteen years each, one more than ten years, seven between five and ten years, and the remaining seven less than five years. In few cases was the period of service less than two years. In this last category were the two visiting blacksmiths who spent several months each at intervals doing work necessary for the mission itself in connection with the construction of its mills, and in providing services and instruction in smithing to interested Senecas. Periodic inspections, sometimes semi-annually, were made by representatives of the Indian Committee and thus a continuity of contact with the Indians was maintained on both a local and non-local level.

With a few exceptional times, the mission consisted of a core staff of three unrelated people, including at least two men. Volunteers never seemed to come from the same family. When women were included after 1805, one married couple frequently resided with one or more single missionaries of either sex. Unmarried women resided either with married couples and/or with single males, apparently without much comment. The missionaries lived together in a communally operated domicile, but there is little information about internal management except that women, when present, managed the household, men the farms and mills, and both sexes taught the Indians when

they were free from other duties to do so. As long as the missionaries were engaged in farming and mill management, two males, frequently assisted by hired labor, was the minimum number necessary for efficient maintenance of the establishment.

On the whole, at initial contact the missionaries were young adults, between twenty and thirty. The youngest independent (i.e. not accompanied by parents) missionary was Joseph Harlan, who was eighteen when he first arrived in 1811 to be a schoolteacher. Whether his youth contributed to his dissatisfactions we cannot tell, but his residence of less than two years was the shortest service recorded. The oldest volunteers were Robert and Elizabeth Clendenon who were prosperous farmers in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, and in their fifties, when they sold their farm and removed to the reservation (Wayman 1965:3-23). Accompanied by one of their several children, they served four unhappy years from 1812 to 1816, a period of turmoil for American society in general, for western New York in particular, and for the Clendenon's personally. Not only did they report themselves discouraged with the condition and progress of the Senecas, but also burdened with excessive work and responsibilities with which they could not cope.

Interaction between the missionaries was harmonious; at least the reports to the Indian Committee always so indicated. An exceptional period of negative tale-telling occurred during the Clendenon's stay, when the missionaries resident at Cattaraugus reported critically on the practices at Allegany

fostered by the Clendenons, particularly a renewal of tool lending and a non-distribution of raw materials (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2: May 10, 1812). The absence of data does not lend this atypical antagonism to systematic analysis, but it seems likely that a number of factors including the absence of an experienced missionary to train and encourage them, a lack of clarity of policy regarding proper allocation of time and materials, their age, and the burden of excessive work would have operated against the Clendenon's successful mission. Their isolation and lack of community ties may have been a factor in their distress.

Social interaction between the missionaries and the Seneca community appears to have been very limited. Because of the absence of institutionalized religious activity involving Quakers and Indians which would have provided regular and frequent occasions for interaction and for the conveying of white values within a context of religious sanctions, encounters between Indians and Quakers happened by chance or within specific goal delimited situations, such as the administration of services, the teaching of skills, and formal council meetings. Indians were actively discouraged from joining the Quakers in their religious exercises, and the Quakers evinced neither interest nor information about Indian religious ceremonies. Quaker reports do not indicate that they participated in the social life of the Indian community, nor that they were particularly informed about the details of that life.

No marriages occurred between Indians and Quakers and no suggestion of sexual liasons of any sort. The life of the mission had a continuity of activity above and apart from that of the Indians, and occasionally the missionaries had to be reminded by the Indian Committee that they were there to teach civilization to the Indians and not to run a successful commercial establishment.

The basic economic support for the mission came from the Indian Committee. In 1813 the balance sheet of their accounts shows their cash resources at $16,079.66 "nearly all of which is in Bonds & Notes, with Securities & bearing Interest" (I.C. Minutes: April 12, 1813). Regular contributions and bequests added to the fund. On the other hand, the regular activities of the missionaries provided the basic subsistence upon which they lived and the additional activities of grinding grain at the mill for a fee, and sawing and selling lumber became an ongoing source of revenue. In January, 1805, several months after the sawmill had been built, the Indian Committee gave their permission to ship boards to the Pittsburgh market, but cautioned the missionaries not to go into business and lose sight of the purpose of the mission (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2: January 7, 1805). In spite of the caution, the Quaker mills continued to produce boards for the Pittsburgh market, although the missionaries did not usually undertake the rafting of the lumber themselves, preferring to sell the boards directly to merchants at the mill. In 1807, they sold boards to a Cincinnati merchant for $7.50 per

thousand (ibid.: April 3, 1807), and in 1809 they reported having 50,000 feet of boards on hand of which they had sold only 12,500 at the mill, thus necessitating arrangements for further sales at Pittsburgh (ibid.: June 5, 1809). Quaker commercial milling activities continued until at least 1821. As far as the Indians were concerned, these milling activities immediately produced a lack of clarity about Quaker motives and intentions towards the Senecas, and became a growing source of Indian discontent. An account of this period of tension will follow in the next chapter. The mills were obviously profitable and, although not encouraged by the Indian Committee to do so, it seems apparent that the young missionaries were self-motivated to the commercial success and business acumen that was intrinsic to Quaker life.

The missionaries, on the whole, came prepared with skills appropriate to their undertaking. Most came from, and returned to, farming areas around Philadelphia, i.e. Chester County, Lancaster County, and Bucks County. Doherty says of this area that "between 1800 and 1830, southeastern Pennsylvania went through an agricultural revolution. Long and wasteful use of the soil had exhausted it, but now its fertility was restored through the use of fertilizers and crop rotation" (op.cit.:54). The missionaries came from and were trained in these areas in which the most progressive agricultural techniques were being employed, in contrast to the local white settlers from New England who had abandoned their depleted farms. On the whole, the missionaries were able to perform and teach those

skills necessary to an agrarian society, and their own information and skills were supplemented by visiting specialists prepared to teach other skills such as blacksmithing.

Because the Quakers chose not to teach religion except as a generalized set of values informally conveyed, they did not have the threat of supernatural sanctions to reinforce their teachings. Although they could suggest that certain behavior, such as brittle marriage and gambling were displeasing to the Great Spirit, it was very unusual that the Great Spirit gave evidence of his displeasure in a way meaningful to the Indians. An exceptional case occurred in 1814, when Nicholas Silverheels, who had been actively selling liquor, became convinced on his deathbed that he was being punished for this activity. His declarations to this effect were reported as having had a profound effect on the Seneca community, and the sale of liquor fell off (I.C.C. op.cit.: March 8, 1814).

On the other hand, the Quakers had a threat more serious than supernatural sanctions to stimulate Indian efforts to comply with their direction; they could always withdraw from active assistance to the Seneca community. The veiled threat of such withdrawal was always presented and, when aired at appropriate moments, it provoked the desired response from the Senecas; the promise to try to conform with Quaker demands, declarations of impotence and helplessness without Quaker assistance. To appreciate the implications of the threat, it is necessary to understand what the Seneca needs and

expectations were in relation to the Quakers and how these changed relative to a changing environment.

CHAPTER IV

Senecas and Quakers And The Sequential Economic Strategies of The Allegany Senecas

"Agriculture was instituted by the Almighty, Genesis, 2:8 and 15: 'And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And the Lord God took the man and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it.' Thus Adam at once became a husbandman, and reared a family of farmers. Genesis, 4:2; 'And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground.' We also learn that Jabal, son of Cain, 'Was father for such as dwell in tents, and of such as have cattle.' Thus agriculture was the first calling of the human race and divinely established. Hence it is inferior in dignity and importance to no other, and is the basis of all pursuits."
(Adams 1893:76-77)

No one tells us what Eve was doing in the Garden, but if she was doing what eighteenth century Quakers thought she should be doing, she was making soap, knitting and diligently sweeping the sod. For it was the "unnatural" division of labor and the social consequences of that division that the Quakers bent their every effort toward restructuring. Ultimately the final test of the success of the Quaker program to move the Senecas from "barbarism" to "civilization" would have been acceptance by the Indians of the concept of private property, with an associated pattern of male agriculture, and finally assimilation into the culture and structure of white American life. Although the concept of private property and the division of labor are intricately related, for convenience of exposition we will first consider the economic strategies of the Senecas and will postpone to a final chapter a consideration

of the pressures on the Senecas to divide the land and accept the concept of private property, thereby completing the process of "civilization."

In 1961 George Heron, who was then the President of the Seneca Nation offered the following comment in an interview with the anthropologist, Stanley Diamond:

> If a man really decided he wanted to be a farmer, there's no doubt he has always had the land here to accomplish this end. But maybe you might say, he just has no inclination to farm anymore. There was a, not commercial...he's always had the inclination to farm for his own needs, he might raise enough corn, potatoes, beans and other commestibles to see his family through the winter, there's no doubt about that type of farming; but to actually go into commercial farming as a livelihood, I'd say he has never done this (Tape VI, transcription p. 8, 1961).

I would also say that he had never done this, and that the assertion that the Senecas became "a nation of farmers" through Quaker efforts aided by Indian vision is contrary to the evidence contained in those Quaker accounts which, while asserting great success in their mission, give us the data for understanding the seemingly inexplicable ups and downs of Seneca acceptance of the Quaker program of socio-economic development.

While I have gone to some lengths to explicate motives for Quaker interest in Indian activities apart from the customarily offered explanation of an ideological commitment to "good works," I do not believe that a convincing case can be made for Quaker material interests being enhanced by the

conversion of Seneca males to agriculture (that larger federal interests were so served, is, perhaps, a separate issue). On the contrary, if the Quakers had encouraged the Indians to hunt and had then acted as a market for the skins they would probably have had a better economic enterprise going. But, unlike other colonial programs for socio-economic development which have waiting markets for the utilization of the production of native workers, the Quakers had no clear markets in mind for the sale of the products resulting from the more intensive farming methods that they advocated. Without such a system of distribution to supply the cash needed by the community to purchase items essential to them that they could not themselves manufacture, attempts to divert a male population from cash deriving activities to non-cash deriving activities were doomed to failure, unless the Quakers provided those items directly without cash as an intervening variable. Seneca behavior, I would suggest, can be understood against a background of Quaker willingness or unwillingness to supply goods and services which otherwise had to be purchased, and against a changing economic situation in the local area, conditioned by white economic activities. The general picture which emerges is that of the Senecas as a highly flexible and adaptable community, influenced by cultural preferences but not tied by them, continually attempting to maximize their situation in the direction of a viable economy.

To say that there were "no" markets for the sale of various products is somewhat to distort the picture. Distant markets

existed particularly at Pittsburgh for furs and lumber, but not for agricultural products which were supplied by local farmers in the Pittsburgh area (Kaufman 1964:446). The use of the Pittsburgh market, in fact, perpetuated those conditions such as male mobility and alcohol use, against which the Quakers and Handsome Lake both inveighed.

During the first fifteen years or so of the nineteenth century, minor local markets for the sale of Indian agricultural products did exist in the person of emigrants and the earliest settlers. But the white settlers who took up farming had the same shipping problems as did the Indians and became both competitors for the local market and less dependent themselves on Indian produce.

On the whole, for the first fifteen years of the Seneca-Quaker contact period and as long as women continued to supply the basic subsistence through traditional agriculture, nothing the Indians did could really be immediately economically unsound. They could follow Quaker advice, raise crops and cattle and sell any surplus with relative ease; they could follow traditional patterns of hunting and fur sale and turn a profit on that; they could cut and raft timber and make out well. Generally, they could do all of these at one time, opting for one direction over the other when market conditions warranted, and by selectively avoiding an overcommitment in the direction of Quaker social restructuring, they could keep their options open. Like the Quakers, land company developers, such as Joseph Ellicott and William Cooper envisioned developing complete

communities and understood the necessity of supplying settlers with facilities such as sawmills, gristmills and roads, without which a community could not survive. Cooper, in particular, pointed out that specialization was necessary and that a settler must choose either to become a tradesman or a farmer; he could not successfully function as both simultaneously (1810:17). It was inefficient for an individual to undertake the multiplicity of tasks needed for successful living. The Quakers were structuring a non-efficient community, not on a white model, but on a utopian one, and unless they themselves planned to act as the tradesmen for the agricultural community they envisioned, it is difficult to see how they expected the Indian community to succeed.

At the same time that one feels a need to explore Quaker motives in offering aid to the Indians, so does one feel a need to understand the Senecas' acceptance of such aid and their appraisal of the situation in which the aid was offered in more complicated terms than just their "desperation." For, as Berkhofer has indicated (1965a), manifest coercion was lacking in the situation. The Allegany Senecas had to request assistance from the Quakers initially, and the only sanction the Quakers had was the threat of withdrawal. Thus it is necessary to explore what the Quakers were offering, what the Senecas thought they were offering, and the changing patterns of interaction as new events provided additional "information" to the interactional process. The Quakers came bearing a range of both overt and covert gifts and the Senecas differentially

selected what they wanted within their own cognitive and environmental context. The course of these moves, the tensions they created, and the moves to relieve the tensions are so intricately tied to the economic continuum of Seneca life that it seems most convenient to consider these factors together, chronologically following the course of the interaction to see the dynamic process at work.

Because I am proposing an explanation of Seneca behavior which favors regarding them as rational actors, it is appropriate to briefly consider an alternative explanation of this same behavior that has been much favored in the past. The Quakers called it their "habits of mind," and anthropologists like William Fenton (1963) and Morris Freilich (1958) call it "cultural persistance;" but whatever it is called, the argument is advanced that resistance to Quaker teachings and advice stemmed from the hold that previous behavioral patterns exercised on the population, a resistance to change and a selective preference for new activities which would conform in structure and in "motor habits" (Fenton 1971:137) with traditional activities. Morris Freilich (op.cit.:473-83) has argued that contemporary Caughnawaga Mohawk males engage in high steel construction because such an activity with its excitements and dangers, the geographical mobility which it offers, and the possibility of frequent absences from the home community, structurally resembles the older warrior patterns through which men acquired prestige; that is, in effect, a replacement of that older activity with a structurally comparable newer one

because it offers similar psychological compensations.

Although it would be foolish to propose that culture does not influence behavior, the Seneca evidence time and time again demonstrates flexibility and receptivity to new ideas, techniques and behavior which would belie the hypothesis that the Senecas were bound within the tight constraints of a previous culture model. It was almost axiomatic among whites that Indians would not work for wages, but in 1810 many young men became wage laborers and wage labor activity became the primary source of employment in the nineteenth century, not in the spectacular short term contract employment of high steel work which developed only in the twentieth century, but in the steady employment offered by the railroad and growing local industries. Although women mocked men who took up the hoe, they themselves took with enthusiasm to the new skills, which involved novel motor habits, such as spinning, knitting and weaving, taught by the Quakers. Insofar as culture conditioned their cognitive context, the Senecas must have preferred activities which were familiar in that context, but because of the lack of flexibility which the culture model offers to account for change and for novel choices, we must reject it as sufficient explanation, and consider the influence of culture as one of many variables to explain behavior.

In his psychological study of contemporary Tuscaroras, Wallace has described their symbolic division of the world into that "of the clearing" (the women's world; the reservation) and that "of the forest" (the men's world; the outside) (1952:26-27).

He later amplified on this dichotomy by explaining:

> It is not an exaggeration to say that the full time business of an Iroquois man was travel, in order to hunt, trade, fight and talk in council. But the women stayed at home. Thus, an Iroquois village might be regarded as a collection of strings, hundreds of years old, of successive generations of women, always domiciled in their longhouses near their cornfields in a clearing, while their sons and husbands travelled in the forest on supportive errands of hunting and trapping, of trade, of war, and of diplomacy (1969:28).

Although this pattern varied at different periods in history, most inflexible probably during the period of the fur wars and less so during extended periods of peace, the pattern of sedentary females and mobile males was generally but not invariably, the case. The Seneca division of labor, then, arises directly from this circumstance, with women producing those items fixed in the ground and men exploiting the extensively and randomly distributed resources. Both men and women had an annual cycle of activities which inhibited their ability to take on new ones unless they gave up the old ones. Women's activities were tied to the seasonal responsibilities of planting, cultivating and harvesting, which they did not give up, but instead used the winter, a season of low female labor investment, to learn and practice new skills, which they temporarily abandoned when their agricultural duties were pressing.

Men's work, too, was seasonally conditioned, with the highest labor investment coinciding with women's period of least labor, i.e. the winter, when the fur of animals is at its thickest and the pelts most desirable. Hunting for meat was

a year round endeavor by men, but intensive hunting was to procure skins for sale and not meat for food, and this activity, according to the Quaker accounts, lasted from November until late winter, with a temporary return in mid-January to participate in the mid-winter (New Year) ceremonies. The skins were sold in the Pittsburgh market in April, at which time the hunting parties returned upriver in canoes laden with their purchases, which frequently included liquor.

Because winter was not a period during which women were intensively employed, they often accompanied men to their hunting camps, and not infrequently these hunting trips were family affairs. William Allinson reported in 1809 that this was still the case and women and children accompanied the hunters and lived in temporary cabins (1809:56-57). This participation by women, although not essential was evidently helpful, as they were able not only to perform domestic chores within the hunting camp, but to prepare the skins while the men were acquiring them. Although the literature contains many references to the possibility of "temporary wives" accompanying men during the long months away, during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century the references are specifically to families in the Quaker sense of the word engaged in the activity. It seems likely that very young children were not included, although older children were frequently absent from school because of their participation or attendance in the hunting camps.

Other seasonal activities removed whole families, and indeed frequently the bulk of the community, from the home

village. In the late winter, when the nights were cold but the days sunny, the sap begins to run in the sugar maple, and families withdrew to the "sugar bush" where a temporary camp would be made, the sap tapped, and syrup and maple sugar prepared. Here, too, children were included and again the school, if it was operating at all, was vacated. The same total community participation was evident during the yearly pigeon hunt, and the birds were preserved for future use as well as consumed on the spot.

Because the Quakers defended their programs by repeated references to the uneven and inequitable distribution of labor which placed an excessive demand on Indian women while men indulged themselves in little more than amusement, it seems appropriate to mention several assessments of the equality of effort under the old system. John Heckewelder, a Moravian missionary writing in 1817 of his own observations of an earlier period, remarks:

> There are many persons who believe, from the labour that they see the Indian women perform, that they are in a manner treated as slaves. These labours, indeed, are hard, compared with the tasks that are imposed upon females in civilised society; but they are no more than their fair share, under every consideration and due allowance, of the hardships attendant on savage life. Therefore they are not only voluntarily, but cheerfully submitted to; and as women are not obliged to live with their husbands any longer than suits their pleasure or convenience, it cannot be supposed that they would submit to be loaded with unjust or unequal burdens (1879:155).

Mary Jemison, who performed them, denied that the tasks of Indian women were even hard when compared to white women.

She writes:

> Our labor was not severe, and that of one year was exactly similar in almost every respect to that of others, without that endless variety that is to be observed in the common labor of white people. Nothwithstanding the Indian women have all the fuel and bread to procure, and the cooking to perform, their task is probably not harder than that of white women who have those articles provided for them; and their cares certainly not half as numerous, nor as great. In the summer season we planted, tended and harvested our corn, and generally had our children with us; but had no masters to oversee or drive us, so that we could work as leisurely as we pleased (1824:55).

Judith Brown has compared Iroquois and Bemba society to evaluate the economic role and related status of women, which authorities agree was high among the Iroquois and relatively low among the Bemba, although both were matrilineal societies in which women engaged in agricultural activity. Insofar as Brown has surveyed the literature extensively, it is not necessary to repeat that survey here. Rather, let me quote Brown's summary as it relates to the question of the economic role of Iroquois women. It is extremely relevant to this discussion, insofar as I maintain that women were not reluctant to accept Quaker innovative activities but were reluctant to give up the older agricultural activities and the opportunities for social interaction with other women from which they derived prestige, real power and control within the society and over their own lives. Brown writes:

> ...Iroquois women controlled the factors of agricultural production, for they had rights in the land which they cultivated and in the implements and the seeds. Iroquois agricultural activities, which yielded bountiful harvests, were highly organized under elected female leadership...

> Iroquois women maintained the right to distribute and to dispense all food, even that procured by the men. This was especially significant as stored food, constituted one of the major forms of wealth for the tribe. Through their control of the economic organization of the tribe, Iroquois matrons were able to make available or to withhold food for meetings of the Council and for war parties, for the observance of religious festivals and for the daily meals of the household. These economic realities were institutionalized in the matrons' power to nominate Council Elders and to influence Council decisions. They had a voice in the conduct of war and the establishment of treaties. They elected "keepers of the faith" and served in that capacity. They controlled life in the long-house.
>
> The unusual role of Iroquois women in politics, religion and domestic life cannot be dismissed simply as a historical curiosity. It cannot be explained by Iroquois social structure, nor can it be attributed to the size of their contribution to the Iroquois economy. The high status of Iroquois women was the result of their control of the economic organization of their tribe (1970:164).

The agricultural activities of Iroquois men were culturally deemphasized, but they did in fact contribute substantially to agriculture through field clearing activities, for, as Parker tells us, "the work of girdling the trees and of burning the underbrush was that of the men" (1912:21). The accounts already cited of the formidable task that such clearing presented to the early settlers are sufficient to demonstrate the real contribution that this offered to the subsistence economy. At the same time we should note that the reports about numbers of acres cleared by men which the Quakers cited to substantiate their claims of transforming the division of labor among the Senecas does not represent a change of pattern at all, but a continuation of the traditional agricultural system.

Land clearing resulted, naturally, in the felling of great numbers of trees, in the past left to rot or burned along with the burning of the underbrush, thus contributing to land enrichment; or, under Quaker aegis, utilized by the men as split rail for fencing or for house building, and then, at a later period, sold for cash. Cornplanter had a sawmill available for the conversion of logs into boards as early as 1795, and the Quaker mill was built and in operation for the same purpose by the end of 1804. In 1807, after a period of hostility between the Senecas and the Quakers during which tension over the mill figured large, the Indians had their own mill. From 1798 on, the Quakers reported men energetically clearing land, splitting rails and building houses from April and through the summer months. But we must again note that this kind of activity in no way implies the substitution by men for women's agricultural activities, nor any transformation of the annual productive cycle for either sex, nor, in fact, not necessarily any change at all made by the Quakers. The men were doing it when the Quakers arrived and probably would have been doing it whether the Quakers arrived or not because this was men's work. Except in times of war, summer months found men close to home, engaged in local hunting and fishing for immediate consumption. Councils, frequently held in the fall, removed the men from the local community, and winter hunting to sell skins kept them away during most of the winter season. Thus, the Quaker missionaries invited the visiting Committee to come in the spring as "the Indians are more generally at

Home at that Season of the Year" (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2: December 17, 1805). The insistence by Handsome Lake that the community remain in a village pattern during the winter months, although free to disperse during the summer, may be precisely related to this annual male cycle, rather than to the ceremonial cycle to which it has always been linked. With men absent during the winter months, the scattering of women on widely separated homesteads seems an inefficient, potentially dangerous, and downright lonely pattern.

On May 17, 1798, a party of five Quakers arrived to establish a mission, in response to Cornplanter's request, presumably as the representative of his community, to do so. The two older men, Joshua Sharpless and John Pierce, were there to supervise the initial operation and to give authority to the project; the three younger, Henry Simmons, Halliday Jackson and Joel Swayne, to remain to instruct the Senecas. The community into which they came, Deardorff remarks was a "peculiar" one (1951:81), but its peculiarity was not in its organization but in the fact that it was located on Cornplanter's private land, held by him in fee simple after its donation and survey by Pennsylvania in July, 1795. Two other communities were also in existence locally, one in the area of contemporary Salamanca and a very small one with a remnant population of three or four families located nine miles above the Cornplanter settlement. This remnant village had been the site of the largest settlement but apparently the uncertainties about the disposition of the reservation boundaries made advisable the clustering

of the population on land to which the title was clear and the boundaries established and so, in 1798, the majority of the Allegany Senecas were temporarily and recently relocated on Cornplanter's land.

The community was, however, a completely viable one. A population of about four hundred people were living in an irregularly laid out village of from thirty to forty log and bark houses, and a rough calculation would indicate that these housed multiple families, perhaps, but not clearly, following a matrilocal arrangement, but probably with a great deal of variation. Wallace remarks that "it is difficult now to establish the rules governing residence. Cornplanter's town had been the home of Cornplanter's wife, and in this very loose sense he was living matrilocally, but the composition of his own household suggests that a combination of matrilineal and affinal kinship ties, health, and economic and political power determined the actual choice of residence" (1970:188). But indeed, this is what we expect residential groupings to reflect if we agree with Murdock that "the one aspect of social structure that is peculiarly vulnerable to external influences is the rule of residence" (1949:201) and that "it is in respect to residence that changes in economy, technology, property, government, or religion first alter the structural relationships of related individuals to one another" (ibid.:202). With the diminution of the opportunities for external warfare removing men from the community (cf. Ember and Ember 1971), the need for the organization which a strict matrilocal arrangement gave became

unnecessary and, although men's work required less cooperative organization than women's, the possibility of, minimally, flexible, if not absolute residential organization around men, becomes likely. The osteological investigations of skeletons from burials dated between 1850 and 1930 in the area, suggests to Lane and Sublett (1972) that residence had by that time become patri-virilocal, although anecdotal accounts of post-marital residential behavior of the period indicates a great diversity of possibility.

William Allinson, who visited the settlement in 1809 as part of a regular inspection team, presents a very detailed ethnography of the Allegany Senecas, including a description of the marriage and residential practices of the time, which reflects a preferred pattern of virilocality within an apparently endogamous community. Allinson reports that marriages were arranged by the mothers or eldest sisters of the couple on the basis of the young man's stated choice. A gift of trinkets worth approximately $6.00 to $10.00 was presented by the man and returned if his proposal was not accepted. If it was accepted, the mother of the girl then accompanied her to the house of the man (but he was almost certainly living within some family context) where she was left, but "as the Seasons for planting, hoeing, gathering corn, procuring Fire wood and other business came on, the female connections of the young woman assist her in the different operations during the first year at the end of which without any ceremony the marriage is considered valid & honorable" (1809:55-56). The

activities described, particularly wood gathering, were ongoing throughout the year and indicate the close presence of the girl's family, hence village endogamy. The very frequent incidence of brittle marriages and serial monogamy that Allinson elsewhere describes would further support a pattern of either matrilocality alone or virilocality with village endogamy. We are not told what happened in the case of village exogamy, but the necessary support which a girl required from her family during that first year which seems to have ritual force as well as a practical base would suggest that the girl would have to remain near her own group and virilocality would not operate. The mobility of men frequently brought them into other villages for extended periods of time during which they often contracted marriages.

With endogamy the general rule within a village and with a pattern of house locations of a close settlement type, specific residence rules have little significance for work group organization; related women could as well work together in one field even if they didn't share one roof. The inhabitants of Cornplanter's house do, however, even reflect a pattern of related women living together; the two-family house included Cornplanter, his wife and five daughters with their husbands and children, and their one retarded son in one section; and in the other half, Handsome Lake, his two daughters and their husbands and children. Although Cornplanter and Handsome Lake, half-brothers through their mother who was the sister of Guyasuta who had led the Allegany community before Cornplanter took his uncle's

place, were of the Wolf Clan, their daughters were not, under the matrilineal system; unless the children of both Cornplanter and Handsome Lake were of the same clan, the house did not represent a clan house in the way that older multiple family longhouses probably did, but a matrilocal (or uxorilocal) type of organization is evident. Cornplanter's two other sons, Charles and Henry, lived elsewhere in the community, as did Handsome Lake's son.

The town was not stockaded, but did have a fence built around it to keep animals out and perhaps to demark that symbolic boundary between "forest" and "clearing," though not in any sense to divide property or designate ownership. Some livestock - three horses, fourteen cattle, one yoke of oxen and twelve hogs - was privately owned, but whether kept inside or outside the enclosure is not reported. We shall discuss the ownership of livestock and its care shortly, but here may note simply that livestock, as a novel introduction to the Iroquois subsistence economy, became an area of men's activity.

An estimated sixty acres of the two to three hundred acre enclosure was under cultivation by the women. If we follow Fenton's estimate (1954b), based on discussions with contemporary Senecas, that thirty bushels of shelled corn could be raised on an acre of new ground and that ten bushels per person are necessary for a yearly sustenance, it is difficult to see how this cultivated acreage would sustain a population of four hundred people. On the other hand, regular use was made of the fertile islands in the Allegany and, insofar as privation

was not reported during the following winter, it seems likely that other fields were in production or else other sources of food were being used. Parker (op.cit.:34-36) emphasizes that the Iroquois always stored corn and other vegetables against emergencies and for trade and Brown has pointed out that control of this surplus by women was one of the important controls over economic resources that they exercised. Although the Cornplanter community was a new one, it is possible that a surplus from previous years was being utilized, evidenced by the presence of cornbread being eaten in May of 1798, or that the surpluses accumulated by the other communities up the river were being tapped. In any case, we do not know this. Halliday Jackson said that "it was said to be a time of scarcity among them" (1830:29), but May would be, particularly within a new community, before any but the early wild spring vegetables (such as wild onions and other greens) were available and when game is least abundant. Then, too, scarcity is not starvation; the Indians were reported to be eating two meals a day and Parker writes that "few of the eastern Indians had more than two regular meals each day, but this did not prevent any one from eating as many times and as much as he liked, for food was always ready in every house at all times" (ibid.:61). Furthermore, although the Quakers did not like the menu, the Indians with that hospitality that Morgan saw as a fundamental aspect of their social organization (1881), were willing to share with the Quakers. The Quakers noted that provisions were extremely expensive to procure and that, in fact, there

was no source of any supply nearer than Pittsburgh, from which they had arranged a shipment of goods in April before coming on to the community. Until the shipment arrived, and even after, they were dependent on the Indians and the Indians were willing and able to assist them.

One of the first, and then ongoing, areas of tension between the Senecas and Quakers arose over the issue of reciprocity which the Indians practiced, the Quakers promised, and from which they rapidly withdrew. Not only did they withdraw from it, but they bent every effort to discourage it among the Indians, for they recognized it for the leveller that it was and believed it ultimately destructive for any possibility of industrious private enterprise. Allinson's account suggests that by 1809 the Quakers may have been somewhat successful in their efforts for "formerly when a stranger or Distant Friend entered an Indian Habitation it was common to set before them such provisions as they had cooked in the House, which the guest partook of without ceremony except that of thanks but Friends have rather advised not to give their provision indiscriminately to Wandering or Idle Persons lest it should encourage indolence & be a source of oppression to the industrious & frugal - in this respect therefore there is some change" (op.cit.:74). Whether the Senecas, or any significant number of them, really followed the Quaker's advice is not clear, although in 1807 they pointed out to the Quakers that sharing food was the Indian custom which they would continue to follow although not demanding that the Quakers did so (I.C.C.

op.cit.: January 31, 1807).

The Quakers were initially received into the village "with an apparently hearty welcome, and treated with kindness" (op.cit.:Reel I, Box I, May 11, 1798). They were careful to specify always that they did not seek Indian land to own, but they asked for the use of acreage on the reservation on which to establish their residence and farm, and they were told that they might choose whatever they wished. After some examination, the Quakers decided to settle at the old Village (Genisinguhta), which had been all but deserted, nine miles up the river from the Cornplanter settlement. The advantage in this area was that extensive land had already been cleared, and the three or four families who lived there were "several of the most sober and respectable" (ibid.). Cornplanter extended total freedom of utilization to the Quakers, saying:

> I told you, brothers, the land was all before you, to choose where you please...he was then inquired of whether Friends might have liberty to cut timber in the woods for the use of the farm, to which he replied, 'I wish you would cut all the trees down, and I will give you another liberty, if you see a deer you may shoot him, and you may catch fish in the river' (Jackson op.cit.:31).

Whatever authority Cornplanter may have assumed to himself, the policy of action towards the Quakers was always decided in council, and replies to Quaker speeches and proposals were never given until some period of private consultation among the Indians could be had. Thus we may assume that there was general agreement on permitting the Quakers free access to the land and its resources. To further establish a reciprocal

exchange, the Quakers were loaned Indian tools and then presented by the women with the seeds of "corn, potatoes, beans, squashes, and a variety of other garden seeds which they presented as a present to Friends, observing 'that it was very hard to come so far and have nothing to begin with'" (ibid:32). The Quakers purchased a small house for $20.00 from the woman and her daughter who owned it. The Quakers promised that a boatload of goods was coming up the river with tools that the Indians might borrow, but the initial contact was all one sided and involved the Quakers as recipients and the Indians as the givers.

A reciprocal exchange was maintained throughout the summer. Halliday Jackson noted that "great numbers of them came flocking about Friends, especially the women, who appeared kind and respectful, frequently supplying them with venison, fish, strawberries, and such other delicacies, as their country afforded" (ibid.). We should note here that the inclusion of venison in the list of food gifts which the Quakers sorely needed before their own harvest was available, confirms the control that women had over not only their own products, but also over the meat procured by the men, to distribute as they saw fit. In exchange, the Quakers distributed "useful articles, such as needles, thread, scissors, combs, spectacles, etc., which were sent for that purpose, and were received by the natives with lively marks of gratitude" (ibid.:32-33).

By 1801 and then increasingly in 1802, the resident missionaries gave strong indications that they felt they had

become embroiled in a reciprocity arrangement which was a nuisance to them and, they maintained, a hinderance to Indian progress. At the point of initial contact on May 22, 1798, as part of the speech specifying the conditions under which the mission was to operate, the Quakers had declared that "we think our young men will not be able to raise any more this year...than what they will want to live upon; but we are in hopes another year, they will have a little to spare; and we are willing they should give to your old people, that can't work for themselves, one bushel out of four, of all the grain, etc. that they have to spare; the rest they must have to buy salt and other things with, which they can't raise off of the ground" (I.C.C. op.cit.: May 22, 1798). In addition, the Quakers promised that they would assist in the building of a gristmill the following summer, contributing half towards the expense of its construction if the Indian community would contribute the other half. The Quakers suggested that if the Indians would not spend money for trinkets or liquor, they could easily put the money aside from their annuity payments, but this apparently did not happen (or was not possible), and, in 1801 in a similar context, Cornplanter remarked that it was extremely difficult for the Senecas to put money aside as they were always in debt to the traders (ibid.: February 28, 1801). A gristmill was finally open in 1804, but only after the Quakers had acquired private property and were able to relocate it on their own land with no confusion as to ownership or right of access.

At the same time as the Quakers were making their initial settlements, Joseph Ellicott with a crew of surveyors was surveying the reservation boundaries (ibid. May 14, 1798). The record does not indicate the extent of the contact between the missionaries and the surveyors, but it seems likely that there was some and that this might have led to the rumors that were spread by "some who were rather unfriendly to civilization" (Jackson op.cit.:33-34) that the Quakers' motives were suspect and that they had designs on Indian land. Although this may indicate a lack of unanimity among the Senecas regarding the Quakers, no action against them was taken at this time.

The harvest of 1798 was apparently excellent, and in the fall the women were busy storing food for future use (ibid.). The winter hunting was likewise extremely successful, and Jackson tells us that good hunters killed and skinned approximately one hundred deer each, with some bagging even more, and while the skins were taken, the meat was left lying around in the forest, indicating no great anxiety about food.

The Quakers provided a range of services which were apparently well received and utilized by the Senecas. In July, 1798, the Quakers assisted in the construction of several houses for which Cornplanter's sawmill was a source of boards, but no information is available as to terms under which these boards were sawn, or how much the housebuilding depended on sawn boards. Housebuilding, traditionally men's work during the twelve to fifteen year periodic village relocations, was an ongoing activity through the summer months, and continued each year,

and was always cited by the Quakers as one of the marks of Seneca advancement. We should note, though, that most of the houses built until 1804 were at that time abandoned when all but a few families left the Cornplanter settlement, so that the labor investment until 1804 was, in effect, wasted, and they had to begin all over again. In the spring of 1799, the Indians assisted the Quakers in the construction of a schoolhouse, and the Quakers ploughed several lots for the Indians. At the same time, the Quakers established a smith's shop which was "found useful in repairing the Indian's tools" (Jackson op.cit.:36). In the spring of 1800, the Quakers again ploughed land for the Senecas, and one Seneca man tried ploughing, but as we learn from another manuscript, this was done for the Quakers on their land and not on land which was to be planted by the man ploughing (Jackson 1810:135-6). In the spring of 1801, the famous experiment of ploughing versus hoe preparation of alternating rows were tried, and the ploughed rows produced more and higher corn (Jackson 1830:43). That same spring Indian men were reported to be ploughing Indian land. In general, the Quakers reported a greater willingness by men to engage in field activities, particularly ploughing, and saw this as a gradual move to their desired goal.

The Quakers were disappointed in the poor response they got to their urging Indian families to settle near them and thus to be readily available for instruction and, presumably, supervision. Only one man did so, but he was severely crippled and unable to engage in regular male activities. Under Quaker

direction, he learned to read and write and, it is reported by Jackson, eventually became a trader (ibid.:39).

In the summer of 1801 a blacksmith, Vincent Wiley, arrived to teach blacksmithing to two selected Indian boys and to perform blacksmithing services. Although the students were apparently able, various difficulties such as ill health, family affairs and a general lack of interest interfered with their success at learning, and in 1803 the Indians expressed themselves very dissatisfied with the limited services which their own smiths were able to provide (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2: September 24, 1803). On the other hand, the Indians understood the primary function of the Quaker smith to be direct service to themselves, and their demands for attention were apparently a great irritation to the Quakers, who reported that "if not attended to, reflections and dissatisfactions arise against us" (ibid:Reel I, Box I: November 8, 1802).

Problems about blacksmithing services may have been a catalyst to the missionary dissatisfactions, and the first intimation of problems came in a letter of August 3, 1801, when they wrote to the Committee to urge that blacksmithing be seriously taught for "if some of them here had a more competent knowledge therein, we are of the belief the use of the settlement would be pretty much over at this time and that it would be more improving to the Natives to leave them to depend on their own endeavors" (ibid.). The Committee in Philadelphia responded negatively to this suggestion saying that they were afraid that a withdrawal at that time might

produce backsliding among the Indians, and that that in turn would be discouraging to the Committee and to the Quaker community generally. This response is interesting as a reflection of the stake the Quaker community felt it had in maintaining relations with the Indians and the self-perpetuating nature of its benevolent activities once these had been initiated. On the other hand and as an attempt at remediation, the Committee suggested an innovation in the relationship, one which would be formalized later; to wit, that the Indians should start paying for some of the things they required, mostly iron at this point for the blacksmith to work, so that they would appreciate the value of the commodity (ibid.: July 12, 1802).

Although the Committee had expressed itself satisfied with the progress of the Senecas, the resident missionaries obviously must have had a bad year, for in December, 1802, they specifically suggested removing themselves from Indian land and breaking the reciprocity relationship that the Indians wanted and expected and the Quakers did not. They wrote:

> Settlements made on their lands for their benefit may for a seasonable time have a good effect, but their ideas being so weake and for want of more sensibility of the intention of society toward them, leads to dependence that evidently obstructs their own advancement, which dependence more increases as they observe an increase of production from the land we cultivate the notion being so prevalent amongst them that we are under an obligation to contribute and gratify every request of that kind which are often very unreasonable and improper to grant and if not complyed with reflect and say we enjoy such and such benefits from their land (in order to prevent disunity) this at times reduce to a compliance that tends to retard their advancement and renders our influence of less avail in many things than perhaps might be if we were

situated more independent of them (I.C.C. Reel I, Box I: December 11, 1802).

The missionaries then suggested the establishment of a separated mission station, located on their own private property to which selected Indian families might come and settle around them, hoping thereby to create that kind of deculturalized mission population which Service describes in Latin America (1955) and which was created among the Mohawks at Caughnawaga (Postal 1965).

The Committee's response to this proposal was reserved. The members were most anxious, in particular, to know whether the idea had been approved by the Indians, who they did not wish to offend, and whether any of the missionaries now resident would stay on. The project involved a financial commitment and was of a scope that had not previously been envisioned (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2: March 27, 1803). The missionaries acted immediately on the limited encouragement they received and in June reported that they had selected a location sixteen miles up the river and away from the Indian community, and that Cornplanter not only approved, but felt it would be most beneficial to the Indians because it would encourage them to move onto the reservation up the river (ibid.: June 20, 1803).

The visiting committee arriving in September must therefore have been somewhat surprised to learn that the plan had not met with Indian approval. Both Handsome Lake and Cornplanter stressed that moving off Indian land was a Quaker and not an Indian desire, and that they would approve such a removal only

on condition that the new mission was much closer to the Indian settlement than the Quakers proposed. The speeches of these Indian leaders deserve careful attention for what they reveal of the needs that the Indians had for the Quakers, and those of the Quakers for the new terms that were being set for a continuation of the relationship.

Handsome Lake addressed the Quakers first and said that he was pleased and satisfied with their living among them, and that the Great Spirit was obviously satisfied too as no misfortune or ill health had befallen them. Having given both human and supernatural sanctions as the basis of approval, Handsome Lake then went on, in an imperious way which apparently suggested a rejection of any implications that the Indians were not masters of their own affairs, to say:

> We have been very much engaged in business respecting the affairs of our Nation, which has prevented us from answering your proposals of declining the settlement of Gensinguhta and moving up the River and settling on land of your own joining ours. We now all agree to leave you at full liberty, either to remain where you now are on our land or remove up the River and settle on land of your own only that you settle near us - The Little Valley is as far up the River as our people think you should go, as we want you to be near us, that you may extend further assistance & instruction, for altho' we have experienced much benefit from you, and some of our people have made considerable advancement in the knowledge of useful labour, yet we remain very deficient in many things, and numbers of us are yet poor...I myself have been advising our people to pursue the course of life you recommend to us and we have fully concluded to follow habits of industry, but we are only just beginning to learn, and we find ourselves at a loss for tools to work with; we now request you to bring on plenty of all kinds you think will be useful, then such of our people as are able to buy for themselves, and such as are poor, we wish you to continue to

> lend to and they shall be returned to you again. We also want you to bring on useful cloths, and sell to us, that we may get some necessary things without having to go so far for them (ibid.: August 30, 1803). (Italics theirs).

Cornplanter then added his comments, which indicate another role that the Quakers filled, that of mediators with white society. Cornplanter reviewed his part in inviting the Quakers and then said:

> When I was at Philadelphia a long time ago, the Indians and white people at that time continued to kill each other. I then heard of the Quakers, that they were a peaceable people, and would not fight or kill anybody. I enquired of the President of the United States about them, whether or no this account was true, he said it was true enough they were such a people. I then requested him to send some of them to live among the Indians, expecting they would be very useful to us...You have lived peaceably among us, and no difficulty has happened between you and our people. We now want you to stay with us, and stand between us and the white people, and if you see any of them trying to cheat us, we wish you to let us know of it - or if you see any of our people trying to cheat the White People, we wish you to let it be known also, as we confide in you that you will not cheat us (ibid.).

Handsome Lake's speech suggests several points of importance. This was the period, following his initial vision on June 15, 1799, during which his influence and political power was at its height. In a letter dated January 23, 1803, written by Jacob Taylor at Handsome Lake's dictation, he said, "The principal part of the Seneca Nation have agreed to be under his government and nothing in future of any consequence that relates to the Seneca is to be transacted without the knowledge and approbation of Conudiu (i.e. Handsome Lake)" (ibid.). Furthermore, in the same letter, it is noted that the location of the

Grand Council of the Six Nations had been officially transferred from Buffalo Creek to Allegany, and was now under the control of Handsome Lake. The particular business which he was actively engaged in and which inspired the transfer of the administration of the Seneca Nation was his attempt to countermand the sale of land on the Niagara River, for which Red Jacket at Buffalo Creek was being held directly culpable and for which the Code of Handsome Lake had him eternally punished in hell (in the Edward Cornplanter version. Actually, in earlier versions, it is Farmer's Brother who is being punished (Deardorff 1951:100-101), but then no one was free of the guilt of land sales). By 1809, if not before, the central location of authority had reverted back to Buffalo Creek and Handsome Lake's influence was in decline, but in 1804, Handsome Lake was at the pinnacle of his success, with an estimated backing of two-thirds of the Senecas, receiving and going on delegations, and particularly deriving prestige and power from President Jefferson's endorsement of him in 1802 (ibid.:94). Difficulties with the Muncies in 1801, resulting from his accusations of witchcraft against them and with bloodshed only prevented by white interference apparently did not diminish his prestige nor his influence. As an ally and endorser of the Quaker mission, then, he would have been invaluable, but in spite of his declaration of accord, the Quakers, in fact, did not find him a help and declared, "although Connedin (i.e. Handsome Lake) had advised them to quit drinking whiskey, he was otherwise endeavoring to propagate notions very inimical

to the concern in which Friends were engaged, by recommending them to follow their old customs, and not allow their children to learn to read and write; that they might farm a little, and build houses, but must not sell any thing which they raised on their land, but give it away to one another, and especially to their old people; and, in short, enjoy all things in common" (Jackson 1830:43; cf. also Pierce 1801:4).

Although contemporary anthropologists have cautioned against focusing on the issue of alcohol consumption in the Handsome Lake movement while ignoring the social reforms he was advocating (Tooker 1968), the use of alcoholic beverages by the Senecas was a primary concern of his, and its control not only reduced outward aggression within the community, but also made money available to be spent on other things. Presumably, too, a more sober male population could spend its time engaged in useful activities, rather than "sleeping it off." Handsome Lake did not initiate the movement to abolish alcohol from the Senecas. The community in council had agreed to enforce a ban on alcoholic beverages before Handsome Lake had his first vision, and had appointed two young men to make sure that none was brought into the settlement. Handsome Lake's inveighing against drinking was not only a reflection of his own convictions, but an endorsement of public policy through religious sanction. The vocal Quaker disapproval of drinking was an additional reinforcement to continuing the ban, and temperence in general was high until about 1811.

Pittsburgh, as the Quakers found, was the nearest market

for trading, although trading was also done by the Indians at Warren, Pennsylvania (Burges 1965), at Fort Franklin (Reynolds Collection ms.), in Meadville (Reynolds 1938), and at Niagara (Simmons ms:83). Alcohol was among the articles procured by trade in Pittsburgh, and the early spring, when the canoes returned laden with trade goods after a winter's hunting, was the occasion for the annual drunken spree, which resulted in deaths and general disruption in the community. In Handsome Lake's speech then, I believe we should focus on his application to the Quakers to supply locally those goods for which the Indians were otherwise dependent on the Pittsburgh market.

The Quakers themselves were cognizant of the implications of distant trade on the control of alcohol consumption. Halliday Jackson (1810 ms.) discussed the fact that in 1799 the Indians had brought back kegs of beer from Pittsburgh when they went to sell their furs. He suggested in a footnote to this information that "a trade upon benevolent principles would be advantageously opened by friends with the Natives giving them more for their peltries than others and thus superseding the necessity of their going to a distant market. It should be a barter with useful supplies" (ibid.:122fn.; Italics his). That the manuscript dates from 1810 would lead us to suppose that the circumstances he describes for 1799 were relevant to a decade later, and Handsome Lake's proposal for the control of the problem was supported by some Quakers, although it was not acted upon.

Like the Quakers, Handsome Lake was hoping for the development of a self-sufficient community which would have as little interaction as possible with the white communities that were the suppliers of liquor. If the Quakers would provide those items which the Indians could not manufacture for themselves, the isolation would be possible. In spite of Tooker's cogent arguments, I would maintain that the engagement of men in agriculture was not a primary intention or focus of Handsome Lake, but rather a by-product of keeping them close to home within the protective supervisory confines of a temperate Indian community. Certainly his admonitions against the sale of agricultural products made the possibility of a cash dependent community transforming its economic activities to an exclusively non-cash basis impractical and economically unrealistic. On the other hand, traditional men's activity, i.e. hunting, resulted in drunkenness only at the terminal point, when trading necessitated contact with the white, liquor filled towns. Thus Handsome Lake did not object to men hunting, or for that matter to women farming, or to any aspect of the traditional division of labor. He objected to distant markets and the locally fixed presence of the Quakers offered him the possibility of filling trade goods needs close to home.

Cornplanter's suggestion that the Quakers filled a vital need for the community as mediators with the white world does not represent the first time that Cornplanter indicated such a need, nor the last one. In a petition to the Assembly of Pennsylvania, in March 1790, Cornplanter stated:

We are often disturbed by bad people. We must

> hunt very hard for skins to keep our wives and children alive, when we get them we have no place in the Quaker State that we can go to trade but Pittsburgh, when we come there, our camps are plundered, our horses and canoes stolen, as also some of our people killed by bad people. We come to Pittsburgh for redress, no man can understand us, neither can we find any persons appointed by the great Fire of the Quaker State to hear, to judge, and interpret for us... (McAllister Collection March 2, 1790).

In October of 1790 he addressed a further communication, enumerating a list of attacks and abuses by whites on Indians, including murder and theft, and giving a general picture of how vulnerable the Indians were in relation to whites (ibid.).

On his various visits to Philadelphia to address both the state and federal governments, Cornplanter and his fellow Indians were welcomed, entertained and given presents by the Quakers. As a result of this attention, and because of their reputation for good conduct towards Indians in general, Cornplanter came to regard the Quakers as the answer to the need for the presence of trusted white men to intercede with the white world, people of prestige and influence with all levels of white society, unlike the few white men who had settled within the community and lowered their standing with white society by becoming virtually Indians themselves. As we noted, too, the interpreters, Jones and Parrish, had taken bribes to influence the Indians to acquiesce at the Treaty of Big Tree, and were not to be trusted. But the Quakers, with their reputation for honesty, were. In June, 1796, the Indian Agent, Chapin, writing to the Secretary of War, added a note, referring to Cornplanter: "He made me promise I would write you to remove

the white people who are settled about them - as they are a bad people, and put the people called Quakers in their place" (O'Rielly, June 8, 1796).

When the resident missionaries developed facility with the Seneca language, they became even more valuable mediators. A letter from the chiefs dated June 11, 1807 indicates the dependence which they felt on Jacob Taylor, who was planning to leave for home. In part, they wrote:

> You know our friend has been with us a great while, and we are well satisfied with the aid he has given us; we have always found him very useful in assisting us, in cases of difficulty...we wish him to be here to assist us about our sawmill, and in difficulties which frequently occur between us and the white people (who are now settling round our land) as we think another Person, a stranger to us, and not acquainted with Indians, could not render us the same service (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2: June 11, 1807).

When the Quakers decided to expand their mission to include a branch at Cattaraugus, they noted that a council of chiefs, warriors and women who agreed to the Quakers' land purchase were extremely eager to have them there "as the hope it might be a means of preventing bad white people from imposing on them" (ibid.: June 8, 1808).

The Quakers continued to act as influential mediators for the Senecas, through the period of the 1820's to 1840's, when most of the reserved land was lost and a final settlement made to reserve the Cattaraugus and Allegany reservations, through the period of Seneca Nation formation in 1848, and through the unsuccesful battle to prevent the construction of

the Kinzua Dam in 1965. Although it is outside of the scope of this paper to do so, an evaluation of the role of the Quakers in these various events is sorely needed. Certainly the tensions existing between the Orthodox Quakers of Philadelphia, assisting and advising the Allegany Senecas, and the Hicksite Quakers of New York, assisting and advising the Cattaraugus and Buffalo Creek Senecas, provided a differential set of signals and frequently contrary directions for action, which must have contributed to confusion and a lack of unity among the Senecas themselves. But it seems unlikely that without Quaker intervention and publication of the illegalities involved in the movements to grab Seneca land, any of it would have been saved. On the whole, the Quakers acted in what they understood to be the best interests of the Senecas. Contemporary Senecas, many of whom attended the boarding school at Tunesassa maintained by the Quakers to wean the children away from Indian life, speak of the Quakers with uniform good will and confidence although frequently with hostility to the school itself. But no Indians became Quakers. They were always the honest, trustworthy "other" of whom Indians did not become a part. And it may have been this very differentness, the aloofness, the inaccessibility, that made them continuingly satisfactory mediators for Indians who trusted no other white men, nor frequently each other.

The Committee spent several weeks considering the address they had received and on September 24, 1803 were prepared to respond and to set the new terms for future Quaker-Indian

relations. They were able to report that they had found an adequate location on Tunesassa Creek, which met the Indian condition for proximity. Because of the problem of clearing land, they indicated that they would continue to need the older farm for another season to plant, but would remove that winter from the house that they had been occupying if a new house could be built in time, after which the old house could be disposed of at the Indians' discretion.

At two separate places in the Quakers' address, the matter of tools and tool lending was brought up. Whatever remained of the first set of tools which had been brought and lent out were to be left with the Indians. It would have been impossible to reassemble the set, and it seems likely that most of that first parcel was permanently gone, and that the Quakers were in effect washing their hands of the problem. They therefore suggested that some chief should be put in charge of this first set, that they would continue to provide "assistance and instruction" at their own discretion, but tools were not to be distributed at all by the Quakers, who were transferring any problem associated with reciprocity back to the Indian community itself. They summarized their position by saying, "We think it will be best for you to appoint some persons to have particular charge and care of them, as lending tools has been very troublesome and you will now have some to lend, we think it will be best for our Friends to leave off lending (ibid.: September 24, 1803).

In spite of the Quakers definitive action, tool lending

and an expectation of reciprocal behavior continued to be a sore point, reappearing as an issue throughout the first twenty years of their interaction. From the response contained in an address of January 31, 1807, it is apparent that problems had arisen the previous year, again on the subject of tools, and that the Quakers had decided to discontinue acting as any source of supply. Jacob Taylor reported that he said: "Your people continue to apply to us to buy Tools. What shall we say to them? If you want us to sell to them you must open the path again. And when you answer our speeches on business we intreat you to appoint good men to speak, and let them speak the united voice of your people that so both you and us may know what to depend on" (ibid.: January 31, 1807).

The Senecas' response to this was to say:

> We now wish you to continue to sell Tools to us as you used to do, for we find a great advantage in having tools so near for when our people are at work, and break one, they can soon go and get another...About giving our people victuals as was talked of last fall, it is the custom amongst us, but we can't tell you to follow our customs - and respecting lending tools, some families among us are yet very poor, and it may be some of them may ask for tools to borrow when they are in great need, but you may act your pleasure about lending to them (ibid.).

In addition the Senecas indicated that, in response to the plea for a responsible spokesman to represent the united voice that Handsome Lake had been so appointed.

Again in 1812, in a letter dated May 10, 1812, the missionaries at Cattaraugus, particularly Jacob Taylor who

had previously served at Allegany, complained about the conduct of the Clendenon family serving at Allegany and included the complaint that tool lending had been renewed by them. Taylor insisted that the Indians had various means for procuring their own tools, including money which he felt was otherwise spent for trifles. Furthermore, he was indignant at a renewal of the practice, because it would set a bad example for the Senecas under his jurisdiction at Cattaraugus, and as "they are yearly emigrating between the two settlements," the difference in policy would be immediately apparent. (ibid.: May 10, 1812).

As for the proposal to supply necessary goods locally to avoid the Pittsburgh market, the Quakers declined to do so, saying: "We do not want to keep a store of goods among you, we think it will be best not, but we intend to send a few scythes, sickles, augurs, and some such tools to sell to such of you as may want to buy, but if any of your people buy from them and then sell to white people they are not to sell any more to such as do so" (ibid.: Report dated December 14, 1803 of meeting held September 24, 1803). Although they were willing to make available to a limited extent those implements that they regarded as important to the Indians, their unwillingness to supply the trade goods essential for other than agricultural purposes such as cloth and ammunition, committed the Indians to a cash economy in the Pittsburgh market.

While their address to the Indians at this time does not indicate it, the report of the committee noted an additional

new direction of the relationship, vis a focus on women for, "as the men accustom themselves to labor the women have less drudgery to perform. We therefore believe their situation should claim our serious attention" (ibid.: December 13, 1803). Having made a permanent settlement at Tunesassa, the situation was more conducive to the placement of entire families as missionaries, rather than the former arrangement of single men. In the spring of 1805, the first women missionaries arrived and the direct instruction of Seneca women in Quaker approved skills began.

The year 1804 was a period of settlement relocation for both Quakers and Indians. The Quakers moved by February, although they requested and were granted continued use of the farmlands they had previously worked. Moving onto virgin land for the first time, the Quakers found that they were having trouble clearing away the timber and were forced to hire help, not Indians who were out hunting, but first a white man and then a Negro to do this clearing for them. The timber which was cleared, however, had an immediate outlet in the sawmill, which along with a gristmill were constructed immediately upon moving and were in operation by the following winter. The blacksmith, John Pennock, remained with them during this year, but his activities mainly centered on performing smith's work on the mills: thus he was not available to perform services for the Indians.

Although the Indians' decision to relocate seems unrelated to the Quakers', it is possible that a desire to be closer to

the new Quaker settlement might have been one of the considerations in deciding to move. But the reason seems clear enough for Quaker reports indicate that it was Cornplanter's desire to lease his land to white men which hastened the Indians' decision to leave his private property and settle on the reservation land which was above the state line. Cornplanter was reported to have forbidden those living on his land to plant on it, which, in effect, was an eviction notice. The first indication of such trouble is reported in February, 1804 (ibid.: February 2, 1804), and by April it was reported that ten families had already moved and settled on the site known as Cold Spring. Thirty men working together had cleared four acres on which to establish the village and had built log houses to accomodate the settlers. By April, the house building had ceased and attention was directed to clearing land for corn and to hunting (ibid.: April 24, 1804).

The Quakers' initial reaction to the Indian move was positive, but this quickly changed when the new settlement was constructed on the older village model rather than in a dispersed farmstead pattern. Some of the families did elect to establish their homes away from the village, and the Quakers commented on their reactions to these alternative moves in the following way:

> Several other families have fixed on spots of land up the river to build on, detached from their little town and have opened small clearings for the purpose of building on contiguous to excellent flats of land to raise corn on. These last parcels are taking hold of the right end of things and the nearest road to distinct property. To these our

> advice flows freely and generally acceptable to them. The other party that are huddling together in the town (are Indians yet) are not beginning right in our view (ibid: February 4, 1804).

Again, residential relocation provided a rapid adjustive device for a response to external change, in this case both technical and idological change provided by the Quakers, which some Senecas ignored and remained in the clustered village, and others accepted and dispersed in a novel pattern. Those who so dispersed were able to separate themselves from the demands, responsibilities and supervision of the Indian community, but with Quaker approval and encouragement (which undoubtedly included assistance) supporting this decision to so separate. In 1809, Allinson reported that the best farm he passed, separated from the Cold Spring community was that of a man Kah'shun'dee whose wife was dressed "in a silk short gown" a white fashion very different from the other Indian women he described. The man, who raised oats, corn and other grains "is industrious and wealthy - not fond of attending their feasts and councils and declines the appointment of a chief" (op.cit.:108). He had in short, withdrawn from both the contraints and rewards of Seneca society.

The dispute with Cornplanter which resulted in relocation was disquieting to the Indian community, and by August, 1804, there was a move to reinstate him to the position of a chief, from which he had been displaced when the trouble started. (The position of chief, although differing in many ways from sachemship, shared with it the characteristic of external

assignment and the title could be withdrawn at the discretion of the legitimizing agents within the community. Chiefs were not self-appointed although white men accepted such self-appointment and chose to ignore the question of legitimacy when it suited their purposes). By June of 1805, Cornplanter informed the Committee that peace had been restored between the disputing parties and that he had been reinstated to his former position (I.C.C. op.cit.: June 26, 1805). Although his position was restored, what he did not get was the rights to a mill seat on the reservation land itself, which the Indians denied to him and leased instead to a white man living on Cornplanter's property for a rental of 60,000 board feet a year with the mill to be constructed at the man's own expense. Although the work was begun, it seems probable that this mill was never in operation, perhaps owing to what the Quakers saw as, for him, highly disadvantageous terms of rental (ibid.: April 24, 1804).

The major issue of conflict between the Senecas and the Quakers at this period and until 1808 seems to have centered around the issue of the Quaker sawmill and the larger issue of the Quakers' ultimate purpose in being there, which the sawmill came to represent. The Quaker mill was completed and in full operation by December, 1806, and the missionaries reported that they had cut a lot of lumber and had a good prospect of selling it at the mill, rather than having to raft it down the river and the likelihood was that the mills would prove profitable. (They had already received approval from

the Committee to raft boards to Pittsburgh but were warned at that time not to go into business in a serious way (ibid.: January 7, 1805). The year before, the Quakers had set the conditions for providing milling services to the Indians. The first 10,000 feet of board would be cut free of charge, and grain ground for one year. The Committee added to these offers, a proviso that the Indians must haul their own lumber to the mill for cutting, a procedure which the lack of draft animals had frequently been cited as making difficult, if not impossible; and, in addition, that the first crop of wheat should be ground free even if it were raised after the first year in order to encourage the growing of wheat (ibid.). An additional 7,000 feet of boards was offered to the Senecas if they would open a road between the Cold Spring settlement and the Quaker settlement at Tunesassa. (ibid.).

Any cutting beyond this was on a strictly cash basis, which the Quakers explained by saying, "If any of you want Boards we will sell them to you for 4 shillings per hundred - but, we don't intend to trust any because we want to keep the chain of friendship bright - and, if you want any of your own logs sawed or boards or scantling to do your own building, if you but...hawl the logs to the Mill, we will saw them for the one half" (ibid.: June 26, 1805). These two different sets of prices, one for domestic consumption and the other unspecified, might give us reason to believe that the cutting and rafting of lumber by Indians for sale might already have been in effect.

There is no detailed record of what the Indian reaction was to this commercialism of the Quakers, but it must have been negative for on August 21, 1807 the missionaries wrote to the Committee: "The Allegany Indians have heretofore manifested a desire to have a saw mill erected on their own land to be considered a public property; and altho no application has been made to us on the subject, we have under various considerations believed it a suitable time to offer them some assistance to build one" (ibid.: August 21, 1807). In a letter of October 16, 1807, they explained why they proceeded to make an offer to the Indians without first soliciting Committee approval:

> The disaffected part of the Indians have frequently labored to propagate a belief that our saw-mill was erected with a view of accumulating an interest out of them - stating that they had been informed it was intended for their use, but they found it quite otherways. These and similar ideas by being artfully insinuated we perceived had gained considerable ascendancy over some of those who had appeared well disposed (ibid.: October 16, 1807 - Italics theirs).

The Committee approved a $200.00 contribution toward the construction of an Indian sawmill, and then in January 1808 approved an additional $100.00 in response to a request for more help which they felt should be sufficient if the Indians did the necessary work on the mills and did not hire labor to do so.

Information about the history of the Indian sawmill is scanty. When the mill was completed in October of 1808, the millwright was contracted for several months to work the mill

on a percentage basis and to train some Indian men in its operation and management (ibid.: October 28, 1808). How successful this was is not indicated, but in 1811, when lumber prices were low, the Quaker mill inactive and with boards for sale piling up at the mill, the Indian mill was being rented by two white men for one year, with repairs being made at Seneca Nation expense (ibid.: February 12, 1811). By March of 1812, the Indian mill was being run by Indians, but very little work was reported being done there. Furthermore, the mill had been badly damaged during heavy snows and repairs were projected (ibid.: March 20, 1812). In 1819, the only timber being cut was for private building purposes, and the mill was quite inactive. On the whole, the cutting and rafting of timber as a cash activity during the second decade of the nineteenth century seemed to by-pass the need for a mill on the reservation and instead logs were transported down the river and milled in or near Pittsburgh.

The demise of the Indian mills in 1820 came as a remarkably, and one must almost believe, a consciously symbolic gesture by the Indians. A letter of December 3, 1820 reported that Blacksnake and his followers, during the period of active rejection of the Quakers and their idea of "civilization," "have also sold the saw mill irons that were given to the Nation some years ago by friends, & have taken the proceeds to fix up their council house at Cold Spring...that party will have nothing to do with friends, and they will sell what has been given to the Nation & with the money fix up a house to dance in -" (I.C.C. Reel III, Box 3: December 3, 1820).

At the same time as dissatisfaction over access to the Quaker mills was arising, vocal opposition to the instruction of women was mounting, and was probably not a totally independent issue. From the beginning of the mission, as we have observed, women were interested in what the Quakers were doing and they were invariably reported to be friendly and cooperative. The activities of the exclusively male missionaries, however, were focused on men's work and the encouragement to assume activities which they regarded as appropriate to men, including the traditional women's work of field labor and fuel hauling. But if the men were to do the women's work, then what were the women to do? Halliday Jackson explained the rationale for the initiation of the instruction of women when he wrote:

> Although many of the Indians had constructed comfortable houses, very few of their women took any pains to keep them clean and in neat order. They manufactured none of their own clothing, except the mockasins they wore on their feet. They had no knowledge of making soap, and of course their clothes could not be very clean - and very little improvement in domestic affairs had as yet taken place among the Indian families. In proportion, however, as the men became more accustomed to labour, it released the women from their former drudgery, and having now the opportunity of getting all their grain ground which before they had to pound in wooden mortars, it would afford them more time to turn their attention to the business of the house, and the concerns more properly allotted to females in all civilized societies (Jackson 1830:50).

For the instruction of women, it was necessary to supply women teachers, and thus the first family, Benjamin and Rachel Cope and a single female missionary, Hannah Jackson, who had

served at Oneida, was introduced in May, 1805. Their first project was to build a structure near the missionaries' house to accommodate the women students, probably a fortunate decision because it replicated that social environment in which women's activities were customarily carried out. Although, during that first winter, the women seemed interested and instructions were given in soap making, knitting and spinning, progress was very slow because of a general lack of materials and the inability to procure spinning wheels in Pittsburgh. The problem of materials for women's activities follows the same pattern as we have seen with tools, from both the Indian and the Quaker side: i.e. by the Indians an expectation of the contribution of materials by the Quakers and a general lack of access to raw materials either because of limited cash, distance to market, or inexperience; by the Quakers, the initial contribution and initiation of the activity followed by a refusal to continue acting as supplier except on a cash basis. Although flax could be grown locally, and finally was for a limited time and to a limited extent, raw wool had to be purchased as local wolves had made sheep raising impossible in the area. The third raw material, cotton, could not be grown locally because of the climate. In 1806 the Committee indicated that it was willing to contribute flax and wool for the women to learn with and that more women should come to learn to spin (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2: September 15, 1806).

The results were encouraging and in February of 1807 two or three women were said to be making very good progress

in spinning and the missionaries wanted to weave it for them for the encouragement it would give. A family living within the Quaker settlement (but not part of the mission staff) were reported to have a loom and the experience necessary to do the weaving. At the same time that this positive information was being conveyed, the Quakers reported that an active movement, led by Johnston Silverheels "to diswade and discourage the Indian women from learning to spin & artfully calculated to cooperate with their ignorance and create an aversion to such employment" (ibid.: February 3, 1807) was underway. The Quakers were extremely fortunate in this instance to have the support of several of the elder head women, who appeared in the council called to discuss the matter and who supported the training of the women. The Indians' public response to the Quakers was to declare that they would encourage, but could not force the women to cooperate.

Spinning was continued during the winter months, and the Quakers wove what was spun. In the summer "their attention to their cornfields, and outwork hath prevented much being done" (ibid.: May 16, 1808). The elderly head-woman, O-yong-go-gas, made surprising progress in spinning and the Quakers remarked that "the attention and care of two of their elderly women over the young spinners, has been very satisfactory to us" (ibid.: March 21, 1810). As in the case of a physical structure which would allow the women to work together, so the supervision by women of high status over the work party continued a formal organization within which women were comfortable

and able to achieve prestige, even though the task was a novel one.

In 1809 Jonathan Thomas volunteered to return to the settlement to teach weaving in which he was skilled. It was specified that he would do so for only one year, but for the first half of that year no one came forward to learn, although Thomas continued weaving what had been spun. Apparently the year limit was extended and in 1811 Thomas was instructing a woman and her husband(!) in weaving; three months later she is reported to have made extraordinary progress, to have woven all the yarn the Indians had spun, and was "now weaving for some of our neighboring White people" (ibid.: September 20, 1811). This rapid commercialization of a new skill was a unique phenomenon and not apparently emulated by other Indian women. It is, however, an indication of the temporary market that newly settled whites provided for Indian goods and services. By 1816 the two weavers had reduced their activity and "having been chosen masters of their religion and other ceremonies, and being very tenacious of them, their time is much engrossed by them to the great prejudice of themselves and others in the way of both civil and religious improvement" (I.C.C. Reel II, Box 3: March 8, 1816). The inclusion of the woman's husband as a junior partner in the weaving operation is a surprising element but not difficult to understand. Weaving was not a sex associated activity in the first place, although the Quakers were directing their attention to the women and thus making it so. But even among

the Quakers, it was Jonathan Thomas and not one of the women who was the weaver. Further, the Seneca weavers were elderly and of high status, as evidenced by their role as Faith-Keepers in the religious ceremonies, and it seems entirely likely that an elderly, respectable man would incur no loss of prestige by assisting his wife in a non-traditional activity in which they were uniquely successful. It even seems likely to me that too much emphasis may have been placed on a division of labor by sex among the Senecas, and that its power to influence behavior has been overrated, particularly after warfare diminished. However that may be, no other man is ever reported to have learned to weave, and it is not clear that even this man actually wove himself, or whether he merely assisted his wife while she wove.

In the spring of 1810, the Quakers reported that their last crop of flax had been very good, that they had purchased some wool and flax in Pittsburgh as a supplement and that supplies were sufficient (ibid.: March 21, 1810). A year later, having been encouraged by the success of the operation (although still less than half of the Seneca women were engaged in the activity with fifty out of a total population of one hundred and ten spinning), the Quakers decided it was time to alter the terms of the operation:

> All the flax, wool and cotton that has been spun ...had been furnished them at the expense of the Institution...as they are in a National and untutored ideas, we could do no less than hold out the advantage to all, that they that would do the most would have the most to their share. This

> we conceive has been well so far but as it may operate against the spirit of procuring flax and wool for themselves, we would suggest to your consideration whether the time for continuing this help should not be nearly at an end, and in the room thereof substitute premiums to those that would raise flax for themselves, and at the same time keep flax and wool to sell to those that may incline to buy...Several of the natives have raised flax but none have dressed their crop, but apply to us for a supply of that article as their right in the present arrangment (ibid.: February 12, 1811).

A premium was offered for flax grown and prepared for spinning, but there was little response. Charles O'Bail, Cornplanter's son, grew some in 1813, but this was raised to sell and he did not want to process it (ibid: June 6, 1813). In the same year, when the Clendenon's used the flax on hand for their own domestic needs, they were scolded by the Committee and they responded by complaining about a lack of clarity of the policy in general and the policy about flax in particular (ibid.: August 3, 1813). The Committee's answer was that the Indians must be supplied with flax (ibid.: Ocotober 13, 1813). In 1813, a further problem arose because of the failure of the flax crop due to wet weather (ibid.: October 25, 1813). Because it was difficult to grow, it was also difficult to buy; furthermore, it was difficult to prepare for spinning and in 1815, although several Indians had grown flax, only two had cleared it, one a widow who worked her own land, and had grown, cleaned and spun her own flax ready for weaving (ibid.: March 15, 1815). That summer only one person sowed flax. By 1819, the Quakers reported that there was little spinning or weaving being done, because although some people

had raised flax, they did not want to process it (I.C.C. Reel II, Box 3: March 7, 1819) and it would appear that what was being raised was being done so for sale to local whites rather than for home consumption. By the beginning of 1820 the high point of the domestic manufacture of textiles was passed and the Quakers wrote that "not any flax that we know of was raised the last season and but little spinning done amongst them" (ibid.: April 15, 1820). Purchased textiles, therefore, continued to be the raw material out of which clothing was made and which, of course, required cash.

There are a variety of possible and related reasons for the decline of an interest in the home manufacture of textiles, which never at any time took the place of purchased textiles for the Seneca. Probably the major reason was a general decline in such home manufacture throughout the United States and the growth of a commercial textile industry by the beginning of the nineteenth century (Hedrick 1933:164). With raw materials difficult and expensive to procure, and tedious and time consuming to process, and commercial textiles increasingly less expensive and undoubtedly better looking, available to purchase when other trade goods were being purchased, the attractions of home manufacture must have been significantly reduced. The initial attractions produced by establishing a social environment in which spinning was carried out as a communal activity was reduced by the procurement of additional spinning wheels and the removal of the activity to the home

to become a solitary one done for the product and not for the social rewards of the process. Furthermore, if, as I maintain, men had not removed from women the tasks which they previously performed, then Halliday Jackson's original rationale for the introduction of new domestic arts for women would be obviated. The one person who for a while consistently took over the entire process of raising, processing and spinning flax was a woman, a widow, who added rather than substituted these activities to her previous tasks. Furthermore, by 1819 to 1820, the Indians were disenchanted with the Quakers and their advice, as we have already remarked at the dismantling of the sawmill, and Quaker encouraged activities were undoubtedly at a low level of prestige.

Because so much confidence had been given to the supposed rapid conversion of Seneca males into "a nation of farmers, it seems to me important to reevaluate the scanty data and try to piece together a picture of what Seneca men were really doing. The vast preponderance of the data comes from the Quakers themselves and their reports are skewed towards convincing that the goal of the mission was succeeding. What they apparently did assist in doing was to make agriculture a respectable alternative for males, which almost certainly would have happened without the presence of the Quakers anyway. But agriculture became an alternative only, and one that frequently did not meet the ever-pressing need for cash.

Novel aspects of agricultural activity which were introduced by the Quakers were adopted by men primarily. Although

there seems no real physical basis for assuming that women cannot handle a plow or draft animals, plow agriculture is male agriculture, the plow is a man's tool, and instruction in its use by the Quakers was exclusively directed toward Seneca men. The first Seneca man tried his hand at plowing in 1801, using the Quaker team and plow on their land and the acquisition of this skill was apparently prestigious for men. The experiement of plowing versus hoeing in field preparation demonstrated the value of planting in a plowed field. On the other hand, we must be cautious in thus assuming further involvement by men in crop production; women can certainly plant and tend a field plowed by men in the early spring.

Plows and oxen to pull them were scarce and expensive commodities. By 1811 there were only six yoke of oxen and four plows, owned as collective property (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2; February 12, 1811), and wages were earned by those men who were able to plow for others. In 1819, for instance, it is reported that a young man had plowed twenty-two acres for other Indians at the rate of $2.00 per acre (Society of Friends 1844:138), and plowing thus became, not an early step in a total cycle, but a specific activity with an immediate cash reward.

Animal husbandry was another activity in which men were actively engaged and the Quakers were very encouraged by the rapid accumulation of animals, for, as they pointed out in 1798 "we cannot expect a great deal done by them at farming until they are better supplied with working creatures" (I.C.C.

Reel I, Box 1: July 28, 1798). Animals were purchased (or bred) each year; yokes of oxen apparently communally owned, but horses, cows and swine were private property. Halliday Jackson introduced an innovation in 1801 by building a sled for hauling wood, and although the Quakers indicated in connection with their mill that the Indians would not be able to haul logs without sufficient oxen to pull the load, the Indians were reported to be hauling wood and using horses rather than oxen. The accumulation of horses, at first applauded by the Quakers, was later deplored by them and by 1817 they were saying that "they have more horses than is of any advantage to them" (October 16, 1817). Besides the transportation they provided, I would suggest that the accumulation of horses may have been associated with the growing lumbering activities of the period, and as in 1801, that the Indians may have been using horses, because of a lack of oxen, to haul lumber either to the sawmill or to the river for rafting. Certainly some kind of animal energy must have been employed to move the huge pines which were cut, and the white lumber industry used horses. The Quakers, who disapproved of the lumbering activity of the Indians would then be expected to regard negatively an increasing number of horses which facilitated that activity. A further factor in the accumulation of relatively large numbers of horses by the Seneca may have to do with the ability of the animal to withstand winter conditions without human care. Horses, who can paw through the snow to uncover underlying grass, can be left untended and apparently are the

hardier for the lack of attention. Their ability to reproduce, if it is not enhanced, is undamaged. With a market for the sale of horses growing as white settlement and traffic grew, and with the minimum amount of attention that they require, the horse is a perfect animal to raise if you want to be off doing something else most of the time.

The numbers of animals kept increasing. In 1801 the Quakers wrote: "Divers have purchased cows, etc., for the use of their families...Some others are about to train young cattle for work of their own rearing. The increasing attention that prevails amongst them in raising cattle, hogs, etc. affords a prospect that they will ere long have a sufficient number of useful animals (ibid.: August 3, 1801), and by 1805 they noted that "they have a number of fat cattle to sell this fall and hogs in abundance" (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2: November 2, 1805). But the increase in numbers did not indicate that these animals were well cared for; in 1802-03, the stock had exceeded the ability that the Senecas had to feed them, and in the winter of 1807 a large number was lost through neglect while the Indians were out hunting (ibid.) February 3, 1807). This lack of attention to animals, lack of provision for regular feeding and for winter shelter was not exclusively an Indian failing. Indeed, the Senecas who received periodic scolding and instructions from the Quakers about the care of animals, may have had more productive practices than their white contemporaries who, Gates tells us, "did not give them the attention and care that was customary for English farmers...cattle were not

housed in the winter...little or no effort was made to assure good breeding practices, and...the condition of the stock was uniformly low" (1968:200). The Quakers advised that corn stalks be preserved as cattle fodder until wheat production would supply the more desirable hay, and although wheat was never grown, the advice about corn stalks was apparently accepted by 1808 when it was remarked that better care was being paid to animals (op.cit.: July 16, 1808).

Although the utilization of animals as an energy source appears to have been a male domain, it is obvious that the care and attention to animals need not be and the reports of contemporary Senecas who remember when animals were kept suggest that it was the women and children who tended them, provided daily nourishment and took charge of milking cows. Although the men probably sold livestock in a male dominated market place, it is also likely that the raising of livestock fitted in with a mobile and flexible male population; men could count on sedentary females to raise the animals the men would sell. Although by 1814, Halliday Jackson noted that little agricultural progress was being made, he also observed that the stock of animals kept increasing (1814:64), and he particularly remarked on the increase of swine which were not only salted for family consumption, but also raised and sold for the rapid income they would produce.

From the very beginning, the Quakers attempted to offer inducements to restructure the agricultural labor patterns of

the Seneca and particularly the sexual association of crops. At a 1798 council, they proposed a set of conditions by which the Senecas would be eligible to receive cash bonuses for agricultural efforts. Most of these, for apparent reasons, must never have been claimed, but they illustrate the Quaker pressure for male agriculture:

1. $2.00 for twenty-five bushels of wheat or rye offered to a man who raised it "in one year, on his own land, not worked by white people."

2. $2.00 for fifty bushels of Indian corn "raised by any one Indian man."

3. $2.00 for two tons of hay "put into a stack or barn."

4. $2.00 to be paid to any woman who produced twelve yards of "linnen cloth, made by any Indian woman, out of flax raised on her own, or her husband's lands, and spun in her own house."

5. $2.00 to a woman who produced twelve yards of woolen cloth, or linsey "made by any Indian woman, out of the wool of her own, or her husband's sheep, spun in her own house."

We will give you these premiums for four years from this time, if our young men stay so long, and upon these conditions, that the person who applies for the premiums must produce a certificate from two of the chiefs, certifying the quantity of grain, cloth, etc. for which the premium is demanded, and that it was raised, or made in the manner above mentioned, and that the person so applying, has not been intoxicated with strong drink at least for the term of six months before such application (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 1: May 22, 1798).

I have found no evidence to indicate that any premiums were paid under the set of specified conditions although the Quakers continued to suggest and offer premiums as a way to get Indian compliance.

A distinct sexual association of crops developed among the Senecas, with corn, beans, squash, potatoes and vegetables in general raised by women; and animal fodder crops, particularly oats, and some wheat and hay raised by men, which is the same general pattern described by Shimony with reference to the Six Nation Reserve in Canada (1961:154-155). Wheat, as we have already indicated was not a successful crop in the area although its production was constantly urged by the Quakers who offered premiums and free seed as an inducement to grow it. In a detailed analysis of the agricultural activity of thirty-five Seneca families (in 1820) (Jackson 1830:85-88) only six were proposing to plant wheat, and only three to make hay. Oats, on the other hand, were being raised by all but eight men mentioned, and we might remark carefully that seven out of these eight did not have horses; oats, as a developed fruit, is more suitable for horse feed than for cattle feed. That corn was a woman's crop is indirectly confirmed by a typical statement made in 1810 which reports that "several of their men have sowed spring wheat this season, and we believe an increasing disposition prevails amongst them to render assistance to their women in the planting of corn" (I.C. C. Reel I, Box 2: June 16, 1810) This impression is further confirmed by a school report of a young boy who wrote that his brother planted buckwheat and his mother planted corn and potatoes (Howitt 1820:144), thus indicating that until at least that time the progress in agriculture which had been regularly reported had not affected male involvement in the growing of

corn, the basic staple of the Seneca family and the crop which occupied the largest acreage as late as 1820.

Because cash was a necessity for the community, unless agriculture could offer cash rewards, it could not be a full-time activity for males. Although it did not become full time, it did, nevertheless, offer the possibility of some cash, not only through premiums but also through the sale of produce to whites. It is important here to observe that we cannot be sure whether this money was earned by men or by women. For instance, in 1805, Halliday Jackson reported that "divers had corn to sell" (Jackson 1810 ms.), but insofar as corn was a woman's crop and its distribution traditionally controlled by them it is possible that it was women, not men, selling corn. Certainly repeated accounts exist of travelers buying corn from Indian women (e.g. Allinson op.cit.:36). In 1812, it is reported that "they have raised good crops of wheat and corn last season; many of them find the advantage of tilling their ground not only for their own subsistence but sell considerable to white people" (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2: March 20, 1812). As rather a twist on the usual story, Ellicott wrote in 1819 that the white settlers had been lax in farming and that "wheat is now $2 per bushel and scarcely any at market, Indian corn $1.50 and little in the settlements to be had at any rate. I am informed that many of the inhabitants have had recourse to the Indians for that article; a people it seems who possess more prudence and discretion in providing the means of subsistence than we do ourselves...but absolutely

a letter of March 15, 1815, in which it was remarked that "several of the Indians spent some of their time last summer in squaring timber for the Pittsburgh market and took it down in the fall...There has been more industry this winter than common in making shingles, squaring timber, etc." (I.C.C. op.cit.: March 15, 1815). The indirect testimony of this statement, as well as others that I have already cited suggest that some activity in lumbering had been ongoing for some time before 1815.

Although various people are credited with operating the first lumber mill or rafting the first load down the Allegheny, the mill established by Cornplanter at his settlement was at least one of the first, if not the very earliest, in the area from which boards were shipped. In 1795 the commander of the fort at Pittsburgh learned that Cornplanter had boards to sell and sent, first an experienced sailor to purchase it, and then, hearing that competitors wished to make the same purchase, a man on horseback to quickly secure the lumber. Cornplanter's letter to the commander reveals him to be an experienced man of business:

> I thank the States for making me such kind offers. We have made peace with the United States as long as water runs, which was the reason that I built a mill in order to support my family by it. More so, because I am getting old and not able to hunt. I also thank the States for the pleasure I now feel in meeting them again in friendship, you have sent a man to make a bargain with me for a certain time which I do not like to do. But as long as my mill makes boards, the United States shall always have them in preference to any other, at the market price, and when you want no more boards I can't make blankets of them. As for the money you have

> sent, if I have no boards to the amount, leave it and I will pay it in boards in the Spring (Sipe 1927:465-466: letter dated December 3, 1795).

The observation of the activities at Cornplanter's mill must have been stimulating and suggestive to other Senecas, as well, but there is no information about whether any others participated in those activities.

When the Quakers built their sawmill, they immediately began to sell lumber to the downriver market, either rafting it themselves or selling it to merchants who rafted it. As I have already described, the Indians' observations of these activities led to a resentment over the profit the Quakers were making from a facility which they believed has been established to serve the Indian community, and immediate action was taken to procure a sawmill of their own, but whether this mill was primarily intended to provide boards for home consumption or commercialization is not clear. Norton's observations in 1809 suggest the possibility that rafting of lumber was already engaging Indian attention (1809:9). The Pittsburgh trader, Wrenshall, writing in 1816 described the rafting of timber and shingles as part of the regular trading trips of the Senecas, and indicated that the Indian mill was being utilized for this purpose. He wrote:

> They have besides a sawmill; and being surrounded with lofty pine trees, they cut them into boards or scantling and float them down to Pittsburgh, at the time of high water. And on these rafts they bring their Peltry, furrs, and good canoes, to push up their return cargoes. On the tops of these they also bring their wives and children, and sometimes

> shingles, the latter of which I have bought for one dollar and fifty cents per thousand and paid for them in merchandize (Wrenshall 1816: 128 (Quarto Four).

High water, as we know, occurred twice a year, in early spring with the thaw and in autumn, which would suggest that the summer season could be profitably used by men to prepare the timber they would ship in the fall, and would completely divert them from agricultural activities, except as the felling of trees contributed to the clearing of land. With this in mind, and although land clearing involves more operations than just tree felling, we might wonder if some of the enthusiasm for clearing land which was consistently reported with pride by the Quakers might not have had the sale of lumber as a conscious and profitable goal.

Once the cutting and rafting of timber got seriously underway, it continued as an important activity of Seneca men and the Quakers were highly displeased. The visiting Committee of 1817 remonstrated with the Indians, saying:

> You are very capable to calculate what is for your advantage and what is not. We therefore desire you would take into consideration whether you would not have been in a better situation generally if you had employed the same time which you have spent in cutting and rafting timber in cultivating your good land. (The comment appended adds:) Yet it is evident their attention... to cutting and rafting pine timber has much retarded their progress in agriculture (I.C.C. Reel II, Box 3: October 16, 1817).

In 1819, one of the missionaries transmitted his analysis of the situation of lumbering versus agriculture, and his comments serve as a good summation of the relevant arguments.

He wrote:

> They see many sawmills down the river below their Reservation that will purchase their logs and pay cash for them, or saw them into boards & give the Indians half for himself to run to a market, and often gets a return for his labor in a few weeks ...Many of their young men have served a sort of apprenticeship to the business, understanding it they follow it of choice for interest rather than the labour of the field...The men not so much accustomed to clear land. It takes time & attention to chop, burn, fence & prepare it for crops. The crops often light, oxen not owned by all, many tools wanted, not within the reach of some with the means they have to procure...hunting & cutting logs presents themselves, they choose these rather then the improvements of a new farm (op.cit.: March 17, 1819).

The Senecas derived money not only from the sale of boards, but also from employment as river pilots who rafted both their own lumber and that of white men down to Pittsburgh. The indications are that they were regarded as exceptionally skilled in an activity in which skill was highly regarded and well paid, and earned the admiration of Indians and whites alike (Kussart 1936; McMahon 1958). An elderly Seneca proudly told me that his grandfather was reputed to be one of the best pilots on the river and was well respected within the Seneca community. Although respectable whites may have looked askance at the behavior of the rivermen who patronized the taverns along the river which had been built to capitalize on their trade and who fought in the streets of Pittsburgh, an Indian probably derived considerable prestige from competing successfully in the white world while, at the same time, he could remain a productive member of the Indian community. Wrenshall's description of the all-purpose load was applicable, most likely,

to only the earliest period of Indians rafting, and it rapidly became an all male activity in an all male world. One cannot help but be reminded here of Freilich's (1958) argument that the engagement of Iroquois men in "super-male" activities is caused by the cultural persistance which such activities permit. I have no doubt that the attractions of rafting are partly attributable to the structural similarities which it bore to war parties from which men formerly derived prestige. But, as I have already said, such an explanation, insofar as it diverts our attention from the fundamental economic reasons for preferring rafting and lumbering to farming, is deceptive and insufficient. Beginning with the economic reasons, and adding to these the psychological attractions of structural familiarity enhances the argument that agriculture was not a preferred activity for men.

The direct sale of standing trees to white lumbermen was another way in which timber provided cash for Senecas. This practice is first mentioned in 1820 and this date corresponds to the time that local histories date the beginning of extensive lumbering in the area that was to dominate the local economy for the remainder of the century. A notice in O-He-Yoh-Noh, the weekly newspaper of the Allegany Senecas for January 23, 1974 contained a notice to the effect that a local company was interested in buying standing timber and would locate a portable mill on the site to process it, indicating a one hundred and fifty year old pattern of white exploitation of Indian timber. The possibility of selling

standing timber extended the range of people who could derive a profit from the industry, as it allowed the elderly and infirm to participate in, and derive cash from, an activity that had previously been limited to able-bodied adult males. The issue of cutting and privately selling a resource that was not privately, but nationally, owned, became extremely important in the discussions about the division of the reservation into private lots, and will be treated further in the next chapter.

Lumbering was not the only cash producing activity in which men could engage, and the importance of hunting to the Indian economy was underplayed by the Quakers; the disappearance of game was one of the rationales for the introduction of male agriculture. Indeed, the Indians, for their own purposes, always stressed that the game had or was disappearing and thus they needed whatever assistance the Quakers would provide, but here again I would suggest that this was a ploy to maintain a relationship from which both sides derived certain benefits. As a projection of future possibilities, as whites came to settle the area, the game would, of course, go, but contemporary Indians have told me of providing for their families for years on the earnings from trapping which is, even now, a minor but present source of cash and was, before the 1965 relocation, much more important. There are few Allegany Seneca garages today that do not have traps for beaver, muskrat and raccoon suspended from nails in the wall.

James L. Clayton, in his discussion of "The Growth and

Economic Significance of the American Fur Trade 1790-1890" (1967:62-72), stresses that "the popular idea that the coming of civilization automatically caused the fur trade to decline must be discarded. It not only grew with increased settlement, but on at least one occasion its principal base of operations actually shifted toward the center of population and away from the frontier. The beaver, bear, fur seal and buffalo declined with the westward movement, but the smaller animals such as the raccoon, mink, and muskrat seemed to thrive as settlement increased" (op.cit.:71). The possibility existed, then, for the continual exploitation of some kind of fur bearing animal, supplemented by the skins of the deer which were sold directly as skins, or as processed items such as moccasins. From a previous citation, we know that game was so plentiful in the winter of 1798 that only the skins were taken and the meat left to rot in the forest. The reminiscenses of "A Pioneer Trader" recount this early period:

> In the early part of this century the Cornplanter band...had quite a trade at Pittsburgh...From the source of the river to near its mouth were the Indians' elysium fields, the hills and mountains being stocked with vast herds of deer and other game. They generally had to winter on the way down to Pittsburgh in the hills and mountains to kill game to make their purchases with. In 1799 an Indian called by the whites Hayes, during the hunting season killed 60 deer and other game, only 47 miles north of Pittsburgh...The white hunters sometimes objected to the Indians hunting as they had sold their lands. The Indians, however, alleged they had made no transfer of the game on their land, and while it lay wild they had rights as good as, if not better than, the white man...they were not molested (Sloan 1902:226).

Wrenshall, the trader at Pittsburgh, described the load

necessary for us to follow" (op.cit.: Vol. II, p. 244). But the Indian agricultural success that he cites is based on the continued cultivation by women of the subsistence crop which the whites were purchasing.

As Ellicott's remarks indicated, local markets for the sale of agricultural products did exist although they were never extensive. Both white settlers who were increasingly present after 1806, and white emigrants who wintered in Olean during the same period, needed some of the produce the Indians could supply. But this kind of market did not warrant a commitment to intensive agriculture and the lack of transportation, the lack of local population centers, and the frequent problems of natural disasters did not offer great opportunity for prosperity through agriculture to local Indians or whites and both groups sought other methods of earning necessary cash. On his travels in 1814, while passing through the Olean area, Halliday Jackson noted the condition of the local whites and remarked:

> But little progress is made in farming, and making other accommodations to render the situation desirable. The land being very heavily timbered was hard to clear and in many places where they had deadened their timber and made considerable progress the design was abandoned and inhabitants fled...The settlers have appeared to turn their attention very much to the lumber business (1814 ms:8).

As did the settlers, so did the Indians, and the first report of extensive lumbering to be actively pursued by the Senecas occurred at about the same time as for the whites. With reference to the Indians, the first mention is made in

on the canoes around the year 1803, "heavy loaded with furs, peltry, mogasons, deer hams, tallow, bear skins and money which they receive from the United States government" (op.cit.: 125, Quarto Four).

Year after year the Quakers reported the men away hunting in the wintertime which invariably interfered with what the Quakers wanted them to be doing. In 1805, Seneca men were unavailable for employment by the Quakers who had to hire white men and a Negro to assist them; in 1807, cattle died because of lack of attention. The ability of the Senecas males to live by hunting through this period is testified to by the report of John Norton who visited the settlement in 1809. Because his conclusions are so different from those usually advanced in support of the Quaker claims, I will quote them at length as a crucial piece of evidence:

> These people have an advantageous situation; although their Reserve is only half a mile on each side of the river, for forty miles in length, yet it takes in the most valuable kind of land, and that purchased by the people of the United States adjoining to to, being rough and broken, and not likely soon to receive inhabitants, forms the most valuable hunting ground of any possessed by the Five Nations. They can conveniently take skins, meat and timber, to Pittsburgh, where they generally get a good price for these articles; the distance is only about 150 miles, and when the water is high, they can descend with Canoes or boats in two or three days...Our Host told me that Friends had taught several of their people to plow, and to do Blacksmith work, and some of their women to spin...but that many found it more their interest to hunt than to work; that for his part, he had acquired all his property by hunting, and that with the produce of the Chase, he had hired people to build and work for him (1809:9). (Italics mine).

Hunting was temporarily curtailed in 1810 as a consequence of the embargo of 1808 which served to reduce the price of skins. A new source of cash was sought by men, who were then reported to be working as hired laborers for other Indians (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2: March 21, 1810; cf. Jackson 1830:56). Hunting must have been resumed thereafter, for the visiting Committee in 1812 admonished the men to farm and not to hunt (op.cit.: September 18, 1812). When the crops failed because of frost in 1816, the Indians were able to turn to the woods to supply their needs and active hunting, with families accompanying men, was reported for the duration of the winter (Jackson ibid.:67). The 1816 hunting seems clearly to have been hunting for food, as indeed so may have been the resumed hunting in 1812, and food as an item of consumption has not been at issue here , as important a contribution to the economy as it might have been. After this period, hunting ceases to be mentioned by the Quakers at all, although we may be certain that hunting for food continued, and certainly could have been combined with lumbering. The great importance that lumbering takes on at about this time indicates a probable transition from hunting for skins to lumbering as the primary source of cash for men and with the difference that, whereas hunting was seasonally specific, lumbering could be carried on throughout the year.

Although hunting and lumbering probably served to supply the major sources of cash, other activities were also cash

productive and would supplement the basic subsistence produced by the women. Laboring for wages became one such endeavor. In 1799 the Quakers did hire some men to help with their harvest (I.C.C. Box I, Reel 1: November 10, 1799), and we have seen that in 1810 young men hired themselves to work for wages. In 1818, William Halftown paid $14.00 an acres to get land cleared (Society of Friends 1844:138). Plowing for payment was a regular source of income for some and the rate was $2.00 per acre in 1819 (ibid.:132). Indians were hired to carry messages, to serve as hunting guides, and they claimed bounties on wolf scalps. In 1818 a party of Senecas went with Storrs & Company on a road show to England (Bigelow 1896:415; Foreman 1943:120-124), indicating how early show business offered a source of employment for Senecas.

Although alcohol consumption was enjoined within the community, by 1807 the Indians were bringing liquor back from Pittsburgh to sell to local whites (Wallace 1970:305), and by 1811 the traffic in liquor was extremely active, mostly for sale to whites, but also available to any Indian who wished to buy (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2; June 6, 1811). Community and Quaker pressure together acted to eliminate this traffic, but Cornplanter was still selling liquor in 1814, and the disapproval he received from the Quakers was crucial in his alienation from them.

If we are to accept the assertion that the combined efforts of the Quakers and Handsome Lake produced a nation of male agriculturalists among the Senecas, we must then

explain why they ceased to besso during subsequent years. All accounts would indicate that, although subsistence farming continued, and some few men became successful farmers, the vast majority did not farm. In 1893 the Indian Agent wrote that "the people on this reservation are not as a rule engaged extensively in agriculture...(They) have recently begun to develop their lands, having for many years supplied their actual necessities by selling timber, bark and ties. They have been making fair progress in farming for two or three years past..." (Adams 1893:38). Whatever future prospects may have seemed likely in 1893, when Dorothy Skinner observed the situation in 1929, she wrote that "the Indians of the Allegheny Reservation do very little farming at the present time. They do laboring work at the various small towns near the reservation..." (1929:1). And,if one did not know that the following testimony was dated August 23, 1920, he might suppose it was at least 120 years earlier, for Mr. John Van Arnum appealed to the Everett Commission which was investigating the condition of the New York Indians in the following terms:

> We can hunt nor fish no longer, give us education to help us live. We need knowledge in agriculture work to develop our lands...It is education we need in agriculture so that when the young arise to become citizens, we can compete with any man (Everett 1922:191).

The Quaker mission was not a failure even though it didn't produce a nation of male farmers. The Quakers provided necessary economic assistance, and sometimes emergency supplies which enabled the Indians, who could not freely relocate as the settlers could, to get through difficult times. They pro-

vided the mediation with whites at the very time that whites were moving into the area and the Indians needed locally based friends. They taught useful skills and some people learned them. They opened the way for agriculture to be one alternative which men could choose which effort was enhanced by Handsome Lake's openness on the subject of economic options.

But the Indians, within the economic system in which they were forced to operate, could not afford to follow the Quaker's advice and had to find quicker methods which were more responsive to immediate circumstances to satisfy their cash needs; these the Quakers not only refused to fill, but even aggravated by introducing new sets of needs. In a process of rapid adaptation, the Senecas converted many Quaker introductions, such as the raising of livestock and the sawmill, into direct sources of cash.

Had the Quaker mission succeeded in its long range goals the result would have been the social and cultural genocide which was the goal of white well-wishers until recent years (cf. Hertzberg 1971). With the adoption of male agriculture and the separation of farms would come, the Quakers surmised, that desire to own property which is the mark of the civilized man. And the implementation of that desire would result in the abolition of the communal reservation. The Senecas were willing to placate the Quakers on many issues to keep them as friends, but the issue of private property finally produced the reaction about which this essay seeks to clarify, and the process of which will be the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER V

Private Property and The Rejection of the Quakers

"The Indian will never be civilized until he ceases to be a communist. This tribal relationship is the bane of civilization, the strongest ally of savagery." William A. Duncan of Syracuse (Whipple 1889:69).

In the final analysis, the antagonism which developed between the Allegany Senecas and their friends, the Quakers, can best be understood from their differences in attitude towards private property. From this perspective, the Quakers were not the innocent victims of a generalized, psychologically induced hostility to name-calling, identity-threatening missionaries, but rather were central figures in the advocacy of a policy of land division with far reaching social consequences which was unacceptable to the majority of the Indians. As long as the Quakers advocated the division of tribal lands into private lots, but took no real steps to effect it, they continued to be acceptable mediators and friends. Once they decided to concentrate on this particular aspect of social restructuring and took action to effect the change, thus creating a situation of alternative choice without flexibility, the Indians' reaction was one of hostility, culminating in several minor incidents of physical agression which had never before been perpetrated against the Quakers.

Although he cannot and does not ignore it, Wallace's explanation of Seneca rejection of the Quakers does not depend on the threat to the land base as central to the issue

of Indian identity. Rather we are told that it is name calling by missionaries, using the opprobrious term "pagan," that evoked the particular hostility to missionaries in general and the Quakers by association. If we understand Indian identity to be tied to a concept of tribal land, it seems to me legitimate to say that the proposal to abolish tribal lands would be the ultimate attack on Indian identity and name-calling a most trivial act by comparison. The primacy of a tribal land base for such self-identification is a position frequently advanced and central to the arguments presented elsewhere for the retention of the reservation system (e.g. DeLoria 1969). Certainly Elizabeth Colson's analysis of the Makah advances the position that it is only the reserved land that distinguishes the Makah from their white neighbors and permits them to self-identify as Indians and function as a distinctive social group.

PROPERTY AND SENECA SOCIETY

If anyone "owned" the land, it was the Seneca women, but the issue of ownership on an intra-tribal basis was irrelevant until whites began to impinge on it and land alienation became a reality (cf. Washburn 1971a). There are numerous indications that ultimate ownership rested with women (Carr 1883:216-218). Red Jacket, who was the official speaker for the women, in 1791 announced for them that "you ought to hear and listen to what we women shall speak...for we are the owners of the land and it is ours" (Snyderman 1951:20). The amended Constitution of the Seneca Nation of 1868, although continuing the disenfranchisement of women which was not to end until 1964 (Abler

1969), contains in the only section relevant to land sales the provisions that "the power of making treaties shall be vested in the council subject to the approval of at least three-fourths of the legal voters and the consent of three-fourths of the mothers of the nation" (Whipple op.cit.:399). Those "mothers" are the clan mothers, of whom six out of eight had to consent to land sales, although, legally to nothing else.

In general, real direct proof of ownership is absent although various writers have advanced a variety of opinions which tend either to support female ownership or communal ownership of the land (Brown 1970:159-160). In no instance does any authority suggest that land, as a natural resource, was legitimately under male control, but whites, of course, always assumed that control to be effective, and negotiations with Indian males rather than Indian females for land sales was the rule.

Parker adds to the discussion of communally owned fields the observation that individuals might also cultivate private fields, conditionally on also participating in communal fields. Only by communal participation could an individual share in the communal harvest, but if an individual chose to divorce himself from the commonality and to rely entirely on his own productive efforts and utilize only the produce derived from those efforts, he had the right to utilize land to do so. "Individual fields were designated by a post on which was painted the clan totem and individual name sign. Any distressed clansman, however, might claim a right in the individual

field and take enough to relieve his wants, provided he notified the owner" (Parker 1912:29) thus reinforcing communal rights to land, although not unconditionally to the produce which resulted from individual labor.

Parker, changing from the past to the present tense and suggesting in a footnote that he is talking of present time (1910), describes the continuing control by women over the land and over the productive processes performed on that land. He wrote:

> The women of a community who own individual fields and their husbands or male friends may form a mutual aid society...This society chooses a matron of the cornfields...who inspects the individual fields or get reports regarding their progress and who orders the rest of the band to go to the field she wishes cultivated at a certain day and hour. She commences the hoeing and ranges her helpers in equal numbers on either side and a little to the rear and hoes to the end of the row a little in advance of the rest, counts off the unhoed rows and takes her position again.
>
> It is the duty of the owner of the field to provide a feast at the end of the hoeing and each helper takes home her supply of corn soup, hominy or ghost bread (ibid.:30-31).

By the twentieth century, the communal field was a thing of the past, but the communal female work force was not, and men who participated in the work figured neither as owners of the fields nor leaders in the productive activities.

We have elsewhere noted that the women presented the Quaker men in 1798 with produce and with seeds necessary for them to begin their gardens, yet another indication added to the general weight of opinion that women controlled (perhaps a better word than "owned") the distribution of both the raw

materials and the produce connected with agriculture, as well as the implements necessary for their production. There is little to clarify the ownership of Quaker introduced tools, except that we know that the first sets of oxen and plows were communally purchased and communally employed, presumably by men, but likely used to plow fields planted and tended by women. Later plows and draft animals, by at least 1819, seem to have been male associated and were bought, used and sold by men, thereby suggesting male ownership.

On the whole, access to land was open to all, with a labor investment temporarily reserving the use and produce of the land to whomever made the investment, but ultimately open without formal transfer to a new user when the former one had ceased working it. Although the precise determinants of village abandonment and relocation have never been worked out (Stites 1905:149-150), they were probably a combination of several factors: depletion of land fertility, firewood sources, and local animals for hunting. The last was probably the least important in determining the time and place of village relocation insofar as men could and did move to the animals, but the practical distance that women could move from the village to obtain firewood was strictly limited by their daily obligations and was probably a major consideration. The problem of the depletion of the fertility of the land is obvious and it is not clear that, except for the times of relocation itself, fields were allowed to lie fallow, but the continual clearing and burning of new fields would suggest that during

the period that the community was in one locality, they continually opened new fields, either enlarging the total area under cultivation, or keeping the total area constant, moving to newer, fresher soil. In the Allegany region, the selection of new sites for settlement and for planting was made along the fertile alluvial plain unrestricted by considerations of ownership within the local group (Snyderman 1951; Wallace 1957), new plots were cleared, and the periodic cycle begun again, with women utilizing the local resources and men the dispersed resources to which all had rights of access. The same considerations were applied to those sporadically located resources of sugar bush, pigeon hunting areas, and wild food and riverine resources which were communally exploited.

Ownership of property other than land was a function of use rather than of manufacture. Men owned their own weapons and tools of production such as traps, weirs, guns and ammunition. Farming tools, although manufactured by the men, were used by the women, who were considered the owners, most likely as representatives of the maternal family group which worked the land together.

Women customarily owned the houses, although these too were built by the men. When the Quakers first arrived, they purchased their first house from the woman and her daughter "who owned it." With a growing nucleation of families and a concept of a labor theory of value reported by Allinson by 1809, "improvements" built by men were considered as legitimately

saleable by them and it seems apparent that following the white legal system, men came to control, to some measure, the sale of homes, but a continuing pattern of brittle marriages and serial monogamy undoubtedly modified this masculine control of property and is evident today when public opinion supports the legitimacy of a wife's claim to the household.

The early nineteenth century was most certainly a period during which Seneca attitudes towards property and the inheritance of property were undergoing modifications and from which a variety of what have come to be regarded as customary practices developed. Personal property, increasingly representing either a cash investment or having a cash value, ceased to be buried with a corpse. People had begun to make wills which are contained within the records of the surrogate of the Seneca Nation from as early as 1815 (Genevieve Plummer: personal communication). It is not surprising that that segment of the community sufficiently acculturated to make wills was similarly so acculturated as to bequeath property within the nuclear family. The Surrogate Record Books (which begin in July 1898) reveal a preference for awarding estate administration to a surviving spouse, particularly as custodian for children, unless mitigating circumstances, such as habitual drunkenness or other indications of moral ineptitude, intervene. On the other hand, the vast majority of cases of inheritance never appeared for Surrogate adjudications, and at least some part of these must have followed the traditional practice of property distribution through clan determination. One case,

dated April 1899, involved the testimony of clan members concerning customary procedures. The deceased husband had died intestate and, at the Ten Day Feast, the traditional occasion for the distribution of property, the clan announced that the widow was to keep the property that she and her husband had developed together, while the son of the deceased was entitled to all the property which had existed prior to the remarriage of his father to the widow whose rights to the letter of administration of the property the son was contesting. In the course of the testimony, a witness testified to the continuing rights of the clan to make property distribution. He said that he "knows the rule of the ten day feast - When a man died...we as belong four class of clans we are the right ones to make speak after a man belong our clan speech ...At the ten days the same man the first one made speech, declare the distribution of the property...the deceased person the nearest relation right to distribution of the decedent property" (Surrogate Notebook #1). We should observe that this speech does not specify who the proper recipient of property was; who the "nearest relation" was would obviously vary from case to case and in this particular case were not matrilineal family members. But the matrilineal clan claimed the right to make the determination and to continue to legitimize and publicize the determination at a public occasion. Longhouse followers continue to some extent to practice property distribution at the Ten Day Feast, and I have attended several of these, which have become more occasions for rewarding and

praising those who have contributed to the funeral preparations than for real property redistribution. Major property, such as houses and cars, are not included, but personal effects are distributed and some new items, predominately textiles, are purchased for the occasion and distributed. The surviving spouse is ritually returned to his clan by the clan of the deceased and is then free to remarry.

Ultimogeniture, the date of the inception of which I have not been able to precisely determine, developed during the nineteenth century and is now regarded as the traditional way of selecting an heir. One of my informants said that the Senecas do it to conform to white practice and was quite unshakable in her contention that it was customary white behavior. There was a surprising uniformity of agreement among my informants about this "rule" of inheritance; Longhouse adherents insisted it was the proper "rule" and non-Longhouse informants regarded it as a familiar and permissible customary variation. A most interesting situation has developed from this codification of what is probably a custom of recent invention. The current surrogate understands that her decisions are validly and legally based on "preserved tribal law and custom" and has recently determined from the testimony of conservative and reputable Longhouse people of her acquaintance that ultimogeniture is the preserved tribal law and custom (Genevieve Plummer op.cit.). The following affidavit, sworn by the sons and daughters of the deceased woman, forms the basis for this decision, which will provide the precedent for future

determinations of property distribution:

> That deponents state that it was always understood that members of (deceased woman) family residing with her would continue to occupy the premises as their home, but that prior to her death she orally stipulated that the real property that she owned was, upon her death, to go to (name) , her youngest **son** (this being tribal custom and an Act of the 81st Congress, 2nd Session, Public Law 765, at the request of the Seneca Nation of Indians, preserved tribal law and custom in regard to land). (June 1973 - Affidavit).

Although in this case, a son was the heir, this does not seem to be inherent in the inheritance process, and youngest daughters are frequently heirs. Ultimogeniture, I believe, is a system of inheritance highly adaptive to a population in which male mobility is widespread and probably related to the indivisability of limited resources at home. The dispersal of elder children during the parents' active adulthood, would leave them dependent in their old age on the youngest child who remained at home and was offered the property as an inducement to care for aged parents.

PROPERTY AND THE QUAKERS

Because theories of social evolution are so identified with nineteenth century thought, we may fail to appreciate how much they were employed in the customary thinking of the eighteenth century. The Quakers had a clear notion of social evolution, and of stages of development, and spoke about the Senecas as being in a state of barbarism which only their acceptance of holding property in severalty would move into a state of civilization. As it was for Morgan (1877), for the

Quakers the development of a concept of private property was definitionally necessary for the advancement to civilization.

The lack of interest which Seneca men demonstrated in a rapid conversion to agriculture was a great problem in the Quakers' overall program because it was through the attachment to the land, developed through a man's labor investment in that land, that the devotion to private property was expected to grow. Although the Philadelphia Quakers were themselves basically an urban, mercantile people, the commitment to agrarian idealism was strong within the Quaker community, and Elias Hicks, the central figure in the Hicksite movement, advocated a return to the tilling of the earth. Roy Harvey Pearce explains the American commitment to agrarian idealism and the association of the concept of private property with it, when he writes:

> Yet belief in the glorious possibilities of a culture built out of cities and cultivated fields was based on something more than Biblical injunction and economic necessity. 'Those who labor in the earth,' Jefferson had written in 1784, 'are the chosen people of God, if ever he had a chosen people. Whose breasts He has made His peculiar deposit for substantial and genuine virtue.' This is agrarian idealism, the belief that men, having a natural right to their land by occupation and labor, achieve status and dignity by exercising that right and becoming freeholding farmers. It is a deep rooted belief, whose theoretical ground derives from the Lockean theory of the free individual and the metaphysics and the sociology of his freedom. For Locke - and virtually all Americans were, in the most general sense, Lockeans - man achieved his highest humanity by taking something out of nature and converting it with his labor into part of himself. His private property, conceived of in terms of the close, personal relationships of an agrarian society, was his

> means to social maturity. It gave him stability, self-respect, privacy, and the basis for civilized society itself. For Americans, the Lockean theory must have made savage society seem loose, immature, virtually anarchic, full of the false freedom of doing as one pleased; likewise, for Americans the theory now must have made it all the more possible to see how Indians could become truly rational animals. All, indeed, that an Indian would need to be on his way to civilization was, in the words of the Secretary of War in 1789, 'a love for exclusive property' (Pearce 1953:67).

In their program for the socio-economic restructuring of Seneca society, the Quakers demonstrated a sensible and gradualistic approach, believing that a commitment to private property would develop out of economic restructuring. And, as I have indicated, in some measure they were right. The Quakers, who were for the most part patient men, made reference to this eventual goal from the beginning of their association with the Senecas, but in 1816 a concatenation of circumstances arose which suddenly transformed what had been a patient waiting coupled with indirect suggestion, into a concerted effort to induce the Senecas to divide the reservation land into allotments held in severalty. Through an explication of these events, I believe the Seneca rejection of the Quakers will be clarified.

In 1804, when the Indians moved onto the reserved land and away from Cornplanter's property, the Quakers were briefly encouraged to believe that this move would hasten their advancement to the acceptance of division in severalty. In this they were disappointed; some of the community dispersed, but many under Handsome Lake's direction, settled in a village

pattern, prepared their fields together, worked them together, and "were Indians still". References to the division of land in severalty were made in Quaker communications to each other, but not apparently formally to the Senecas. Formal addresses by Indian Committee members advocated changes in the division of labor, general attention to farming by men and domestic tasks by women, abstention from alcohol consumption, and abolition of the pattern of brittle marriages. Although, as we have noted, on specific items such as the abolition of reciprocal exchange of food, the Indian community may have chosen to verbally reject Quaker advice, on the whole there was little disagreement with the general outline of their admonitions as a framework for ideal behavior. Except for the frequently successful attempts to control the flow of alcoholic beverages into the community, little pressure was apparently exerted on individuals by the Senecas to conform to what their leaders verbally agreed was desirable behavior. Not only was formal machinery lacking for enforcing decisons, which the Indians frequently pointed out to the Quakers (e.g. I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2, October 19, 1809), but a general permissiveness towards individual behavior was the rule. The same lack of rigid control which the Quakers deplored in the Seneca parent-child relationship (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 1; February 28, 1801) certainly existed among the adult members of the community. So, although the Quakers might advise as they will, the Senecas behaved as they wanted, and took the occasional scolding with good grace.

Although I choose to emphasize the inherence of the advocacy of private property in the total Quaker mission because this is usually ignored and is fundamental to the difficulties that arose, the more well known reason why the issue of property divisions developed when it did is not to be denied. In brief, moves by the Ogden Land Company, which held the preemption rights to the Iroquois reservations in New York State, were at that point threatening to force the Senecas to abandon their reservations, and the Quakers believed that a division into private lots and the withdrawal of control of power over land from the sachems and chiefs would forestall the possibility of wholesale land sales.

From 1798 to 1809, the preemption rights to the reservations of the Senecas were vested in the Holland Land Company, which seemed content to allow its American agents to sell lands other than those possessed by the Indians. But land sales proceeded much less successfully than had been hoped or expected, and a sale of the useless preemption rights of 193,335 acres at fifty cents an acre (Whipple op.cit.:22) to the Ogden Land Company must have been a welcome move. In a letter dated May 29, 1809, Joseph Ellicott, the representative of the Holland Land Company, introduced Thomas L. Ogden of New York City to Jacob Taylor, the Quaker missionary, and requested that Taylor, being best able to do so, provide them with information relative to the feelings of the Indians "in relation to a sale provided a fair equivalent under all circumstances of money and exchange of land to be conveyed to them in fee or an equivalent in land

by way of exchange" (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2; May 29, 1809). Further, Ellicott asked Taylor to give him an estimate of the value of the Allegany Reservation. There is no evidence that Taylor complied with this request, but the Ogden Company must have been satisfied that it could gain control of these reservation lands for future sale, for they purchased the preemption rights in 1810, although at a council held at Buffalo Creek in the fall of 1809, as Cornplanter reported it to the Quakers, "some of the young warriors had said they would kill any chief who should sell any more of their lands and for his part he thought it would be right" (ibid.: October 19, 1809).

What the Ogden Company purchased was not land, but merely rights to purchase land which was contingent upon the Indians' willingness to sell. Unless the company could acquire the land, their investment of approximately $90,000.00 for these rights would have been a total loss. Thereafter, every means which the politically influential men who made up the company could use to bring pressure on the Indians to sell was used. They manipulated federal and state political actions and opinion to remove the Indians to western lands, particularly to lands in Wisconsin, Arkansas and Kansas; they bribed individual Indians and advisors of Indians to acquiesce in their schemes; and they offered a series of alternative suggestions by which they could acquire the more valuable lands in the northern part of New York State, particularly those around Buffalo and Rochester, and remove all the Senecas to the comparatively worthless land of the Allegany reservation.

It seems very likely to me that the Ogden interest in Indian land is intrinsically tied to the proposed and finally constructed Erie Canal. A chronology of the development of the idea of building a canal across the state is provided by The New York State Council on the Arts (1966) in which they note that the idea of building a canal to tie the inland areas around the Great Lakes by waterway to the east coast goes back to at least 1783. But, it was not until January 1809, that a report was submitted which favored a route through to Lake Erie. The politically active Ogdens would undoubtedly have had knowledge of this report and it certainly would have been to their advantage to acquire, at an extraordinarily low price, rights to land which could later be resold either for canal construction itself or for settlement by those who might be expected to rush in for the economic possibilities that proximity to such a waterway might offer. No matter how inflexible the Indians may have seemed on the issue of land sale, it was certainly to Ogden's advantage to purchase those rights to purchase land when they did. It was not until 1842 that the company acquired the valuable lands they sought, and this process of acquisition is amply documented in various accounts (Society of Friends 1844), the specifics of which are both excessively lengthy and irrelevant for this discussion. We should note, however, that the division of reservation land into individually held lots with the right of alienation vested in individual landholders would well serve the interests of the land company, and would have been unlikely to preserve

as a block any land identifiably Indian.

In 1819 the scheme apparently being urged by the Ogden Company was the relocation of all the Senecas to the Allegany Reservation. In a very long letter written by David Ogden to the Indian Committee member, Thomas Stewardson at Philadelphia (I.C.C. Reel II, Box 3: April 7, 1819), Ogden urged, as a humanitarian, the wisdom of this move. He advocated firstly the conversion of the Indians from an independent status (i.e. with sovereignty) to inclusion into the body politic of the United States. Then he insisted that the move of all to Allegany would insure them of enduring protection both from the claims of the land company, which would be relinquished if the move was effected, and further, from the detrimental effects of white contact which would be eliminated because the mountains around the area and the poor soil would act as a limiting factor to white settlement. With a lack of consistency, he claimed that the area had good soil for Indian use and would provide an ample living derived from farming for all the Senecas. It was certainly no coincidence that the previous month, the New York State Assembly passed the following resolution:

> RESOLVED, (if the honorable the Senate concur herein) that his Excellency the Governor be requested to co-operate with the government of the United States in such measures as may be deemed most advisable, in order, as far as it may be found practicable, to induce the several Indian tribes within this state to concentrate themselves in some suitable situation, under such provisions, and subject to such regulations as may be judged most effectual to secure them the best means of protection and instruction in piety,

> and agriculture, and gradually to extend to them the benefits of civilization; and that he is authorized and requested to take such measures, either with or without the co-operation of the government of the United States (New York State Assembly #50 contained in I.C.C. ibid.)

By 1811, Indian agitation about land sales was intense. The Committee in Philadelphia was also greatly distressed, specifically at the possibility of the relocation of the Senecas in the west. They pointed out that such a move "would tend to frustrate the benevolent designs of society, render abortive the exertions made and useless the money expended for the improvement and comfort of these poor people" (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2: June 21, 1811). But the Indians had no intention of selling their land or of relocating elsewhere and thereafter whatever advice they received from any agent of the white world, whether government or missionary or land company, it was always evaluated within the context of potential land loss.

The War of 1812 conveniently intervened to quiet the question of land sale. The wholesale retreat of white settlers from the northwestern part of New York State was not conducive to encourage immediate efforts to acquire more land to sell. (Dorsheimer 1879:197). Because they realized the negative effect that hostile neighbors might have on pressures to force them to sell their land, the Senecas were concerned that their white neighbors feared possible Indian uprisings in the area and went to considerable lengths to reassure them of their peaceful intentions (ibid.:186-189; Turner 1849:588-89). What-

ever their sentiments about the contest between the English and the Americans, the Senecas, whose investments were held for them in trust by the President of the United States, were not likely to side with the English. The Senecas participated actively on the American side (Parker 1916, Cook 1961) and the Quakers saw this participation as particularly detrimental to Indian attention to agricultural pursuits and a spirit of industry. The Quakers were right, insofar as it was lumbering and not farming which claimed the attention of Indian men after the war.

With the end of the war also came a renewal of the pressure from the Ogden Land Company for the sale of Indian lands. Jacob Taylor wrote to the Committee on June 29, 1816 that he had learned from a private source that Horatio Jones and Jasper Parrish, those white captives who had lived with the Senecas and functioned as interpreters since before the establishment of the reservations, had been hired by the preemption company to influence Indian opinion. Taylor reported that a clear majority opposed any sale, and he thought no chiefs were in favor of it; but he added "there has always been a few disapated characters even amongst the chiefs whose intrigue with white men is difficult to detect and for want of faithfulness to their own people has most generally proved the source of the Indians Calamities" (I.C.C. Reel II, Box 3: June 29, 1816).

In this letter, and for the first time so clearly presented, Taylor advanced the position that the division of land into private property "would attach them more generally to the

true value of it and would not leave the decision of their property as much to the chiefs" (ibid.). He remarked that he had introduced the subject at Allegany and that some interest had been shown, particularly insofar as Cornplanter appeared very sympathetic to the proposal. Thereafter Taylor regularly continued to urge the measure at every opportunity in the persistent way that was characteristic of him as it is revealed by his correspondence.

As a brief aside on a subject about which it would be inappropriate here to dwell at length, the position of Jacob Taylor as the gradually emerging major figure in Quaker-Seneca interaction is an interesting one and suggests several questions which are unanswered. When the Quaker mission was extended to include Cattaraugus, Jacob Taylor moved there from Allegany and directed the mission, but under a new set of conditions, for we learn from a letter dated March 16, 1810 that Jacob Taylor was to pay for the cost of the saw and grist mills to be built at Clear Creek and "also the cost of the Southern moiety of the land shall have said property vested in him, reserving to the Committee the right of grinding the grain of the Indians residing on the Cattaraugus reservation one year after the grist mill is in operation toll free" (I.C.C. Reel I, Box 2: March 16, 1810). In 1815 (ibid.: undated) the Clear Creek property of 364 acres and its improvements were noted as the property of Jacob Taylor "in fee simple," although the actual closing of the mission there and the removal of all Quaker property did not occur until October 1822. Taylor, then,

while on the one hand a Quaker missionary, was also a private landholder in the area, whose judgments presumably were influenced by both positions. The frequency with which he was contacted by land company personnel indicates both an appraisal of him as a knowledgable and influential figure with the Indians, and a certain rapport which these officials felt with him. There is nothing in the record to suggest that Taylor operated with anything but the best interests of the Indians as he saw it, but we may be justified in believing that his vision was conditioned by his position. Furthermore, his outspokenness led him to quarrel at least with Cornplanter who, the Quakers reported, turned from them to a Presbyterian missionary and invited him to establish a mission at the Cornplanter settlement because "'he said friends had forsaken him and that one of us (Jacob Taylor) had said he formerly was like a bright star and gave light to his people, but that he is now a dark lamp or like a rattlesnake that poisons them.' However just the simile, it gave great offence for he alledges that such a sentiment coming from a Quaker causes the Indians to think light of his judgment and that they sometimes decline to follow his counsel and that he wanted somebody that would not forsake him" (ibid.: March 15, 1815). Although the Philadelphia Quakers had always urged the resident missionaries to work through the traditional political structure of the Indians, in 1817 they began to suggest measures to curtail the power of chiefs, and these suggestions were at least in part instigated by Taylor himself.

Not only did the Quakers hope that land held in severalty would attach a man more firmly to his land, but they also hoped that it would offset the growing interest in lumbering which depended for its success on free access to communal resources. By cutting off this free access, the Quakers hoped to nip the new activity in the bud, and to redirect interest to farming. By sheer accident, this intention could not have occurred at a worse time, because the obvious defects of a total commitment to intensive farming as a basis of supplying all subsistence needs was at no time more dramatically revealed to be a dangerous procedure as in 1816, "the year without a summer". The accounts of that year and the next until the harvest of 1817 throughout the entire northeastern United States are indeed tragic to learn (Douglas 1951). Crops never matured, and there were killing frosts in every month of the year. Seed was eaten for food and caused widespread disaster the following year. Provisions could not be purchased in most localities and prices in market centers were exhorbitant. A letter from Tunesassa dated March 8, 1817 describes the conditions in terms that resemble Colin Turnbull's account of the Ik (1972):

> Those of them that are young and strong and have money can get to live. The old, infirm, women & children that have not men to hunt for them or otherwise provide are and will be bad off, if they can get something it will be well for them, but I really fear that many of them will be nearly or almost lingering away for the lack of food. We give but very little yet to any, we sell at cost such things for food as we can spare for the needy, we fear to open any door that we cannot close at will...We do not propose to give but very little, and in no case without proper caution in the situation we are placed in (I.C.C. Reel II, Box 3: March 8, 1817).

The Committee requisitioned emergency funds and provisions were purchased and distributed in a manner which suggests much more organization and coherence of the Indian community than the Quakers gave them credit for, and it is possible that the reciprocity that was extant in the community would have operated to prevent death through starvation of any of the Senecas. The Quakers who had worked to reduce the obligations of a reciprocal economic system did not believe the destitute would be provided for, although the differential distribution of wealth within the community, if mobilized for the general welfare, probably could have sustained all. Generously, the Quakers provided emergency relief and the community efficiently handled its distribution. Remembering that the Senecas have an eight clan system, the following description suggests that food distribution was conducted through the clan organization:

> 8 Indian men were appointed by the chiefs to assist us in their several divisions, each man stating to us their number, the several poor within his division, and to stand by to see that the number brought forward by each family was correct...In a council with the chiefs some time previous to the division, the above mentioned way was concluded on as being most likely to give general satisfaction; and we have not as yet heard of any complaints respecting it (ibid.: June 15, 1817).

How much this disaster served to encourage diversification of economic activities it is impossible to say, but those natural occurrences of frost and flood must have influenced a rational evaluation of the economic potential of farming as a total commitment and the wisdom of making inaccessible by

ownership of land in severalty at times of crises those resources which had been open to all and which might sustain all. To borrow an apt summary from Marvin Harris, "We do not have to see a safety valve get stuck and a boiler explode in order to judge that the valve is there because it normally prevents the boiler from destroying itself" (1974:66).

The pressure on the Indians by the Quakers to divide the land intensified after 1816. The subject took precedence over all others in Quaker-Seneca communiques. From the Report made in October, 1817 and submitted by the Committee which had visited the Indians at Allegany and Cattaraugus we learn of at least one of the problems which land division would produce as the Indians saw it, and of the actions which the Quakers were proposing for its instrumentation. The Quakers must either have come prepared with the Declaration which follows, or prepared it on the spot, for Indians to use; we have no reason to believe it was, in fact, ever used. It does show, however, that what the Quakers were suggesting was not a real division into private lots, but rather a system of guaranteed usufruct, and that a major intention was to limit the power of chiefs to alienate land. The Declaration proposes as follows:

> To all People to whom these presents shall come Greeting. Whereas at a public council of the Seneca Nation of Indians at Buffaloe, Cattaraugus and Allegany held at Cattaraugus in the Month of September Anno Domini 1817 it was concluded and agreed to divide the Allegheny Reservation into lots as suitable dimensions to be occupied by individuals and families of the said Seneca Nation of Indians for the separate use and benefit of the occupants respectively in order to promote improvement and ensure to the said occupants

and their heirs the said lots respectively together with the improvements they made thereon but in such manner nevertheless that no individual or family shall be at liberty or have the right of selling, leasing, or making any transfer to any white person and that except for the occupancy of the said individuals and families the whole of the said reservation shall be considered as the property of the said Seneca Nation. But always nevertheless so that the said Seneca Nation shall not have the power or right of selling to any person or persons whomsoever without the consent of the parties interested therein and allowing to the said individuals or families respectively the value of their improvements. And whereas in order to carry into effect the aforesaid agreement the said Allegheny Reservation has been surveyed and laid off into lots agreeably to a plan or map hereunto annexed and certain allotments have been made to individuals or families agreeable to the numbers and names respectively entered therein. Now these Presents witnesseth that the said Seneca Nation of Indians represented at public council held at _____ this _____ day of _____ in the year _____ by the following named Chiefs to wit (here insert the Chiefs names who are to sign on behalf of the Nation) by and with the consent of the said Seneca Nation of Indians and on their behalf in consideration of the aforesaid agreement and in order to render the same good and valid to all the intents and purposes aforesaid have and by these presents do covenant and agree for and on behalf of the aforesaid Seneca Nation and mutually between themselves and for their successors as Chiefs of the said Nation that the said lots respectively numbered and marked with the names of individuals and families shall be and remain the right and property of the individual or family for whom it has been allotted, designated and marked and is from the decease of the occupant then to descend to such child or children or other person or persons to whom the said occupant may by a last will and testament give the same or for want of such will then go to their descendants and the widow of the deceased in such proportions and way and manner (illegible word,) the Nation shall hereafter agree and the lots unappropriated and unmarked shall or may be given by the Nation to such individuals or families as they or any of them shall be prepared to improve the same and their names be written in the said plan or map hereto annexed to be held and

> enjoyed and descend to their posterity in the way and manner of those already marked as above mentioned. And it is also promised, covenanted and agreed that the chiefs of the Seneca Nation of Indians shall not at any time hereafter in any way or manner make over to any Person or Persons the whole or any part of the said Allegheny Reservation without the consent of such Indians as reside thereon which shall appear by said Indians writing their names or placing their mark to a paper prepared for the purpose and explained to them in the presence of at least creditable witnesses of their own choosing... (ibid.: dated September 1817, Report October 16, 1817).

On the face of it, this agreement seems a reasonable compromise with the concept of private property and might be supposed to guarantee the inalienability of the reservation, thus meeting Indian needs of protection from the land company. The Indians, as we shall describe later, doubted that such halfway private property measures were possible to institute so that they would offer legal protection from rapacious white men who, they knew, controlled the legal system. But other issues besides land alienation itself were involved and included the problems of access to dispersed resources, interdigitation of fields, and interreservation mobility.

On this last point, we may remember that Jacob Taylor complained about the renewal of tool lending at Allegany in 1813 because, as he pointed out, there was widespread residential mobility between Allegany and Cattaraugus and he was afraid that the Cattaraugus people would be adversely influenced. Although the population numbers remained fairly constant, a comparison of any list of names of residents from one year to the next reveals a change in personnel, and following the

history of any one individual (e.g. Jacob Johnson in Wayman 1965) demonstrates a great deal of mobility between the reservations, for relocation as well as for visits. With a permanent allocation of land, the possibility of easy mobility would be curtailed.

The fact that Allegany, alone of the reservations, was singled out for the experiment in division must have been very disquieting to them. It is never clear from the proposals just who were to receive allotments of land at Allegany although the Quakers presumably believed it was to be those currently resident, including as the Allegany representative to the council stated, "a number of Onondagas among them, whom they considered the same people as themselves and that in the division of their land they would allow them to occupy lots equal with themselves" (ibid.). But the Indians in general were very specific in insisting that the reservation at Allegany did not belong to the people at Allegany in particular, but the Nation at large and a speech by Pollard, a leading figure at the Buffalo Creek reservation, suggests that perhaps non-residents might have legitimately claimed land. He said:

> Your advice is to divide our land and hold it for the benefit of ourselves and our children. You think it best to run it off into lots. We have considered it all round and we will tell you brothers what our conclusion is - When any person wishes to try an experiement they make a beginning to see how it will do. We have agreed to let the Allegany Reservation all be run out into lots. It belongs to the whole of the Seneca Nation we are all consenting to it. That reservation we wish should all be run out into lots and be for the whole of the nation. We don't want it parted from the rest, but be all included in one deed and signed by the whole (ibid.).

Although the Quakers did not recognize it at the time, apparently the Allegany Indians were not receptive to being used experimentally and alone vulnerable to all the problems they understood to be inherent in the division question. They, more than any other reservation, had received the continued help and attention of the Quakers, and now they alone were to bear the burden of the Quaker experiment in land division which would, without question, block the development of the lumbering industry which had just begun and which required unlimited access to forest resources without considerations of trespass. Of course, this is just what the Quakers had in mind. The visit to Allegany, described in the same report, revealed a most unsatisfactory situation to the Quakers. Agriculture had come to a stop, and men were diverted by the lumbering activities; "they have more horses than is of any advantage to them," they noted, which I have suggested may be specifically tied with the developing lumber trade, and the Quakers observed a general condition of disorder in the villages. As an indication of the agitation which the Allegany community must have been experiencing, a witchcraft accusation within the community arose while the Quakers were present and was calmed only with much difficulty.

Letters from Jacob Taylor to the Committee indicated a continued enthusiasm for the divisions, and on February 16, 1818 he wrote saying that the time had come to survey the Allegany Reservation preparatory to making the divisions. He recommended that Cotton Fletcher, a surveyor for the Holland

Land Company, be hired to carry out the work. Again, we should observe that although no collusion may have been operative, the utilization of a land company surveyor who might be seen as an agent for those trying to effect the sale of the reservation, could be very threatening to the Indians who did not want to sell.

Cotton Fletcher later reported to Jacob Taylor that he had arrived on August 4, 1818 ready to begin the work which he had been led to believe met with general approval. Instead, he found, he was met by a delegation of Senecas headed by Cornplanter who expressed themselves firmly opposed to any survey and who invited both Fletcher and Jonathan Thomas, the Quaker missionary, to immediately depart from their land. This they did and Fletcher remarked to Taylor that "whether it will be expedient for you to come over here or not, I do not know. I suspect thee cannot anything be done with the Indians at present" (ibid.: August 11, 1818).

On August 24, 1818, a group of chiefs who were in favor of the divisions wrote to the Committee requesting that they procure some kind of official document from the President of the United States saying that he wished the divisions to be made and that such divisions would strengthen their title to the land. Such a document, they said, would effectively quiet the opposition (ibid.: August 24, 1818). But a clarification of federal level governmental policy was never forthcoming, and the Indians received two different sets of instructions, both purporting to be directly from the top administrative

level. On the one hand, Jasper Parrish read in a council a letter from the Secretary of War representing the President, which instructed them for their own benefit, to remove immediately to Arkansas and to ignore the advice "of officious and designing men" who were obstructing the move (ibid.: August 18, 1818); on the other hand, they received a letter from James Monroe, the President, endorsing the Quakers as friends of the Indians and advising strict land divisions comparable to those of white society which would effect their progress towards civilization (ibid.: January 15, 1819). In addition, as we have already noted at length, by March 4, 1819, the New York Assembly was advocating the consolidation of all the Indians in one place, and David Ogden had identified that place most suitably as the Allegany Reservation. It is no surprise that the tension at Allegany continued to mount and that the Quakers specifically became identified as the locus of the Indian problem.

THE SENECAS REACT

My discussion of the events of this period has thus far made no mention of the influence of other Christian missionaries which was growing particularly at Buffalo Creek and to a lesser extent at Cattaraugus. At Allegany, the Presbyterians had made minor inroads through the agency of Cornplanter, but he reversed his position on the advantages of such association, and the Reverend Timothy Alden reported him to have been of obviously "deranged mind" (1827:138) because he decided that Christianity was for white men and that he would follow the

way of the Great Spirit. Alden's report, clearly partisan as it was, is the basis for Wallace's assertion of Cornplanter's state of insanity during this period (1970:327-9), during which Cornplanter, with the model of his halfbrother, Handsome Lake, undoubtedly in mind, received messages from the Great Spirit instructing him to direct the Indians to reject the advice and ways of white man. Other accounts, which do not rely on Alden, reveal Cornplanter to have been a rational man who elected to live out his life in an Indian manner, who was cordial to guests and lucid in council (e.g. Sipe op.cit.; Tome 1854). Wallace and others have repeatedly emphasized a clear factional division into Christian and Pagan groups which formed the ideological basis for decision-making, but Abler has ably demonstrated that such factional divisions are a spurious model of reality and that on the separate and important issues which divided public opinion such as emigration, land divisions, and a chief versus a constitutional form of government such ideological allegiances did not form the basis of the divisions (1967; 1969). A revealing statement from Buffalo makes the point that "the two parties no longer divide upon the point of religion but upon the broader question of civilization" (I.C.C. ibid.: July 10, 1819). If we read "civilization" as "private property," which I believe we may justifiably do based on the arguments already presented, then the issue which divided the Allegany Senecas in particular was not Christian versus Pagan, emblematic as these terms were, but rather private property versus communal property; and the

specific objects of hostility and attack were not missionaries in general, who were more concerned with religious conversion and less with social restructuring, but rather the Quaker missionaries, who were primarily concerned with socio-economic restructuring and land divisions.

The resurgence of a nativistic movement is reported by Alden in a letter of August 28, 1818 in which he describes the council held at Tonnawanda. "The great object of this council," he writes, "was to revive the moral instructions from Godkukkewaunau Konnedieyu (i.e. Handsome Lake)" (op.cit.:58). These religious occasions also offered the opportunity for the "Pagan" Senecas to meet at one place away from the observation of their opponents and to formulate political strategy on an inter-reservation basis. Ceremonies and worship dances were renewed at Allegany at this period and heavily attended, and in a letter in which Joseph Elkinton describes the hostility from the community which he is enduring, he remarks that the sawmill irons which had been given by the Quakers to build the Indian mill had been dismantled and the iron sold to pay for the cost of repairs to a ceremonial house (I.C.C. op.cit.: December 3, 1820).

Joseph Elkinton, who had come to perform as a schoolmaster, was most concerned with the issue of schooling which was receiving a hostile reception from most of the community, but larger issues were obviously involved, as his conversation with Blacksnake reveals. Elkinton said that "Blacksnake said their people did not know why friends had told them the name

of a Seneca would in a few years only be known in history, if they did not endeaveur to take hold of improvements, and many of their people were not pleased with such a language being told them, that they felt no objection to being killed if that was to be their lot, which they thought very little worse than losing their lands would be, which they considered very probable - said also that it had now been twenty years since friends came amongst them, that their people had become more & more divided since that time & had now become two parties, that friends had recommended them to divide their reservation & each family have separate farms, which measure the Indians had undertaken & found it a bad one & did not accomplish, that the Quakers still advised them to it, notwithstanding they were aware of the difficulties that had been made in the Nation, by the proposition & stated as much as if friends had been in great measure the cause of the difficulties & divisions among the Indians" (ibid.:December 3, 1820).

Elkinton was afraid for his own safety, an attitude which was apparently shared by Jonathan Thomas and several Indians sympathetic to the Quakers. Apparently this fear was justified because, as Elkinton reported, "Blue Eyes was telling me on 2 day evening last, that one of the Indians said he would get a hickory & give me a whipping as I went back & forth to the school by his house, and other of them intended to break the boat that I crossed the river with, & last evening when I returned home I found the skiff was considerably broken, shivered apparently with the pole of an axe, but I have not

yet found the lambaster...In going back & forth thro' Cold Spring I often think it is like the 'blackness of darkness' & feel glad when I get away from the village" (ibid.).

This incident marked not only the high point of Indian hostility towards the Quakers, but also the withdrawal by the Quakers from further concerted efforts to effect land divisions, although the subject was referred to repeatedly. By 1821, the Quakers arranged to lease the Tunesassa property for a year, although the missionaries were to stay on and focus their attention on the school. But they were very discouraged and Jonathan Thomas wrote to the Committee that "I often feel myself wore out with thoughts & discourses with these people on their difficult divided situation, as it relates to Indian customs & a gradual advance to civilized life. They have so many excuses in the one, & so little resolution to put in practice the other, that it sometimes bring to my mind a doubt whether they ever will become a people much changed, from what they are at present" (ibid.: March 27, 1821). For the first time, the Quakers were considering the possibility that the object of their mission, their efforts and their money would never be accomplished.

Agitation in the Indian community remained high for a while and a movement was commenced to divide the reservation into two parts; one for those who wished to retain communal ownership, the other for those who wished to divide. This was phrased as a Christian versus Pagan division (and the

proposal came from the Pagan side), but the land division implications are clear (ibid.: March 5, 1821). The prototype for this kind of division was not lacking and the Oneidas had effected such a one in 1805 (Ricciardelli 1963:313). Although the suggestion was made many times, it did not go into effect at Allegany at any point.

The advisability of land divisions was reconsidered again and again by the Indian community, but each time rejected. In 1885, Judge Sherman remarked that "The Senecas have heretofore resisted every effort made by the State of New York to induce them to allot their lands in severalty, under the apprehension that such allotments might result in breaking up their tribal relations, and so forfeit their reservations to the Ogden Land company" (1885:11). Sherman's statement generally does sum up the major Indian objections to the divisions of which we have access to the specifics from Quaker reports of Indian statements in 1819 and 1824. These reveal Indian concerns directly and confirm my analysis of the indirect evidence of the implications of land divisions for the Seneca community.

In 1819, Jonathan Thomas reported to the Committee the substance of conversations he had been having with Senecas concerning the divisions. This letter reveals that early Seneca objections were concerned with the effect such divisions would have on the subsistence economy and access to resources on the division of labor and the rights of women. We should especially note here that women emerge, as they

rarely do in Quaker reports, as directly opposed to the proposed changes. Thomas writes:

> ...many questions arose such as how will we do where our fields lay promiscuously or in confused division and all shapes & lines spliting & separating them & perhaps occupied by others, without a consideration for them. The women seemed to claim such parcels of land for planting corn, & potatoes, etc., on and the idea of a division into lots became very unpopular with them because they were sensible that clearing land was a hard task to perform by them & much difficulty to get their men to do it on account their favorite scheme cuting pine logs to run to market instead of the labour of the field for subsistence...may cut where most convient without control. Many think that if divided into lots they cannot do this & that lots that may fall to them will not have within its lines bottom land for planting, and pine for rafting & say better owned in common (ibid.: March 17, 1819).

By 1824, in addition to the above consideration, a new set of problems was suggested. Joseph Elkinton related a conversation he had with Blacksnake who described a council held at Tonawanda in which the issue of land division had been discussed and, after due consideration, rejected on the grounds that there were too many disadvantages involved. Elkinton asked Blacksnake to enumerate these "difficulties and disadvantages" and received a list which included first, the problem of the division of interdigitated fields and the threat of a loss of labor investments. Secondly, the Indians believed that the preemption holders would find a way to purchase land from individual deed-holders. Furthermore, it seemed very likely that land held by deed would be subject to seizure by white people in lieu of payment for credit that they had extended to Indians, which was a common practice. Then land

privately held would likely be subject to taxation (and Cornplanter had had this problem arise in 1822 (ibid.: January 2, 1822; and February 11, 1822) so that the Indians would have been made aware of the likelihood of being subject to taxes). It seemed to the Indians that it would be impossible to remove whites who leased land from private-property owning individual Indians, and that such whites would provide poor moral examples. Lastly, as a general summation, Blacksnake declared that "it would not answer." When Joseph Elkinton pointed out that these objections could be met by dividing the land conditionally, as the Quakers had proposed in 1817, Tunis Halftown objected by saying that it was an odd kind of private property which did not vest the rights of alienation in the property holder, and a kind of private property unknown in the white world. Elkinton's response was to suggest that they were creating problems which were not real (ibid.: November 21, 1824).

With a rejection by the Senecas of the Quakers over the issue of land divisions, a new phase of interaction between these groups was begun; the Quakers ceased to believe they could transform the adult community and chose instead to focus on schooling for the young with the hope that gradual indoctrination of children might make the next generation more responsive to "civilization." The Indians tried to reinstitute the relationship on the old basis; they were deeply distressed at the withdrawal of the Philadelphia Quakers from active concern and support and appealed to them to remain and continue

their assistance; but those who rejected the Quakers' suggestions for land divisions, continued adamant in their refusal to yield on this issue, and preferred Quaker withdrawal to compromise. The other side, who obviously felt themselves totally vulnerable to threats from the white world and in need of constant protection by white friends, pointed out that they were not prepared to be abandoned, that those who had been taught skills were on the Pagan side and that the others continued to need help (ibid.: March 29, 1822). It is interesting to speculate that those who felt most prepared to deal with the white world should feel most able to oppose and reject white mediators, and that it was feelings of differential vulnerability which underlay opposition or acquiescence to white demands for compliance.

But almost all of the Allegany Senecas, after the initial acting out of hostility, indicated again and again that they wished the Quakers to remain and they predicted that, if the Quakers withdrew, this would open a breach for active missionary entry which had already occurred on the other reservations (ibid.: September 14, 1823). "Do not cast us off," the Indians appealed (ibid.: March 13, 1825) and, in fact, the Quakers didn't, but the twenty-five years of the active interaction of responsible adults, of the setting of conditions and making adjustments and compromises over the terms of this interaction were over, ended by the lack of flexibility of a position on which compromise was not possible. By proposing to dissolve

the basis of Seneca tribal relations, as the quotation at the beginning of this chapter described it, the Quakers were threatening the very foundation of their Indian identity and their viability as a community. Of all the threats which this identity and viability would face that offered by the Quakers was apparently the least malicious and came to be recognized as such by the Indians. But the Quakers, whose stable internal organization was at the same time shaken by the dissension of the Hicksite Movement, could not tolerate the novel hostility of the Indians and withdrew from that active intervention which offered the Indians the possibility of questioning the motives of "friends like these."

REFERENCES CITED

Abler, Thomas S.
1967 "Seneca Nation Factionalism: The First Twenty Years." In E. Tooker (ed.) Iroquois Culture, History, and Prehistory: Proceedings of the 1965 Conference on Iroquois Research. The University of the State of New York; New York State Museum. Albany, New York.

1969 Factional Dispute and Party Conflict in the Political System of the Seneca Nation (1845-1895): An Ethnohistorical Analysis. (Dissertation.) University of Toronto. Microfilm: National Library of Canada, Toronto.

Adams, W. (ed.)
1893 Historical Gazeteer and Biographical Memorial of Cattaraugus County, New York. Lyman, Horton & Co., Ltd. Syracuse, New York.

Albert, George D.
1896 Report of the Commission to Locate the Sites of the Frontier Forts of Pennsylvania. Clarence M. Bursch.

Alden, Timothy (Rev.)
1827 An Account of Sundry Missions Performed Among the Senecas and Munsees: In a Series of Letters. J. Seymour, New York.

American State Papers
1832 Class I, Indian Affairs, Vol. I. Washington, D.C.

Barker, Charles A.
1970 American Convictions: Cycles of Public Thought 1600-1850. J.B. Lippincott Company, New York.

Beals, Alan R. and Siegel, Bernard J.
1960 "Pervasive Factionalism." American Anthropologist, Vol. 62 #3. p. 394-417.

Divisiveness and Social Conflict: An Anthropological Approach. Stanford University Press. Stanford, Ca.

Berkhofer, Robert F.
1965a "Faith and Factionalism Among the Senecas: Theory and Ethnohistory." Ethnohistory, Vol. 12 #2. p. 99-112.

1965b Salvation and the Savage: An Analysis of Protestant Missions and American Indian Response 1878-1862. University of Kentucky Press, Lexington Ky.

1971 "The Political Context of a New Indian History." Pacific Historical Review, Vol. XL #3. P. 357-382.

Bigelow, Albert (Rev.)
1896 "The Indian Show of Storrs & Company." Buffalo Historical Society, Vol. IV. Buffalo, New York, p. 415-16.

Blacksnake Memoirs "The Draper Collection." State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Madison, Wisc.

Brown, Jennifer
1973 "British Fur Trade Domesticity in Northern Wilds: Some Cases and Implications." Ms. (read at the American Antropological Association Meeting at Toronto.)

Brown, Judith
1970 "Economic Organization and the Position of Women Among the Iroquois." Ethnohistory, Vol. 17 #3-4. p. 151-167.

Burges, George
1965 A Journal of a Surveying Trip into Western Pennsylvania under Andrew Ellicott in the Year 1795 When the Towns of Erie, Warren, Franklin and Waterford Were Laid Out. John Comming, Mt. Pleasant, Mich.

Carr, Lucien
1883 "On the Social and Political Position of Women Among the Huron-Iroquois Tribes." Harvard University Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology Report #16. Harvard, Mass. p. 207-232.

Cattaraugus County Planning Board
1968 Physical Resource Survey of Cattaraugus County: A Survey of Selected Physical Resources and Appraisal of The Limitations and Potentials for Development in Cattaraugus County, New York. Little Valley, New York.

Chazanoff, William 1970 — Joseph Ellicott and the Holland Land Company: The Opening of Western New York. Syracuse University Press. Syracuse, New York.

Clayton, James L. — "The Growth and Economic Significance of The American Fur Trade 1790-1890." Selected Papers of the 1965 North American Fur Trade Conference. Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul, Minn. p. 62-72.

Cole, Alan 1965 — "The Quakers and the English Revolution." In T. Aston (ed.) Crisis in Europe 1560-1660. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

Colson, Elizabeth 1953 — The Makah Indians: A Study of An American Tribe in Modern American Society. The University of Manchester Press, Manchester, England.

Cook, Frederick 1887 — Journals of the Military Expedition of Major General John Sullivan. Auburn, Knapp, Peck & Thompson.

Cook, Lura L. 1961 — "The War of 1812 on the Frontier." Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society. Vol. IX, Buffalo, New York.

Cooper, William 1810 — A Guide in the Wilderness: or the History of the First Settlement in the Western Counties of New York, With Useful Instructions to Future Settlers. Gilbert & Hodges, 37 Dame St., Dublin, Ireland. (Reprint: George P. Humphrey, Rochester, New York. With an Introduction by James Fenimore Cooper. 1897.)

Craven, Wesley F. 1968 — The Colonies in Transition 1660-1713. Harper Torchbook. New York.

Cross, Whitney R. — The Burned-over District: The Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Religion in Western New York 1800-1850. Cornell University Press. Ithaca, New York.

Davis, Ralph 1973 — The Rise of the Atlantic Economies. Cornell University Press. Ithaca, New York.

Deardorff, Merle H. 1941 — "The Cornplanter Grant in Warren County." The Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine. Vol. 24 #1.

1944 "Our Revolutionary Battle." Warren County Almanac. Warren, Pennsylvania

1946 "Zeisberger's Allegheny River Indian Towns 1767-1770." Pennsylvania Archaeologist, Vol. 16 #1.

1951 "The Religion of Handsome Lake: Its Origin and Development." In W. Fenton (ed.) "Symposium on Local Diversity in Iroquois Culture." Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin #149. Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C. p. 79-101.

Dearforff, Merle H. and Snyderman, George C. 1956 "A Nineteenth Century Journal of a Visit to the Indians of New York." (Journal of John Philips.) Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol.100 #6. p.582-612.

Deloria, Vine Jr. 1969 Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto. Avon, New York.

Depres, Leo A. 1964 "The Impliations of Nationalist Politics in British Guiana for the Development of Cultural Theory." American Anthropologist, Vol. 66. p. 1051-1077.

Diamond, Stanley 1961 Seneca Fieldwork: Unpublished Notes.

Doherty, Robert W. 1967 The Hicksite Separation: A Sociological of Religious Schism in Early Nineteenth Century America. Rutgers University Press. New Jersey.

Dorsheimer, William 1879 "The Village of Buffalo During the War of 1812." Buffalo Historical Society Vol. I, p. 185-209.

Douglass, Harry S. 1951 "Pioneer Experiences in Western New York." New York History: The Quarterly Journal of the New York State Historical Association, Vol. XXXII, #3.

Doty, William J. (ed.) 1940 The Historic Annals of Southwestern New York. Lewis Historical Publishing Comapny, Inc. New York.

Dragoo, Don
1974 Carnegie Museum, Pittsburgh, Pa. Private Correspondence.

Elkinton, Joseph
1914 "The Quaker Mission Among the Indians of New York State." Buffalo Historical Society, Vol. 18, p. 167-189.

Ellicott, Joseph
1937 "Reports of Joseph Ellicott as Chief Surveyor (1797-1800) and as Agent (1800-1821) of the Holland Land Company's Purchase in Western New York." (R.W. Bingham (ed.) Buffalo Historical Society, Publication #32. (2 vols.)

Ellis, Franklin
1879 History of Cattaragus County, New York, With Illustrations and Biographical Sketches of Some of its Prominent Men and Pioneers. L. H. Everts, Philadelphia, Pa.

Ember, Carol and Ember, Melvin
1971 "The Conditions Favoring Matriolocal vs. Patrilocal Residence." American Anthropologist, Vol. 73 #3.

Erikson, Kai T.
1966 Wayward Puritans: A Study in the Sociology of Deviance. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York.

Evans, Paul D.
1924 The Holland Land Company. Buffalo Historical Society. Buffalo, New York.

Everett, Edward A.
1922 (Chairman of the Indian Commission: New York State Legislature 1922) "Report of The New York State Indian Commission to Investigate the Status of the American Indian Residing in the State of New York." Transmitted to the Legislature, March 17, 1922. (Rejected.) Privately printed in 1972.

Everts, L. H.
1879 History of Cattaraugus County, New York. J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Fenton, William N.
1940a "Some Problems Arising from the Historic Northeastern Position of the Iroquois." Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collection #100. Washington, D.C., p. 159-253.

1940b "Masked Medicine Societies of the Iroquois." Smithsonian Institute Annual Report 1940. p. 397-430.

1941 "Iroquois Suicide: A Study in the Stability of a Culture Pattern." Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin #128, Anthropological Papers #14, Washington, D.C.

1942 "Fish Drives Among the Cornplanter Seneca." Pennsylvania Archaeologist Vol. XII #3, p.48-52.

1945a "A Day in the Allegheny Ox-Bow." The Living Wilderness #13., p.1-8.

1945b "Place Names and Related Activities of the Cornplanter Senecas." Pennsylvania Archaeologist, Vol. XV #1, #2, #3, #4 and
1946 Vol. XVI #2

1948 "The Present Status of Anthropology in Northeastern North America: A Review Article." American Anthropologist, Vol.50.

1949 "Collecting Materials for a Political History of the Six Nations." American Philosophical Society Proceedings #93 #3, Philadelphia, Pa., p. 233-38.

1951a "The Concept of Locality and the Program Of Iroquois Research." Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin #149, Washington, D.C.

1951b "Locality as a Basic Factor in the Development of Iroquois Social Structure." (ibid.)

1952 "Factionalism in American Indian Society." International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Actes du IV Congress., Vol. II.

1953 "Cultural Stability and Change in American Indian Societies." Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland Journal, Vol. 83, p.169-174.

1956 "Toward the Gradual Civilization of the Indian Natives: The Missionary and Linguistic Work of Asher Wright (1803-1875) Among the Senecas of Western New York. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 100 #6.

1961 "Iroquois Culture History: A General Evaluation." In W. N. Fenton and John Gulick (eds.) "Symposium on Cherokee and Iroquois Culture." Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin #180. Washington, D.C.

1968 Parker on the Iroquois. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, New York.

1971 "The Iroquois in History" In E. Leacock and N.O. Jurie (eds.) North American Indians in Historical Perspective, Random House, New York.

Forbes, Jack D. 1968 "Frontiers in American History and the Role of the Frontier Historian." Ethnohistory Vol. 15 #3, P.203-225.

Foreman, Carolyn T. 1943 Indians Abroad 1493-1938, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Okla.

Freilich, Morris 1958 "Cultural Persistence Among the Modern Iroquois." Anthropos Vol. 53, p.473-83.

Frost, J. William 1973 The Quaker Family in Colonial America: A Portrait of the Society of Friends St. Martin's Press, New York.

Gates, Paul W. 1960 The Farmer's Age: Agriculture 1815-1860. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York

Gouldner, Alvin and Peterson, Richard 1962 Notes on Technology and the Moral Order Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, Inc.

Graymont, Barbara 1972 The Iroquois in the American Revolution. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, N.Y.

Hagan, William T. 1961 The American Indian, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Harder, John F. 1963 The Indian Policy of Henry Knox 1785-1794, Unpublished thesis. Department of History, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

Hardesty, Donald L. 1972 "The Human Ecological Niche.", American Anthropologist Vol. 74 #4, P.458-466.

Harris, Marvin 1974 Cows, Pigs, Wars, and Witches: The Riddles of Culture, Random House, New York.

Heckewelder, John 1876 History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian Nations. Original 1817, printed by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelpha.

Hedrick, Ulysses P. 1933 A History of Agriculture in the State of New York. New York State Agricultural Society. (Reprint: American Century Series, Hill & Wang, New York, 1966.)

Helms, Mary W. 1969 "The Purchase Society: Adaptation to Economic Frontiers." Anthropological Quarterly Vol. 42 #4, p. 325-342.

1971 Asang: Adaptations to Culture Contact in a Miskito Community. University of Florida, Press, Gainesville, Fla.

Hertzberg, Hazel 1971 The Search for An American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, New York.

Horsman, Reginald 1970a The Frontier in the Formative Years 1783-1815. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York

1970b "The Origins of Indian Removal 1815-1824." Historical Society of Michigan, Michigan State University Press.

Houghton, Frederick 1920 "The History of the Buffalo Creek Reservation." Publications of the Buffalo Historical Society, Vol. XXIV, Buffalo, New York.

Hewitt, E. 1820 Selections from Letters Written during a Tour through the United States, in the Summer and Autumn of 1819; Illustrative of the Character of the Native Indians, and of their Descent from the Lost Ten Tribes of Israel; as well as Description of the Present Situation and Sufferings of Emigrants and of the Soil and State of Agriculture. J. Dunn, Market Place, London, England.

Hunt, George T. 1940 The Wars of the Iroquois: A Study of Intertribal Trade Relations. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wis.

Hunter, William A. 1956 "Refugee Fox Settlements Among the Senecas." Ethnohistory Vol 3 #1, p.11-20.

Hyde, Jabez B. 1903 "A Teacher Among the Senecas: Historical and Personal Narrative of Jabez Bachus Hyde, who came to the Buffalo Creek Mission in 1811. Written in 1820." Buffalo Historical Society Publication Vol. 6, New York, p.239-274.

Indian Committee Collection 1791-1802 Reel I, Box 1 1803-1815 Reel 1, Box 2 1816-1830 Reel II, Box 3 Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Archives. Friends' Book Store, 302 Arch St., Philadelphia. (Manusacript collection on microfilm: on file at the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. Pa.)

Indian Committee Minutes — (Manuscript bound in books). Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Archieves, Friends' Book Store, 302 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Izmirlian, Harry Jr. 1969 — "Structural and Decision-Making Models: A Political Example." American Antropologist Vol. 71 #6, p.1062-1073.

Jackson, Halliday
1806
1810-1818
1814
1817 — Journals (unpublished manuscripts) Chester County Historical Society. (Microfilm copies filed at the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, Ps.)
(c.f. G. Snyderman: this bibliography)

1798-1800 — Journal. (manuscript) Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Pa.
(c.f. A.F.C. Wallace: this bibliography)

1830 - — Civilization of the Indian Natives. Marcus T.C. Gould, Philadelphia, Pa.

Jacobs, Wilbur
1950 — Wilderness Politics and Indian Gifts: The Northern Colonial Frontier 1748-1763. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, Neb.

1967 — The Appalachian Indian Frontier. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, Neb.

1971 — "The Fatal Confrontation: Early Native-White Relations on the Frontiers of Australia, New Guinea and America - A Comparative Study." Pacific Historical Review Vol. XL #2, p.283-309.

1972 — Dispossessing the American Indian: Indians and Whites on the Colonial Frontier. Charles Schribner's Sons, New York.

Kappler, Charles J.
1972 — Indian Treaties 1778-1883. Interland Publishing, Inc., New York.

Kass, Alvin
1965 — Politics in New York State 1800-1830. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, New York.

Kaufman, Martin
1964 — "War Sentiment in Western Pennsylvania: 1812." Pennyslvania History Vol. XXXI #4, P.436-448.

Kelsey, Rayner W.
1917 — Friends and Indians 1655-1917. The Associated Executive Committee of Friends of Indian Affairs, Philadelphia, Pa.

Kent, Donald H. and Deardorff, Merle H. 1960 — "John Adlum on the Allegheny: Memoirs for the Year 1794." The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography Vol. LXXXIV #3, #4

Kroeber, Alfred L. 1939 (orig.) — Cultural and Natural Areas of Native North America. University of California Press, Berkely (1963 reprint).

Kussart, Serepta 1938 — The Allegheny River. Burgum Printing Company, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Lambrecht, William E. 1967 — Civilization of the Indians 1783-1812. Unpublished thesis, Department of History, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

Lane, Rebecca A. and Sublett, Audrey J. 1972 — "Osteology of Social Organization: Residence Patterns." American Antiquity Vol. 37 #2.

Leacock, Eleanor B. and Lurie, Nancy O. (eds.) 1971 — North American Indians In Historical Perspective. Random House, New York.

Linton, Ralph 1936 — The Study of Man. D. Appleton-Century Co., New York.

Lurie, Nancy Oestreich 1971 — "The Contemporary American Indian Scene." In Leacock and Lurie (eds.) (ibid.).

1959 — "Indian Cultural Adjustment to European Civilization." In James M. Smith (ed.) Seventeenth-Century American Essays in Colonial History. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Macgregor, Gordon 1970 — "Changing Society: The Teton Dakotas." In Ethel Nurge (ed.) The Modern Sious: Social Systems and Reservation Culture, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, Neb.

MacLeod, William C. 1928 — The American Indian Frontier. Alfred Knopf, New York.

MacNeish, Richard S. and Ritchie, William A. 1952 — "Pre-Iroquoian Pottery of New York State." American Antiquity, Vol. 15, p.97-124.

McAllister Collection — Historical Society of Pennsylvania (Manuscript Collection) Philadelphia, Pa.

McFee, Malcolm 1968 "The 150% Man, a Product of Blackfeet Acculturation." American Anthropologist Vol. 70 #6, p. 1096-1107.

McMahon, Helen G. 1958 Chautauqua County: A History. Henry Stewart, Inc., Buffalo, New York.

McNall, Neil A. 1952 An Agricultural History of the Genesee Valley 1790-1860. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, Pa.

Manley, Henry S. 1947 "Buying Buffalo from the Indians." Proceedings of the New York State Historical Association, Vol. 45, p.313-329.

1960 "Indian Reservation Ownership in New York." The New York State Bar Bulletin, p.134-138.

Mason, Carol Y. 1936 "The Geography of Allegany State Park." New York State Museum Circular #16. Albany, New York.

Mau, Clayton 1944 The Development of Central and Western New York: From the Arrival of the White Man to the Eve of the Civil War, as Portrayed Chronologically in Contemporary Accounts. The Dubois Press, Rochester, New York.

Morgan, Lewis H. 1851 League of the Ho-De-No-Sau-Nee, or Iroquois. Dodd, Mead & Co., New York. (Reprint: Corinth Books, Inc., New York 1962).

1877 Ancient Society: or, Researches in the Line of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. (Reprint:1964)

1881 Houses and House-Life of the American Aborigines. Reprint: The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill. 1965.

Murdock George P. 1949 Social Structure. Macmillan Co., New York.

1967 Ethnographic Atlas. University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Murphy Robert F. 1971 The Dialectics of Social Life: Alarms and Excursions in Anthropological Theory. Basic Books, Inc., New York.

New York State Council on the Arts 1966 "The Canal Courier - The Erie Canal."

Noon, James A. 1949 — "Law and Government of the Grand River Iroquois." The Viking Fund, Inc. #12, New York.

Norton, Major John 1970 — "The Journal of Major John Norton (1809-1816)" Carl F. Klinck and James J. Tolman (eds.) The Publications of the Champlain Society. Vol. 46, The Champlain Society, Toronto, Canada.

O-He-Yo-Noh — Mimeographed newspaper of the Allegany Seneca Reservation. Haley Buildings, Salamanca, N.Y.

O'Rielly Collection — New York Historical Society (manuscript collection). New York, N.Y.

Park, Charles E. 1954 — "Puritans and Quakers." New England Quarterly Vol. XXVII.

Parker, Arthur C. 1912 — "Iroquois Uses of Maize and Other Food Plants." New York State Museum Bulletin #144. University of the State of New York, Albany

1913 — "The Code of Handsome Lake, The Seneca Prophet." New York State Museum Bulletin #163. University of the State of New York, Albany.

1916 — "The Senecas in the War of 1812." Proceedings of the New York State Historical Association, Vol. XV, p.78-80.

1926 — "The History of the Seneca Indians." Empire State Historical Publication XLIII, Ira J. Friedman, Inc., New York

Parker, Ely (papers) — American Philosophical Society, Manuscript Collection, Philadelphia, Pa.

Parrish, John 1892 — "Extracts from the Journal of John Parrish 1773." The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, Vol. XVI #4, p.443-448.

Parrish, Samuel 1877 — Some Chapters in the History of the Friendly Association for Regaining and Preserving Peace with the Indians by Pacific Measures. Friends' Historical Association of Philadelphia.

Parry, J. H. 1961 — The Establishment of the European Hegemony: 1415-1715. Harper Torchbooks, New York.

Pearce, Roy Harvey 1953 — The Savages of America: A Study of the Indian and the Idea of Civilization. The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

Pearson, C. S. (director) 1940 — "Soil Survey of Cattaraugus County, New York." United States Department of Agriculture in Cooperation with Cornell University Agricultural Experimental Station, Series 1935 #12. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C.

Peckham, Howard H. 1961 — Pontiac and the Indian Uprising. Russell & Russell, New York.

Pierce, John — "Journals" (typed version of manuscript). American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, Pa.

1798 — "Fragment of John Pierce's Oneida Journal 1798." Box D10A

1801 — "Visit to Cornplanter" (August 31, 1801 to September 30, 1801) Box D10A

Plummer, Genevieve — (Surrogate: Seneca Nation, 1974): Personal Interviews and Surrogate Notebooks and Records

Postal, Susan S. 1965 — "Hoax Nativism at Caughnawaga: A Control Case for the Theory of Revitalization." Ethnology Vol. IV #3.

Prucha, Francis P. 1962 — American Indian Policy in the Formative Years: The Indian Trade and Intercourse Acts, 1790-1834. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Prufer, Olaf F. 1965 — "The McGraw Site: A Study in Hopewellian Dynamics." Scientific Publications of the Cleveland Museum of Natural History, n.s. Vol.4 #1.

Randle, Martha 1941 — "Iroquois Women Then and Now." in W. Fenton (ed.) (op.cit.) (B.A.E. Bulletin #149).

Reynolds, John E. 1938 — In French Creek. The Crawford County Historical Society, Meadville, Pa.

Reynolds Collection — "Fort Franklin Store Book" (manuscript) Crawford County Historical Society, Meadville, Pa.

Ricciardelli, Alex F. "The Adoption of White Agriculture by the Oneida Indians." Ethnohistory Vol. 10 #4, p.309-328.

Richards, Cara B. 1957 "Matriarchy or Mistake: The Role of Iroquois Women Through Time." In V. Ray (ed.) Cultural Stability and Culture Change. Annual Meeting of the American Ethnological Society,. Seattle, Wash.

1967 "Huron and Iroquois Residence Patterns 1600-1650." In E. Tooker (ed.) Iroquois Culture, History and Prehistory. New York State Museum and Science Service, Albany, N.Y.

Ritchie, William A. 1965 The Archaeology of New York State. The Natural History Press, New York.

Rothenberg, Diane 1970 "Iroquois Residence: An Adaptation to War and Trade." Unpublished paper: Graduate Center, CUNY.

Russell, Eber L. 1930 "The Lost Story of the Brodhead Expedition." The Quarterly Journal of the New York State Historical Association Vol. XI #3, p.252-63.

Schenck, J.S. 1887 History of Warren County Pennsylvania. D. Mason & Co., Syracuse, New York.

Schusky, Ernest L. 1970 "Cultural Change and Continuity in the Lower Brule Community." In Ethel Nurge (ed.) (op.cit.)

Schwartz, Norman B. 1971 "Assimilation and Acculturation; Aspects of Ethnicity in a Guatamalan Town." Ethnology Vol. 3, p.291-310.

Sears, William H. 1961 "First Comment on William A. Ritchie: Iroquois Archaeology and Settlement Patterns." Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin #180. Washington, D.C., p. 41-43.

Seaver, James E. 1824 A Narrative of the Life of Mrs. Mary Jemison, The White Woman of the Genesee. Reprint: Corinth Books, New York, 1961.

Service, Elman 1955 "Indian-European Relations in Colonial Latin America." American Anthropologist Vol. 57, p.411-25.

Sherman Daniel 1885 — "The Six Nations: An Address Delivered Before the Cautauqua Society of History and Natural Science at its Semi-Annual Meeting held in Jamestown, January 29, 1885." W.W.Williams, Cleveland, Ohio.

Shimony, Annemarie 1961 — "Conservativism Among the Iroquois at the Six Nations Reserve." Yale University Publications in Anthropology #65. New Haven, Conn.

Simmons, Henry 1798-1800 — "Journal" (manuscript) Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Pa.

Sipe, C. Hale 1927 — The Indian Chiefs of Pennsylvania or a Story of the Part Played by the American Indian in the History of Pennsylvania, Based Primarily on the Pennsylvania Archives and Colonial Records and Built Around the Outstanding Chiefs. The Ziegler Printing Co., Inc., Butler, Pa.

Skinner, Dorothy P. 1928-1929 — "Seneca Notes" (manuscript) Collected on the Allegheny Reservation, New York, 1928 and Cornplanter Reservation, Pennsylvania 1929. (Complete typewritten manuscript in the James Prendergast Library, Jamestown, N.Y.).

Sloan, James 1902 — "Early Trade Routes: Advantures and Recollections of a Pioneer Trader with an Account of his Share in the Building of Buffalo Harbor." Publications of the Buffalo Historical Society Vol. V., Buffalo, New York.

Smelser, Neil 1963 — Theory of Collective Behavior. Free Press, N.Y.

Smith, Henry Nash 1950 — Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth. Random House, New York.

Smith Wallis 1970 — "A Re-Appraisal of the Huron Kinship System." Anthropologica Vol. XII #2. Canadian Research Center for Anthropology, St. Paul University, Ottawa.

Snyderman, George S. 1957 — "Halliday Jackson's Journal of a Visit Paid to the Indians of New York 1806." Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society Vol.101, Philadelphia.

1961 — "Concepts of Land Ownership among the Iroquois and the Neighbors." In W. Fenton (ed.) (op. cit.) (B.A.E. #149) Washington, D.C.

Social Science Research Council 1954 — Summer Seminar on Acculturation 1953. "Acculturation: An Exploratory Formulation." American Anthropologist Vol. 56 #1, Pt. 1, P.973-1002.

Society of Friends 1840 — Statement of Facts for the Information of Our Own Members, in Relation to the Circumstances of the Seneca Indians in the State of New York, May 29, 1840. Committees of the four Yearly Meetings of Genesee, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. Philadelphia, Pa.

1844 — Conduct of the Religious Society of Friends Towards the Indian Tribes in the Settlement of the Colonies of East and West Jersey and Pennsylvania with a Brief Narrative of Their Labours for the Civilization and Christian Instruction of the Indians from the Time of Their Settlement in America, To the Year 1843. The Meeting for Sufferings: Aborigine's Committee Publication #9. Edward Marsh, 84 Hounditch, London.

Spicer, Edward H. 1969 — A Short History of the Indians of the United States. Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York.

Spradley, James A. and Phillips, Mark 1972 — "Culture and Stress: A Quantitative Analysis." American Anthropologist, Vol. 74 #3, p.518-529.

Stites, Sara H. 1905 — "Economics of the Iroquois." Bryn Mawr College Monograph Series, Vol. I, #3, New Era Printing Co., Lancaster, Pa.

Stone, Rufus B. 1924 — "Brodhead's Raid on the Senecas." Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine, Vol. 7 #2, p.88-101.

Stone, William L. 1841 — The Life and Times of Red-Jacket, or Sa-Go-Ye-Wat-Ha Being the Sequel to the History of the Six Nations. Wiley and Putnam, New York and London.

Sydney, James V. 1963 — A People Among People: Quaker Benevolence in Eighteenth Century America. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Swauger, James L. — "The Mingo." Pennsylvania Archaeologist, Vol. XIX, #3-4.

Thompson, John H. 1966 — Geography of New York State. Syracuse University Press, New York

Thwaites, Reuben G. (ed.) 1896-1901 — The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. Burrows, Cleveland, Ohio. 73 vols.

Tolles, Frederick 1948 — Meeting House and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia 1682-1763. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N.C.

1960 — Quakers and the Atlantic Culture. The Macmillan Company, New York.

Tome, Philip 1854 — Pioneer Life or, Thirty Years a Hunter: Being Scenes and Adventures in the Life of Philip Tome (Fifteen Years Interpreter for Cornplanter and Governor Blacksnake, Chiefs on the Allegany River. Reprint: The Aurand Press, Harrisburg, Pa. 1928.

Tooker, Elisabeth 1968 — "On the New Religion of Handsome Lake." Anthropological Quarterly, Vol. 41 #4, p. 187-200.

1970 — "Northern Iroquoian Sociopolitical Organization." American Anthropologist, Vol. 72 #1, p. 90-96.

1971 — "Clans and Moieties in North America." Current Anthropology, Vol. 12 #3, p. 357-376.

Tuck, James A. 1971 — "The Iroquois Confederacy." Scientific American, Vol. 224 #3, p. 32-42.

Turner, Orsamus 1849 — Pioneer History of the Holland Purchase of Western New York. Jewett, Thomas & Co.; Geo. H. Derby & Co., Buffalo, New York.

Turnbull, Colin 1972 — The Mountain People. Simon and Schuster, New York.

Wallace, Anthony F.C. 1951 — "Some Psychological Determinants of Culture Change in an Iroquoian Community." In W. Fenton (ed.) op.cit.? B.A.E. Bulletin #149.

1952a — "Halliday Jackson's Journal to the Seneca Indians 1798-1800." Pennsylvania History Vol. XIX #2-3., p.117-147; 325-249.

1952b "Handsome Lake and the Great Revival in the West." American Quarterly Vol. IV #2, P.149-165.

1952c "The Modal Personality Structure of the Tuscarora Indians, as Revealed by the Rorschach Test." Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin #150, Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C.

1957 "Political Organization and Land Tenure Among the Northeastern Indians 1600-1830." Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, Vol. 13, p. 301-321.

1956 "Revitalization Movements: Some Theoretical Considerations for Their Comparative Study." American Anthropologist, Vol. 58, p.264-81.

1958 "Dreams and the Wishes of the Soul: A Type of Psychoanalytic Theory Among the Seventeenth Century Iroquois." American Anthropologist, Vol. 60, p. 234-248.

1959 "The Institutionalization of Cathartic and Control Strategies in Iroquois Religious Psychotherapy." In Marvin Opler (ed.) Culture and Mental Health. The Macmillan Company, New York.

1970 The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca: The History and Culture of the Great Iroquois Nation, Their Destruction and Demoralization, and Their Cultural Revival at the Hands of the Indian Visionary, Handsome Lake. Alfred A. Knopf, New York

Wallace, Paul
1956 "The Iroquois: A Brief Outline of Their History." In "The Livingston Indian Records 1666-1723." Pennsylvania History, Vol.XXIII #1, P.15-27.

1968 The White Roots of Peace. Ira J. Friedman, Inc. Port Washington, N.Y.

Washburn, Wilcomb E.
1971a Red Man's Land - White Man's Law: A Study of the Past and Present Status of the American Indian. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

1971b "The Writing of American Indian History: A Status Report." Pacific Historical Review, Vol. XL #3, P.261-281.

Way, Frederick Jr. 1942 — The Allegheny. Farrar & Rinehart, Inc. New York.

Wayman, Dorothy G. 1965 — "Friends on the Frontier: The Clendenon Family." Quaker History, Vol. 54 #1, p.3-23.

Whipple, J.C. (Chairman) 1889 — Report of the Special Committee to Investigate the Indian Problem of the State of New York Appointed by the Assembly of 1888. The Troy Press Co., Albany, New York.

White, Marian 1961 — "Iroquois Culture History in the Niagara Frontier Area." Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Anthropological Paper #24. Ann Arbor, Mich.

1973-4 — Personal Conversations.

Wolf, Eric R. 1964 — Anthropology. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey

Wrenshall, John 1784-1816 — The John Wrenshall Journal (manuscript) The Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Pa. (available on microfilm).

Wright, J.V. 1966 — "The Ontario Iroquois Tradition." National Museum of Canada Bulletin #210, Anthropological Series #75. Ottawa, Canada.

Young, James S. 1966 — The Washington Community 1800-1828. Harcourt, Brace & World, INc., New York.

Ziff, Lazer 1973 — Puritanism in America: New Culture in New World. Viking Press, New York.

Zon, Raphael 1928 — "Timber Growing and Logging Practice in the Lake States." United States Department of Agriculture Bulletin #1496, Washington, D.C.