

The Decline of the Northern California Indian Association

ABSTRACT Thousands of Indians in Northern California were landless, impoverished, and all but forgotten at the turn of the twentieth century. The Northern California Indian Association (NCIA), formed by Christian women in the Santa Clara Valley, sought to improve conditions for these people and spurred the federal government to provide them with land. After fifteen years of success and growth, in the 1910s the NCIA pivoted from supporting direct fieldwork among the Indians to establishing an Indian industrial school near Sacramento. A fire at the school in 1917 caused a devastating setback for the association. Despite having the financial health to survive this loss, the NCIA struggled to carry on. Decreasing membership numbers and an aging leadership indicated critical weaknesses in the organization. World War I and secularization exacerbated these structural problems. The NCIA viewed the emergence of a new organization, the Indian Board of Co-operation, founded by Frederick Collett and Beryl Bishop-Collett, as a significant threat. Frederick Collett accused NCIA members of subverting the fledgling board by maligning the Colletts among government Indian agents, attempting to prevent the board's participation at the Panama–Pacific International Exposition, and urging the courts to remove a foster child from the Colletts' care. With few voices advocating for the Indians of Northern California during this period, the NCIA succeeded in influencing government policy and shaping federal Indian policies and programs. The NCIA's decline allowed a new organization to press for a new round of federal assistance while pushing state and local officials to take greater responsibility for California's Indigenous peoples. **KEYWORDS:** Northern California Indian Association, Indian Board of Co-operation, Cornelia Taber, C. E. Kelsey, Frederick G. Collett, California Indians, Indian reform organizations

THE NOVEL *RAMONA* is often credited with galvanizing federal aid for the Indians of Southern California, but that credit ignores the years of activism undertaken by Northern California Indian welfare activists. In fact, it was the Northern California Indian Association (NCIA) that sparked federal efforts to assist Indigenous Californians in the north. The NCIA used federal treaty commissioners' unratified 1851–1852 California

treaties to cajole the government into action. Burdened by the moral obligation inherent in eighteen treaties the Senate never ratified, Congress funded a survey of the condition of the Indians of Northern California, and by 1908 had appropriated \$150,000 to purchase land on which Native Californians could build homes. During the appropriation process, Senator Charles Curtis actually increased the amount, in hopes that it would “be enough” to convince the activists “not [to] come back here” for more money.¹

With many dispossessed and destitute, California Indians warranted attention in the early 1900s. Their condition was an ongoing concern for the white, Christian reform organizations who were their chief advocates. This essay builds upon the work of Francis Paul Prucha, who details the critical role of Protestant national advocacy organizations in shaping federal Indian policy through 1900 but extends the period of analysis into the twentieth century and specifically includes California.² Valerie Sherer Mathes, who also focuses upon the nineteenth century, has written extensively about the Women’s National Indian Association (WNIA), emphasizing how leading the organization tutored women in the exercise of political power before 1901, the year it cut “Women’s” from its name.³ Of particular relevance here is Cathleen Cahill’s study of the NCIA’s marketing of Indian women’s art, especially the basket trade, because it highlights the incongruity of promoting Native arts while pursuing assimilation of the artists.⁴ Historian Timothy Wright brings discussion of the NCIA into the twentieth century in his study of the Indian Board of Co-operation, founded in 1913. Unlike the assimilationist NCIA, this new group seemed to accept that Native Americans would retain elements of their culture.⁵ Although Edward Castillo mentions the NCIA only in passing, he makes a similar argument, finding an evolving acceptance of Indigenous agency among white-led advocacy groups alongside growing Native involvement.⁶ Bringing earlier studies of the NCIA into the twentieth century, this essay details how the NCIA rose to prominence and then receded, eclipsed by other pro-Indian groups because the NCIA did not keep pace with the times, allowing an opening for a new organization to take the lead.⁷

THE LANDLESS INDIANS OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

The WNIA was instrumental in launching private efforts to assist Native Americans in California. A national organization founded by philanthropic white women in Philadelphia in 1879, the WNIA was formally nondenominational, yet it depended on Protestant organizations for funds and workers. Individual leaders and members drew on their religious faith and, like many Euro-Americans of their generation, on their certainty that Native Americans needed (and wanted) their assistance in converting to Christianity and learning to live as self-sufficient citizens.

Amelia S. Quinton and Mary L. Bonney founded the WNIA to improve the treatment of Native Americans. Through the WNIA, Quinton and Bonney sought to inform the public about whites’ unjust treatment of Native Americans, the federal government’s history of broken treaties with Native groups, and the miserable conditions under which reservation Indians lived. The WNIA urged Congress to fulfill the nation’s treaty commitments, to provide schools on reservations, and to allot reservation lands to individual Indians. The association petitioned federal officials and published leaflets about what many referred to

as “the Indian problem.” Missionary and school work quickly became part of the women’s repertoire. The WNIA established mission stations in tribal communities; once established, religious groups typically took over mission activities. The activities of WNIA women were important modes of political communication for women in 1879, four decades before the Nineteenth Amendment gave American women the right to vote in federal elections. Through these methods, WNIA members leveraged their privileged positions as elite, well-connected Euro-American women to pressure the federal government to improve conditions for Native Americans.

California provided fertile ground for WNIA activists. Moved by Helen Hunt Jackson’s 1884 novel *Ramona*, which dramatized the sufferings of California Natives, the WNIA focused its efforts on aiding the state’s Indigenous peoples. Quinton first came to California in 1891, when she organized seventeen auxiliaries, and established more in subsequent tours of the state. These new branches, in turn, extended the range and scope of the WNIA’s educational and missionary work in California. In Northern California, Annie Kennedy (Mrs. John) Bidwell joined the organization in the early 1890s, intending to “civilize” the Mikcapdo (Mechoopda) Indians upon whose ancestral homelands the Bidwells’ Rancho Arroyo Chico was located.⁸ Annie Bidwell became WNIA’s western vice president and a prominent supporter of the organization.⁹

Quinton founded an Indian Committee in San Jose in 1891. Three years later, the group reorganized to form what became the NCIA, with Anna Ferris Taber (1827–1911) credited as its founder (Figure 1). Taber came to California from New York with her husband, August (1826–1898), and their daughter, Cornelia (1858–1929). Taber and other NCIA members were elite white women living in San Jose and the surrounding Santa Clara Valley. Although a number of men became NCIA members and leaders, the NCIA remained a primarily women-led organization.¹⁰

While the NCIA was solely dedicated to aiding the Indians of Northern California, it collaborated with similar activist groups. For example, the NCIA sought assistance from the Indian Rights Association in lobbying Congress, and worked closely with Charles Lummis’s Sequoya League, an Indian welfare group operating in Southern California. NCIA leaders also sought the support of organizations formed for other purposes. For example, the NCIA rallied women’s clubs, missionary groups, and California chapters of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) to circulate and sign petitions on behalf of Native Californians, to write letters of support for NCIA projects, to publicly endorse the NCIA, and to donate supplies and money to the group.¹¹

Interlocking memberships in other women-led organizations further extended the NCIA’s reach. Quinton and Bidwell were also associated with the WCTU (Figure 2). Anna and Cornelia Taber both belonged to the Monday Club, a San Jose woman’s club.¹² These and other groups hosted NCIA speakers and distributed NCIA literature at meetings, educating members about the conditions under which California Indians lived. The NCIA broadcast its activities in California through the WNIA’s monthly newsletter, *The Indian’s Friend*, with a national readership and distributed to libraries and to editors of other reform periodicals. The NCIA could thus elicit aid from missionary societies and women’s clubs throughout the United States.¹³



FIGURE 1. Anna Ferris Taber.

Courtesy of California Historical Society, FN-27750/CHS2010.441

The group also held conferences that drew participants beyond its membership. In 1906, the NCIA launched the annual Zayante Indian Conference (Figure 2), through which leaders coordinated with other groups, determined strategies, and publicized their activities. Held at Mount Hermon, a nondenominational Christian retreat in the Santa Cruz Mountains, NCIA conferences brought together pro-Indian groups and individuals, field workers, and a shifting group of Native Americans from California and elsewhere. As one director put it, these meetings helped the NCIA determine “the proper course to pursue” to “reach the churches and . . . bring the facts before the public.”¹⁴ By these means, the NCIA built a constituency greater than the organization’s members.

The NCIA’s founding in 1894 San Jose reveals that Native Californians had evolved in the public imagination, from an existential threat to white survival to a population



FIGURE 2. Zayante Indian Conference, with Annie Bidwell seated at center, ca. 1910.
Courtesy of California State University, Chico, Meriam Library Special Collections, sc14178

deserving of white philanthropy. California Indians' route to nonthreatening status was different than that of other Native American groups. California had been densely populated prior to Spanish conquest, but exposure to European diseases reduced Native populations, as did the violence of Spanish colonization and the forced-labor system that Franciscan missionaries employed in establishing twenty-one missions from San Diego to Sonoma. A new era in white-Indian relations came with U.S. military occupation at the end of the Mexican-American War, followed by the discovery of gold in 1848. American settlement unleashed a wave of violence and murder against California Indians; those who survived were driven from their traditional homelands by miners and settlers.¹⁵ By 1906, their numbers had fallen to only 17,000.¹⁶ Meanwhile, American settlers pressed Congress to quickly secure California for the United States. The rush to statehood was followed by a haphazard Indian treaty process in 1851–1852, during which federal commissioners signed eighteen treaties with Native California groups, promising to provide payment in goods in exchange for land cessions and establishment of extensive reservation lands. Americans in California, however, ensured that the treaties were never ratified.¹⁷ From the perspective of the NCIA and other pro-Indian groups, the failure to ratify meant that the United States owed California Indians payment for their lost homelands.



FIGURE 3. The Kelsey family (left to right): Abigail, C. E., and Mary, ca. 1907.
Courtesy of the Kelsey family

Instead of the reservation lands promised in 1851–1852, the federal government eventually set aside numerous small reservations in Southern California and a handful of large ones in the north where, by 1906, about 5,000 Native Californians lived.¹⁸ The remainder, roughly 12,000 Native Americans, drifted from place to place, settling temporarily on land claimed by others and subject to constant eviction.

FIELD MATRONS AND MISSIONARIES

The NCIA's early work reveals that spreading Christianity to Native Californians was central to the organization's goals. Two years after its 1894 founding, the NCIA sent a missionary to the Hoopa Valley Reservation, established thirty years earlier along the Trinity River. In 1901, the WNIA turned its Hoopa mission over to Presbyterian missionaries.¹⁹ In 1902, the group purchased land for dispossessed Indians in the Mendocino County town of Manchester. In preparation for its legislative campaign of 1903–1904 to secure Indian benefits, the NCIA conducted the first U.S. count of non-reservation Indians in Northern California. As part of its continued legislative campaign in 1904–1905, the NCIA initiated a search for the largely forgotten California Indian treaties of 1851–1852.²⁰ Release of the unratified treaties, in turn, prompted Congress to authorize

an investigation into the status of California Indians. Congress appointed an NCIA director, Charles E. Kelsey, as a special agent of the U.S. Indian Office to conduct the survey (Figure 3). Not surprisingly, Kelsey's recommendations mirrored those of the NCIA, namely that the U.S. government purchase land on which California Indians could build homes. From 1906 to 1908, Congress appropriated \$150,000 for the plan and the U.S. Indian Office hired Kelsey to implement it.²¹



FIGURE 4. Indian Map of California, from Cornelia Taber, *California and Her Indian Children* (San Jose: Northern California Indian Association, 1911).

Unfortunately, the NCIA's land-purchase project soon drew criticism (Figure 4). In 1910, Indian Office inspector Joe Norris visited several of C. E. Kelsey's purchases in Lake and Mendocino Counties and found that some were unsuitable for homesites, with value only for pasture and wood for fuel and fence posts.²² A participant at the 1916 Zayante Indian Conference reported that "the whole tract" Kelsey purchased at the Manchester rancheria was so poor that it would "not support one small family."²³ Albert F. James (Wiyot) described the twenty acres Kelsey purchased at Table Bluff in a congressional hearing—in summary, "it is swamp."²⁴ Edgar B. Meritt, assistant commissioner of Indian Affairs, conceded that Kelsey had not purchased "the highest grade of land," a shortcoming Meritt attributed to the paucity of funds appropriated.²⁵

Nonetheless, while Kelsey went about purchasing land for Native Californians, NCIA women focused on the kinds of good works they could perform themselves. For example, concerned that, by their estimate, only a thousand of Northern California's 14,500 Indians had converted to Christianity, in 1908 the association launched a campaign to convince Protestant denominations to send missionaries to California.²⁶ That same year, the NCIA opened the Hannah E. Bean Memorial Mission, named for a recently deceased NCIA director, in the Inyo County town of Bishop. Operated in partnership with the American Sunday School Union of the Pacific Coast, the mission targeted the thousand Natives that leaders called "Pagan Indians." As it had at Hoopa, in 1910, the NCIA turned the Bishop mission over to Presbyterian missionaries.²⁷

Through its reports to the National Indian Association (NIA) (as the WNIA was known after 1901), the NCIA encouraged individuals and organizations to support its work for California Indians. It regularly reported on C. E. Kelsey's work with the U.S. Indian Office and reported in 1908 on three NCIA auxiliaries founded in the San Joaquin Valley, southern Lake County, and San Francisco.²⁸ The group's leaders often addressed audiences of like-minded organizations. In 1909, for example, San Francisco's Commonwealth Club of California invited Kelsey and NCIA corresponding secretary Cornelia Taber to address its annual ladies' night, an event they hoped would generate support for NCIA work.²⁹

One of the NCIA's primary activities was recruiting and supporting field matrons who visited Indigenous women in their homes, encouraged them to observe the Sabbath, and instructed them in American-style homemaking, including cooking, sewing, cleanliness, sanitation, and care of the sick. Field matrons served in remote locations. In 1910, for example, ten NCIA field matrons were stationed in the small rural communities of Requa, Weitchpek, Happy Camp, Eureka, Middletown, Lookout, Colusa, Bishop, Coarse Gold, and Auberry (Figure 4).³⁰

Field matrons' work dovetailed closely with NCIA leaders' belief in Indian assimilation and Christianization. As one leaflet put it, the field matron was "father, mother, minister, lawyer, doctor and nurse for her charges."³¹ Although the NCIA helped with recruitment, the U.S. Indian Office paid the matrons' salaries. The Indian Office employed thousands of white, native-born American women in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.³² Officials of the Indian Office saw the women's labors as integral to implementing its assimilationist policies; historian Cathleen Cahill also sees it as an experiment in federal governance in the far corners of the American West.³³ The job requirements were

minimal: as the WNIA newsletter put it, beyond passing the civil service exam, applicants needed only “good health, practical ability and earnest Christian character.”³⁴

NCIA overtures to potential field matrons drew upon leaders’ belief in women’s inherently maternal and moral natures. “The teacher in the school may save the child,” one notice proclaimed, “but the Field Matron joins hands with the parents and grand parents [sic] in saving the home.”³⁵ Another noted that the Indians “sometimes know more about farming than the men sent to teach them, but they are dying for lack of knowledge of camp sanitation, the proper care of infants and the sick, and the moral restraint and guidance” that “some good woman” could provide.³⁶ Depicting them as children in need of guidance, Cornelia Taber’s 1911 book *California and Her Indian Children* illustrated the religious and maternalistic philosophies that guided the NCIA’s Indian work.³⁷

For their operating costs in the field, matrons relied on contributions from individual members of the NCIA and the NIA. Field matrons in California communicated with Cornelia Taber, letting her know their needs, and Taber called for members to respond with medicines, materials, and cash. Matrons also collected and sent Taber saleable merchandise, especially Native women’s handmade baskets, the proceeds of which the NCIA returned to their Native makers. Matrons received from members donations of barrels of Christmas gifts for redistribution to the Indians. In 1909, Taber specifically requested “scraps for patchwork quilts, . . . pins and hairpins, ribbons and neckties, picturebooks [sic] and toys of all kinds, bright cards, writing paper,” and “a piece of gingham big enough for a child’s dress or an apron.”³⁸

NCIA leaders saw such member contributions as vital to the success of the organization’s mission. In her reports to members, Cornelia Taber stressed “the absolute necessity of equipping” field workers “adequately with supplies.” Otherwise, she feared, the NCIA was “in imminent danger of losing our best workers through utter exasperation at the hampering of their efforts—their lack of material.”³⁹

NCIA leaders were frustrated by the limits that federal funding of field matrons’ salaries placed on their efforts. With only ten field matrons in 1910, the NCIA could not extend to all California Indians the services that leaders believed they needed. But congressional budget caps limited the number of field matrons the Indian Office could hire. Thus, leaders looked for allies to assist them in their work, often successfully. By 1912, for example, it appeared that the NCIA’s 1908 campaign to bring missionaries to California was paying off. The number of church-sponsored Indian missions increased from five missions to seventeen, and the number of missionaries working with California Indians increased from five to twenty-one. By the NCIA’s count, the number of Indigenous people in Northern California reached by Protestant missionaries rose from 1,820 to 8,400.⁴⁰

The NCIA also hoped to enlist local volunteers to help it reach the thousands of unserved Indigenous people dispersed throughout rural Northern California. As NCIA director and U.S. Indian Office agent C. E. Kelsey explained in 1909, “the scattered condition of our Indians makes it impossible for the government to reach all the little bands,” but “any practical, kind hearted woman living near a rancheria” could replicate the work being done by field matrons (Figure 4).⁴¹ The government was buying land for California Indians, but “the land matter is the least of our problems.” To further the work of Native assimilation, “both men and money are wanting to cover the field.”⁴²

To increase the organization's reach, in 1907 the NCIA charted a new direction at its Zayante Indian Conference.⁴³ Attendees began exploring the possibility of establishing an industrial school to train a group of Native teachers to be fielded throughout Northern California. The NCIA believed that this was the simplest, most direct, and most cost-effective way "of teaching Indians the rudiments of civilization."⁴⁴

THE GUINDA INDIAN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL

To build a Native teaching force, the NCIA founded an industrial school for Indian boys and girls. They modeled their school on Alabama's Tuskegee Institute, a normal school for training African American teachers. The NCIA's lessons would cover agriculture, domestic arts, English writing and speaking, Christian principles, and leadership skills. This "industrial training," as C. E. Kelsey put it, would "raise the earning capacity of the Indians" and "fit them . . . for the life they are to lead in their own rancheria."⁴⁵ Students would pay neither tuition nor board, but instead earn their keep through their labor on the property. Unlike existing government Indian schools, the NCIA school would provide a Christian education and train students to be teachers and leaders.

As part of the curriculum, the NCIA would train students to be Native American educators. Graduates would thus form what C. E. Kelsey described as a Native "ministry." Indian teachers could reach Natives more effectively, Kelsey argued, "as no white person can hope to do." Moreover, an Indian teaching force could "be supported in the field for less than half the expense necessary for a white force, and can be partially supported by its own people."⁴⁶ Kelsey explained: "By giving the right training to picked pupils from all . . . rancherias, we will be able to reach the whole mass of Indians" in the way they needed, and as they had "not yet been reached."⁴⁷ Adopting the motto "Only the self-raised stay up," in the 1910s the Guinda Indian Industrial School became the NCIA's flagship project.⁴⁸

The NCIA began searching for a site for the school. The ideal location would have plentiful water and fertile soil, would not be in a town, yet would be accessible to markets for school products. A California woman donated \$4,000 toward purchasing land for the school.⁴⁹ In 1910, the NCIA paid \$6,900 for 483 acres near Guinda, overlooking Yolo County's Capay Valley.⁵⁰ To serve as superintendent, leaders chose Reverend L. L. Legters, who had worked as a missionary among the Comanches of Oklahoma. In addition to raising \$25,000 for land and infrastructure, the NCIA's long-term goal was to raise \$100,000 to support three people, a teacher, a manager, and a farmer.⁵¹ For the short term, it resolved to raise \$10,000 before school opened, either cash in hand or pledged, to cover the school's first two years of operation. The NCIA tasked Legters with raising these funds.⁵²

Fundraising efforts included an appeal for federal support. U.S. Senator Frank Flint amended the 1912 Indian appropriation bill to include \$20,000 for Guinda's buildings and equipment, but the amendment failed.⁵³ Legters carried out a successful East Coast fundraising tour that included meetings with pro-Indian groups and individuals, and attended the annual meeting of the NCIA's parent organization, the National Indian Association.⁵⁴ With Cornelia Taber's help, Legters sought an invitation to the prestigious

Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indians, where he could make valuable contacts.⁵⁵ By May 1911, his last year with the NCIA, Legters reported raising more than \$25,000.⁵⁶ Later that year, Cornelia Taber traveled east on a similar mission; she secured a pledge of \$5,000 to be paid out over five years to the couple who would serve as the school's resident managers.⁵⁷

With start-up funding secured, construction of the school commenced under Guinda's new superintendent, Charles A. Olsen. Described by Kelsey as "a most competent man," Olsen and Native American workers provided all the labor.⁵⁸ Using donated lumber, they erected four structures: a main hall that included schoolrooms, a dining room, and a kitchen; a boy's dormitory; a laundry; and a cottage that housed staff on the ground level and female students on the second floor. Each included porches to give residents shade and fresh air. Workers built a barn and provided the school with water and sewerage. The new school's livestock included pigs, chickens, a pair of horses, and fourteen head of cattle.⁵⁹

In July 1913, the Guinda Indian Industrial School opened with six pupils.⁶⁰ Students ranged in age from ten to sixteen and hailed from Lake, Colusa, Yolo, Fresno, and Madera Counties.⁶¹ The student body grew slowly, to fifteen boys and girls in 1914, to twenty in 1917. To increase enrollments, the NCIA appealed to members to donate funds to pay the tuition of students. In 1916, a local newspaper encouraged contributions, noting that every \$100 raised meant "one more capable Indian child . . . saved for a life of Christian usefulness and to be a leader of his people."⁶²

Although leaders failed to reach the desired \$100,000 goal, the group's annual reports reveal an admirable success at fundraising (Table 1). In 1911, the NCIA showed a balance of \$15,597.75. Costs of construction and equipment probably explain 1912's lower balance of \$6,386.76, and the drop to \$2,227.30 in 1913, the year the school opened. Later reports show that, in financial terms, 1911 was the NCIA's high-water mark.⁶³

Even as it succeeded in opening the Guinda school, the NCIA continued its efforts to publicize the needs of Native Californians. In November 1913, the group held a conference of "representatives of Churches and other agencies at work among the Indians of California" in San Francisco. Participants discussed living conditions among the California Indians, "especially as to their individual ownership of their homes," and their educational and religious needs.⁶⁴ NCIA leaders admitted that the work of educating the public "had outgrown our powers."⁶⁵ They hoped to "lay down" their leadership role and hoped that attendees would support creation of a collaborative council with representatives from organizations already engaged in the work.⁶⁶ NCIA women explained that coordination among agencies would lead to greater efficiency and lower costs. Eliminating the duplication inherent in operating multiple societies would free more funds to aid Native groups. A unified body would also wield greater political influence, while shared discussions would produce innovation and inspiration. The hoped-for council did not materialize.

Unfortunately for the NCIA, disaster struck the Guinda Indian Industrial School in July 1917, when fire destroyed the main building.⁶⁷ Rebuilding began at once, but funds for operating the school remained "much harder to raise."⁶⁸ Olsen's wife had a nervous breakdown, resulting in the couple resigning and leaving the school. The NCIA had no

Table 1 • NCIA Moneys Received, 1900–1916

Year	Total received
1900	\$621.99
1901	\$388.25
1902	\$514.35
1903	\$552.37
1904	\$335.85
1905	No data available
1906	\$253.62
1907	No data available
1908	\$854.14
1909	\$1,242.66
1910	\$10,260.51
1911	\$15,597.75
1912	\$6,386.76
1913	\$2,227.30
1914	No data available
1915	\$3,669.47
1916	\$2,661.08

Source: Report of the Treasurer, *Annual Report of the National Indian Association* (New York: National Indian Association, 1900–1916).

Notes: The amounts mentioned in the text are consistent with those in the table. Funds raised by Legters were split between 1910 and 1911, and some donations were pledged in a single year but paid by the donor over multiple years.

choice but to find a new superintendent, a search that proved unsuccessful.⁶⁹ Money remained tight: leaders were able to collect \$3,000 in insurance money, but the cost of rebuilding exceeded \$6,000.⁷⁰

Other factors hampered NCIA fundraising efforts. U.S. entry into World War I that April soon changed the donation landscape, and philanthropic and reform organizations saw public interest in their work plummet. Campaigns for war bonds cut deeply into charitable donations. That November, C. E. Kelsey confirmed that the NCIA was experiencing “considerable difficulty in retaining the popular interest in Indian matters,” and “feeling the pinch” of the many drives “connected with the war.”⁷¹

The NCIA never fully recovered from the loss of the Guinda school. The group donated money to several California projects and to a mission in Montana but undertook no new projects. Thereafter, the NIA journal barely mentioned the NCIA.⁷² The NCIA’s membership base—and thus its labor force—declined as well. In 1912, C. E. Kelsey’s wife, Abigail, admitted that “our workers have been fewer this year.”⁷³ Analysis of NCIA member dues suggests that membership attained its high point in 1910, when the group boasted 114 members. After that, numbers fell steadily. The NCIA counted only six more members in 1916 than it had in 1900 (Table 2).

Equally troubling, the NCIA faced leadership challenges. Founder Anna Ferris Taber died in 1911. Two years later, C. E. Kelsey lost his position as a special agent for the Indian Office. Kelsey continued as an officer and director, but Kelsey’s termination cost the NCIA

Table 2 • Estimated Number of NCIA Members, 1900–1916^a

Year	Dues and donations to national association	Estimated number of NCIA members ^b
1900	\$11.75 ^c	47
1901	\$11.75 ^c	47
1902	\$13.75 ^c	55
1903	No data available	—
1904	\$15.26	61
1905	\$20.25	81
1906	\$35.75	143
1907	No data available	—
1908	No data available	—
1909	\$24.75	99
1910	\$28.50 ^c	114
1911	\$25.00	100
1912	\$20.25 ^d	81
1913	No data available	—
1914	\$15.00	60
1915	\$18.50	74
1916	\$13.25	53

Source: Report of the Treasurer, *Annual Report of the National Indian Association* (New York: National Indian Association, 1900–1916).

Reports after 1916 do not include dues and donations data.

^a Derived from dues and donations.

^b Throughout this period, the NIA required auxiliaries to pay, per each local member, one-fourth of the annual membership fee, and the NCIA's annual membership fee was one dollar. As a result, the NCIA paid to the NIA twenty-five cents per member. There were tiers of membership above one dollar, as well as donations, that may have been included in this annual payment. By assuming that the annual dues and donations paid by the NCIA were all annual memberships of one dollar, the resulting estimates represent the highest possible number of NCIA members.

^c Dues only (no donations).

^d Reported in 1913 "for 1912."

a powerful connection and the imprimatur of federal sanction. Kelsey moved to Southern California in 1919 and disappeared from NCIA annual reports. Cornelia Taber forged on as NCIA director and continued to support the National Indian Association. Taber served as the NIA's western vice president from 1919 through 1922 but died in 1929.⁷⁴

Many factors explain the demise of the NCIA. The most important external factor was the emergence in 1913 of a new Indian welfare association that challenged the NCIA's vision of how best to aid the state's Indigenous peoples.

THE INDIAN BOARD OF CO-OPERATION

A rival to the NCIA's control over California Indian welfare work appeared in 1913 with the formation of the Indian Board of Co-operation (IBC) by two Methodist ministers: Frederick G. Collett and his wife, Beryl Bishop-Collett (Figure 5).⁷⁵ Ironically, the NCIA introduced the pair to Indian welfare work. The Colletts first learned of the conditions facing California Indians at the 1910 Zayante Indian Conference. Tom Odock of the Colusa band made a stirring appeal for help in educating his children. Attendees raised \$366 on the spot to send a teacher to the Colusa rancheria for six months, and the Colletts agreed to



FIGURE 5. Beryl Bishop-Collett and Frederick G. Collett, with Daisy Lowell Boon and child Lena.
Courtesy of California State University, Chico, Meriam Library Special Collections, sc30879, Dorothy Hill Photograph Collection, MSS 160

take the position. Six months later, when the NCIA declined to support the teacher's salary, the Colletts found other means of support.⁷⁶

While stationed at Colusa, the Colletts petitioned Colusa County to create a public school district to serve the children on the Colusa rancheria, which was located on land purchased by C. E. Kelsey and owned by the federal government. State law held that Indian children were entitled to a public education, in separate schools if feasible or, if not, in integrated schools with both white and Indian pupils. After months of foot dragging by local officials, on February 8, 1912, Colusa County established what historian

Timothy Wright calls “the Cachil Dehe School District, the first all-Indian public school in California” for the children of the Colusa rancharia.⁷⁷

In January 1912, the NCIA and the Colletts signed a one-year contract; in it, the Colletts had responsibility for the “Colusa School,” other unspecified “school matters,” and raising funds for the Guinda school.⁷⁸ But ill will soon developed. Frederick Collett blamed the NCIA, saying that leaders approved their work but refused to pay the couple’s expenses. C. E. Kelsey, on the other hand, complained that the Colletts refused “to do the work we hired them for,” and recklessly incurred debts “without authority.” Besides being “very expensive and very inefficient,” Kelsey groused, the Colletts “aroused a great deal of antagonism everywhere.”⁷⁹ When the contract ended in 1912, the NCIA did not renew it. Kelsey eventually admitted that “feelings between” the NCIA and the Colletts were “not cordial.”⁸⁰

The NCIA’s explanation of the break hints at the source of the trouble. The Colletts’ “financial returns,” it reported in 1912, did not “warrant our continuing them in this work.”⁸¹ The NCIA was focused on raising funds for the Guinda school. The Colletts, however, had different priorities. As Frederick Collett explained in 1916, he wanted cities and counties to fulfill the state’s legal obligation to provide free public education for all children, including those living on rancharias. From his perspective, the NCIA was so focused on the success of its Indian industrial school that “it could not give attention” to this “larger and more important” issue.⁸²

Collett was correct in this assessment. State law did assure non-reservation Indian children of the right to free public schooling, yet many found local school doors closed to them. Writing in 1912, C. E. Kelsey estimated that there were about 2,600 non-reservation Indigenous children in Northern California “who ought to be in the public schools.” Of those, “about 100” were “in private or mission schools,” with “400 in Government Indian schools, 600 in public schools.” Unfortunately, the remaining 1,500 were “in no school at all.” Local circumstances typically dictated which children received public education. In metropolitan districts, for example, where Native children were few, counties typically permitted Indian children to attend white schools, thus avoiding the expense of providing separate schools. “Small school districts,” Kelsey continued, accepted Native pupils because, “if it were not for the Indian children,” they might be forced to close. But in “districts where Indians and whites are both numerous,” pervasive local racism worked against integrating Indian children into white classrooms.⁸³ As the Colletts learned in Colusa, persistent agitation was often required to force counties to honor state law.

The NCIA took a far less militant approach. Indeed, leaders only approached the topic of free public schooling for Native Americans indirectly. In their annual addresses at the San Jose normal school, NCIA speakers lectured teachers-in-training on the “common humanity” that whites shared with Native peoples. Writing in 1910, Cornelia Taber expressed her hope that teachers would “be good to any little Indians” who drifted “into the schools [at] which they will teach.”⁸⁴ C. E. Kelsey blithely reported that white hostility toward Indian children in public classrooms was “slowly decreasing” as the numbers of Indian pupils was “slowly increasing,” but “the increase” was “too slow to help the present generation” of Native children receive an education.⁸⁵

SHARING THE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA FIELD

In the IBC's 1913 constitution, the Colletts fused their twin goals of aiding the "Indians of California and adjacent states to Christian citizenship" with a missionary zeal for "securing for them the advantages of the public schools."⁸⁶ By focusing on public school education for Native American children, the IBC carved out a separate niche for its labors, one that took them in a different direction than the NCIA. Yet leaders chose a name that appealed for cordial relations between the IBC and other groups, namely the NCIA. As IBC officer and director Dorcas J. Spencer observed, "as its name implies," the board intended to act "in harmony with all efforts to uplift the Indian race."⁸⁷ A leader of California's WCTU, charged with its Department of Work Among Indians, Spencer was adept at intergroup coordination. Frederick Collett likewise promised good will, assuring an Indian Office official that he had "refrained from saying anything against" the NCIA; indeed, he was "too much interested in our work to pay attention" to it.⁸⁸

For their part, NCIA leaders had good reason to fear a second Northern California organization with "Indian" in its name. At the very least, the IBC would drain publicity, public support, membership, and funds that might once have gone to the NCIA. Unsurprisingly, the group shunned association with the Colletts or the IBC. When a local newspaper identified the Colletts as NCIA employees in 1913, Cornelia Taber immediately sought a correction. The Colletts, she wrote, were "in no way connected with us at this time." She asked for a published correction, "as it is of importance."⁸⁹ Word of the NCIA's antipathy toward the Colletts reached David Starr Jordan, honorary president of the IBC, in 1916. The NCIA "holds this Board in low esteem," Jordan told a correspondent, regarding it "largely as an arrangement for the personal advantage" of Frederick Collett. "They are skeptical as to any good which the Board of Cooperation has accomplished."⁹⁰ This did not dissuade Jordan from continuing his association with the IBC.⁹¹

Soon after the IBC formed, Kelsey informed Frederick Collett that the NCIA "did not intend to interfere with or hinder in any way any work you may undertake for Indians in California."⁹² Yet within a few years, Collett told an Indian Office official he believed that the NCIA "sought in every way possible to undermine and destroy" the IBC. "All of the accusations" were difficult to fight, because they came "behind closed doors." Collett accused the NCIA of "putting us in a wrong light" with government Indian agents, trying to keep the Southern Pacific Railroad from providing the Colletts with rail passes, attempting to "keep us from having a conference" at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, and saying things that "caused us considerable annoyance as to the adoption of a child."⁹³

Some of these accusations appear to be true. Kelsey maligned the Colletts in letters he sent to two government Indian agents, Calvin H. Asbury and Thomas B. Wilson, in 1914. Acknowledging receipt of a letter from Asbury about the Colletts, Kelsey explained that "we do not plan a war on the people mentioned," but he planned to use Asbury's letter "to good advantage in certain quarters."⁹⁴ Kelsey criticized the Colletts in a letter to Wilson, then advised him to "consider this letter confidential, though you are free to use the information in any way you wish." The NCIA preferred "to keep silence at present," Kelsey concluded, "and let other persons do the exposing."⁹⁵

Yet Kelsey's tactics may not have been necessary, as Frederick Collett seemed capable of alienating Indian agents without his help. In 1913, Collett set out to replicate the success of the Cachil Dehe School District. Inserting himself into the public-school contracting process, he distributed applications for federal tuition aid to school districts in multiple counties. Indian agents routinely reviewed these forms as part of the contract approval process. Asbury disputed the accuracy of the numbers of Indian students on some of Collett's school district applications and questioned the benefit of applying for federal tuition in school districts that had accepted Native children without question for years.⁹⁶

In one case, Asbury reported that Collett had "talked with members of the [school] Board, emphasizing the fact that they had something coming to them from the Federal Government for the schooling of Indian children," giving the school board members "the impression that Mr. Collette [*sic*] was an official of the Indian service." Asbury had no objection to Collett "securing attendance of Indian children in the public schools where such children have not been enrolled," but he did not believe that was Collett's goal. In Asbury's opinion, the IBC "should be known as the 'Collette Maintenance Society,' as I believe the chief purpose of the society, which was organized and is fostered wholly by the Collettes, is to secure to them a salary and traveling expenses."⁹⁷

After a visit from Collett "with eight or ten applications for contracts in Mendocino and Sonoma Counties," an alarmed Asbury wrote to Washington for an evaluation of the California laws governing the school contracting process. Asbury believed that "the Indian children were entitled to attend" school already. He feared that, due to Collett's interference, counties would soon be "insisting on tuition and favoring the exclusion of such children unless such contract is made."⁹⁸ Kelsey believed that "the deluge of applications for Govt aid, sent in by Collett, has queered the whole business" of getting more Native pupils into public schools.⁹⁹ Collett's actions probably launched the federal review of U.S. government tuition payments for Indian children to California school districts that soon followed. Two months later, the U.S. comptroller determined that federal aid could not legally be furnished to California schools because Native Americans were already entitled to free public education under state law.¹⁰⁰

The NCIA and IBC also grappled over the Panama-Pacific International Exposition (PPIE), held in San Francisco from February 20 to December 4, 1915. Both organizations intended to speak about their California Indian work at the PPIE, with the IBC's "Indian Conference" scheduled for August 2-8, immediately before the NCIA's "Congress on Indian Progress" during August 9-14. Both conferences offered sessions on improving the status and condition of Native Americans, but the IBC's program had key differences. The IBC's offerings, for example, included women "in Indian costume" performing ceremonial songs and dances; a slideshow of Indians performing the snake dance with a discussion of Indian legends; a contest in which Native Americans made "fire in [the] primitive way for [a] prize"; and photographer Joseph K. Dixon's lecture "The Last Great Indian Council: The Farewell of the Chiefs."¹⁰¹ Dixon had recently photographed and filmed a gathering of Indigenous "chiefs" for an event billed as the last of its kind for this "noble, though vanishing race."¹⁰² The IBC planned an assemblage of one hundred Native people to open its presentation, and their "breaking up of camp" to mark its end.¹⁰³

In presenting Indians for the entertainment of PPIE audiences, the IBC program simultaneously celebrated and exploited Native American culture.

The NCIA's meeting began the next day, promising "the largest possible attendance of the intellectual leaders of our times, who are interested in Indian problems," as well as "the real workers and doers in the Indian field." To showcase the "progress of the race," the program included alumni of Indian schools and "educated Indian leaders."¹⁰⁴ For the subconference of alumni, the NCIA invited "every Indian present" to "voice his opinions as to Indian needs and participate in all discussions."¹⁰⁵ Surprisingly, at Friday morning's session Kelsey gave a talk on the condition of Northern California Indians that was followed by a discussion of the subject by Collett, Asbury, and others.¹⁰⁶

Although both groups participated at the PPIE, Collett complained that the NCIA tried to sabotage the IBC. According to Collett, an unnamed agent "suggested to me that it would be better for us not to undertake our program." Collett saw in this the "underhanded work" of the NCIA. Collett submitted a draft program to the PPIE, which was well received. According to Collett, officials told him they had asked the NCIA for just such a program, but leaders had "said it could not be arranged." Collett alleged that, even after the PPIE accepted his program, NCIA "opposition continued until the last," with Kelsey trying "to discourage us by saying the Indians would not come, and other things of a similar nature."¹⁰⁷

PPIE records tell a different story. Early correspondence between Kelsey and PPIE organizers suggests that officials wanted presentations that emphasized Indian assimilation, rather than the persistence of Native American culture. One official told Kelsey that the PPIE idea was "not to exploit the Indians in Wild-West show fashion" (a reference to the wildly popular entertainments launched by William F. "Buffalo Bill" Cody in 1893, and in which he performed as late as 1916), but "to show the actual progress" Native Californians had made toward assimilation, "and the possibilities for their future development as good citizens."¹⁰⁸ Exposition organizers told Kelsey they had consulted with the commissioner of Indian affairs, who also was "strongly opposed to any exploitation of the spectacular characteristics of the race."¹⁰⁹ In other words, the NCIA's assimilationist program better matched the approach favored by PPIE officials.

After the Exposition, each group belittled the other's PPIE participation. Ellen R. Smith, NCIA president from at least 1914 to 1917, criticized Collett and Dixon for emphasizing the "more picturesque barbaric features" of Native life, customs that Smith believed had "little real existence" in twentieth-century California.¹¹⁰ Kelsey called Dixon "green" in Indian affairs and thus unworthy to speak on Native life. Dixon's previous tour of the state Kelsey dismissed as "humbug," calling Dixon and Collett "birds of a feather flock[ing] together."¹¹¹

Collett, meanwhile, declared the IBC session at PPIE a success. "It was the largest of the kind ever held in the State," with seventy-five Indians in attendance. Collett viewed Indian participation as affirmation that Indigenous Californians valued the IBC's work, because Indigenous attendees were "sufficiently interested in their own cause to pay their own railroad fare and something toward their expenses" while visiting San Francisco. The NCIA's Congress, on the other hand, Collett scoffed, would have had no attendees if the Indian Office had not sent its employees.¹¹²

The rivalry between organizations became personal when, according to Collett, the NCIA tried to have a foster child removed from the couple's care. According to Collett, the NCIA circulated rumors that led to a habeas corpus proceeding in San Jose superior court when the worker who placed the girl with the Colletts "discovered," as a local newspaper reported, "that the Colletts were not in a position to give the child a good home."¹¹³ To smear the couple, Collett reported, Kelsey took a "desperate chance" and testified that the Colletts had "misappropriated \$250" while employed by the association. Under cross-examination by the Colletts' attorney, however, Collett claimed that Kelsey had admitted that these funds had been properly credited.¹¹⁴ Daily accounts of the proceedings in the local newspaper make no mention of this dramatic testimony. The child remained with the Colletts.¹¹⁵

The NCIA and the IBC continued their jousting for public prominence, with the IBC appearing to slowly gain ground. For example, the NCIA's parent organization, the National Indian Association, often included IBC activities in its annual reports, along with those of the NCIA. This must have been galling to the NCIA, which was an official, dues-paying chapter of the NIA (the IBC was not). NCIA leaders also had reason to doubt the loyalty of Dorcas J. Spencer, the venerable California WCTU leader who had once chaired the NIA's temperance department. In 1914, Spencer submitted reports as NCIA temperance secretary as well as IBC director, but in that year and subsequent ones, Spencer's reports to the NIA discussed IBC activities, making no mention of the NCIA.¹¹⁶

Other signs revealed that the NCIA was losing ground to the IBC. In 1916, for example, the Commonwealth Club scheduled a program on the condition of Indians in California, but this time, Collett and IBC honorary president David Starr Jordan took the stage. Unlike its 1909 talk before the same group, the NCIA's only presence was in the audience, where Kelsey, a Commonwealth Club member, dismissed the presentation as "interesting, but hazy as to a program for the future."¹¹⁷

The IBC and NCIA sometimes pulled U.S. Indian Office agents into their feud. In 1915, agent Horace G. Wilson accused Collett of interfering with the Round Valley Indians. The accusation triggered an investigation by Lafayette Dorrington, a special agent of the Indian Office, whose inquiry ultimately pointed a finger at the NCIA's C. E. Kelsey. Dorrington's report appended a letter from Kelsey to Collett, which, Dorrington said, Kelsey "styled in a friendly manner" that failed to conceal "an unfriendly attitude."¹¹⁸ Another exhibit was a letter from IBC president Carl Warner to Frederick Collett, in which Warner summarized an exchange of letters with Kelsey. Warner reported confronting Kelsey in writing, asking about the NCIA members who had "circulated rumors calculated to discredit" the Colletts, to which Kelsey wrote back "to the effect that the Association had made no charges against" the Colletts.¹¹⁹ Dorrington ultimately concluded that the accusations against the Colletts were "unwarranted and unjust," "wholly without cause or reason and therefore should be dismissed without prejudice."¹²⁰ Dorrington blamed the contretemps on professional jealousy and the "somewhat strained" relations existing "between Mr. Kelsey and Rev. Collett," probably owing to "the fact that Rev. and Mrs. Collett" were "carrying on work similar to that of the Northern California Indian Association."¹²¹

Neither NCIA skulduggery nor an Indian Office investigation deterred the IBC. Collett testified before Congress on behalf of California Indians a number of times in the 1910s

and 1920s, and the legislative record includes numerous letters from the IBC. Ironically, many of the IBC's talking points were identical to those the NCIA had previously made to Congress. Both groups invoked the unratified treaties, laws that prohibited Indians from owning land, the drastic decline in the California Indian population, and the unique status of California Indians as the only Native Americans whom the federal government had not compensated for the loss of their homelands, nor executed treaties with them formally extinguishing Native title.

But the IBC's action plan included an element that the NCIA was unlikely to mention: complaints about the poor quality of the land purchased to provide homes for Native Californians. "Much of the land which was purchased," Collett told the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, "is absolutely worthless." Moreover, the procedures by which "these lands were being bought" were unsatisfactory, leaving Collett to call for "a thorough investigation of the entire situation."¹²² With this, Collett took direct aim at the U.S. Indian Office special agent responsible for selecting the properties and concluding the purchases, C. E. Kelsey.

Kelsey returned the favor. In 1920, he again accused the Colletts of caring more for their own welfare than for that of California Indians. "We have feared their work was and is a means of getting a living," and that "Indians are subordinate" to this goal. The Colletts did not exert themselves on behalf of Native Californians, Kelsey complained. Instead, they helped only a "limited number of bands within easy reach" of their home. Kelsey saw the lack of news coverage of the Colletts' activities as proof that "the papers must have got wise" to the IBC's insubstantiality, since "I have seen but one mention of them in the last four years."¹²³

Despite Kelsey's accusations, analysis of IBC records reveals that the Colletts earned very little from their early work for the IBC. The organization's first budget set Frederick Collett and Beryl Bishop-Collett's combined salary at \$1,800, with an additional \$1,200 for expenses, nearly half of the IBC's total budget.¹²⁴ But the Colletts received no salaries in 1913: the IBC received donations of \$1,228 and spent \$1,228, leaving no pay for the couple.¹²⁵ An IBC report admitted that "overwork and the strain of...financial embarrassment" led to Mrs. Collett's "general breakdown" at the end of that year.¹²⁶ Only toward the end of the 1910s did the IBC's finances stabilize. In 1919, the IBC raised \$4,900, nearly half of which the board paid as salary. It later agreed to pay F. G. Collett "something on back salary" for the years 1913–1916.¹²⁷

THE NCIA'S DECLINE

It was probably inevitable that conflict would arise between the NCIA and the IBC. Yet one rose in stature while the other declined. Why? The two organizations operated in essentially the same environment. They often stated the same overall goals. But in the 1910s, the NCIA saw membership and donations for its work steadily decline. Certainly, one reason was dimming enthusiasm for the kind of evangelical Protestantism that had stirred NCIA founders and supporters.¹²⁸ As NCIA founders died and stalwarts aged, membership in the organization fell, as did public support for its work. Trends in charity work played a role as well: at the turn of the twentieth century, college-educated men and women

professionalized the social welfare work formerly performed by private charitable associations. They and others who called themselves “Progressives” denigrated female volunteers like those who had founded the NCIA.¹²⁹ Finally, with little hope of meeting its ambitious \$100,000 fundraising target, the 1917 fire that destroyed the Guinda school, followed by the loss of the Olsens as resident managers, left the NCIA with no direct means of continuing its program of Native American assimilation and Christianization.

The IBC is a study in contrasts. Frederick Collett was a generation younger than the NCIA’s Cornelia Taber and C. E. Kelsey. Born in 1884, he was just twenty-nine when he and his wife formed the IBC.¹³⁰ Moreover, Collett seemed to relish confronting the establishment and ruffling its feathers, tactics that may have appealed to Americans attracted to muckraking journalism in the style of Ida M. Tarbell, Lincoln Steffens, Ray Stannard Baker, and others.¹³¹ He criticized the ways that local, state, and federal officials had treated and continued to treat California Indians, prompting complaints that he was pushy, abrasive, and/or dishonest.

The IBC took aggressive stances in advocating for Native Californians, including, in 1916, the novel position that the “Indians of California are citizens” of the United States and therefore were “entitled to all of the privileges [and] rights” guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution.¹³² By upsetting the established order, Collett helped to advance and expand the rights of California’s dispossessed Indians. In addition to pushing school districts to provide free public education for Native children, the IBC pushed for Native suffrage; equal protection under existing laws; enforcement of laws that prohibited selling liquor to Indians; medical and financial aid for the sick, aged, and destitute; and legislation that allowed Native Americans to sue the federal government. As it fought to improve Indigenous people’s conditions, the IBC probed their legal status, cajoling officials at every level of government—county, state, and federal—to clarify, define, and fulfill their responsibilities to them. When officials refused to follow the law or denied responsibility, Collett forced them to defend their positions in court. Among landmark cases the IBC initiated is *Anderson v. Mathews* (1917), in which the California Supreme Court ruled that the non-reservation Indians of Lake County were citizens and thus entitled to vote.¹³³

Such lawsuits point up the philosophical differences that divided IBC and NCIA leaders. The boards of both included attorneys—the NCIA’s was C. E. Kelsey—but Kelsey disapproved of taking the judicial route. “Legal proceedings could undoubtedly force Indians into the public schools,” Kelsey observed, “but the schools would be boycotted by the whites.”¹³⁴ Instead of forcing change through legal action, Kelsey and other NCIA leaders favored gradually swaying public opinion through education, such as “sending speakers or literature to Missionary Meetings, Clubs, etc.” which they believed would eventually arouse “public sentiment in favor of Indians.”¹³⁵ Kelsey revealed no sense of urgency: someday he expected that the NCIA’s quiet, steady efforts would “make some people in this State ashamed to deny to Indians admission to schools or churches or the equal protection of the laws.”¹³⁶ Kelsey admitted that such “careful missionary work among some of our white people” would “take considerable time” to produce results.¹³⁷

Ultimately, it is the NCIA’s preference for private charity in the form of the Guinda school that best explains the organization’s decline. At the NCIA’s 1915 “Congress on Indian Progress” at the PPIE, Kelsey spoke on “State and Federal Responsibility for the

Indian.” He explained that Indians fell between the gaps of two jurisdictions, both of which were anxious to deny responsibility. Kelsey called for “some definite determination” of the status of the state’s estimated 12,000 to 14,000 Native peoples, yet he saw neither state nor federal governments as the solution to Native Californians’ problems.¹³⁸ Rather, the NCIA suggested that private groups should oversee Native welfare. “The Indian case is at our private doors,” it asserted, “asking for our attention.” The NCIA believed it offered the best solution for Indian landlessness and poverty: the Guinda Indian Industrial School. “An Industrial School provided by private benevolence,” the association advised, “is the only way” to provide Indians with the help they needed.¹³⁹

Although the NCIA was merciless in its attacks on the IBC, many of its criticisms have merit. Questions about Frederick Collett’s financial practices, for example, dogged his career. The NCIA’s claims that the Colletts incurred expenses without prior authorization was only the first of many allegations concerning finances. Six months after the IBC was formed, anthropologist A. L. Kroeber resigned as a director after the Colletts incurred charges without authorization and beyond the organization’s cash balance.¹⁴⁰

Additional questions surrounded the IBC’s practice of accepting money from Native Americans. Collett believed that people valued what they paid for. Thus, the IBC encouraged those Indians who could afford it to help fund IBC work.¹⁴¹ (The NCIA’s Guinda school also emphasized self-help, but it did not seek money from Indigenous people, instead offering them free memberships in the organization.)¹⁴²

Collett’s contemporaries similarly questioned his acceptance of money from those he was intended to help. Dorrington’s investigation included reviewing Collett’s reported receipt of funds from Round Valley Indians and how he used them. S. M. Brosius, a longtime officer of the Indian Rights Association, criticized Collett in 1922 for asking Native Americans to advance funds for an IBC legislative campaign (this one would allow California Indians to bring suit in the Court of Claims). This was improper, wrote Brosius, and “the first instance of the kind which I recall of this character.”¹⁴³ Brosius subsequently amended his statement to acknowledge that the funds in question were intended to improve the general welfare of the California Indians rather than to advance the Court of Claims legislation. Kelsey commented on the legislation, writing to Brosius that, although the NCIA did “not oppose Mr. Collett’s attempt, his work nevertheless leaves a disagreeable taste. This has been Collett’s failing in other matters,” mused Kelsey. “When he starts out to do something beyond criticism, he does it in such a way as to look crooked.”¹⁴⁴

His experiences with the NCIA left a disagreeable taste in Collett’s mouth as well, teaching him to expect budgetary scrutiny. The IBC’s 1913 annual financial report instructed recipients to “file for reference” because “inquiries will doubtless be made concerning this matter.”¹⁴⁵ Sure enough, a scandal emerged late in 1922 concerning Collett’s use of funds collected from California Indians. Many IBC members resigned. Collett was later indicted for mail fraud in an unrelated case, but he was not convicted.¹⁴⁶

Finances were Frederick Collett’s Achilles’ heel, yet he remained an influential—if controversial—figure in Indian welfare work until his death in 1955. This must have galled the leaders of the NCIA, especially given that Collett’s prominence rose as that of the NCIA faded. After the Guinda school superintendent’s resignation, leaders temporarily

closed the school.¹⁴⁷ They rented out the Guinda property, a move that generated some income for 1919 and 1920.¹⁴⁸ Eventually, however, leaders decided to sell the land. They pledged to use sale proceeds to provide scholarships for “worthy young Indians,” in 1920. With the help of the Parent-Teacher Association, they were looking for “the right sort of young Indians” to receive scholarships.¹⁴⁹ In 1931, after transferring its remaining funds to the NIA, the organization disbanded.¹⁵⁰

LARISA K. MILLER is an archivist who was introduced to C. E. Kelsey by researchers at the National Archives in San Bruno, California. She initially searched for Kelsey’s personal papers. Upon determining that his papers had not survived, she decided to partially fill the gap by doing research and writing about Kelsey. She has a BA in geography and MA in American studies from the University of Minnesota, and an MLIS from San Jose State University.

NOTES

1. *Indian Appropriation Bill, 1920: Hearings before the Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate on H.R. 14746*, 65th Cong., 3d sess., 190 (February 14, 1919) (statement of Frederick G. Collett, Field Secretary of the Indian Board of Co-operation).
2. Francis P. Prucha, *American Indian Policy in Crisis: Christian Reformers and the Indian, 1865–1900* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1976).
3. Valerie Sherer Mathes (ed.), *The Women’s National Indian Association: A History* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2015) (reviewed in *California History* 98, no. 4, 2021), examines the organization’s broader historical context. Mathes includes a chapter on the NCIA, especially its nineteenth-century work, and discusses the group’s decline in Valerie Sherer Mathes, *Divinely Guided: The California Work of the Women’s National Indian Association* (Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 2012).
4. Cathleen Cahill, “Making and Marketing Baskets in California,” in Mathes, *Women’s National Indian Association*. In the same volume, see also Helen Bannan, “The WNIA in the Context of Women’s History,” which compares the organizational histories of the WNIA and the WCTU; and Valerie Sherer Mathes, “The Redlands Indian Association: The WNIA in Southern California,” which provides a history of another WNIA chapter, the Redlands Indian Association. See also Valerie Sherer Mathes, “C. E. Kelsey and California’s Landless Indians,” which discusses one of the NCIA’s male leaders in the early twentieth century, in Valerie Sherer Mathes and Albert L. Hurtado, *Gender, Race, and Power in the Indian Reform Movement: Revisiting the History of the WNIA* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2020). A thumbnail sketch of the NCIA and C. E. Kelsey appears in Larisa K. Miller, “Primary Sources on C. E. Kelsey and the Northern California Indian Association,” *Journal of Western Archives* 4, no. 1 (2013): article 8.
5. Timothy M. Wright, “‘We Cast Our Lot with the Indians from That Day On’: The California Indian Welfare Work of the Reverends Frederick G. Collett and Beryl Bishop-Collett, 1910 to 1914” (MA thesis, California State University, Sacramento, 2004).
6. Edward D. Castillo, “Twentieth-Century Secular Movements,” in Robert F. Heizer (ed.), *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 8: *California* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1978).
7. This method of illuminating conflicting ideas and approaches to Indian reform is used in C. Joseph Genetin-Pilawa, “‘Friends’ and Fistfights: Federal Indian Policy Debates and Late Nineteenth Century State Development,” *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 14, no. 4 (October 2015): 512–520; Valerie Sherer Mathes, “Helen Hunt Jackson, Amelia Stone Quinton, and the Mission Indians of California,” *Southern California Quarterly* 96, no. 2 (Summer 2014): 172–205.
8. Mechoopda-nsn.gov, “Mechoopda Indian tribe of Chico Rancheria,” <https://www.mechoopda-nsn.gov/home/>; see also Valerie Sherer Mathes, “Indian Philanthropy in California: Annie Bidwell and the Mechoopda Indians,” *Arizona and the West* 25, no. 2 (July 1983): 153–166.
9. Mathes, *Divinely Guided*, 168–171.
10. Ibid., 89, 95; Cathleen D. Cahill, “Reassessing the Role of the ‘Native Helper’: Christian Indians and the Woman’s National Indian Association (WNIA), 1905–1926,” paper presented at conference, Women and American Religion: Reimagining the Past, University of Chicago Divinity School, October 8–10, 2003.
11. For more on the WCTU’s Indian work, see Thomas J. Lappas, *In League against King Alcohol: Native American Women and the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, 1874–1933* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2020).
12. Mary Bowden Carroll, *Ten Years in Paradise. Leaves from a Society Reporter’s Note-Book* (San Jose, CA: Press of Popp & Hogan, 1903), 89.

13. Lori Jacobson, "'Shall We Have a Periodical?': *The Indian's Friend*," in Mathes, *Women's National Indian Association*, 46–61.
14. C. E. Kelsey to Albert K. Smiley, October 18, 1907, box 17, no. 241, Smiley Family Papers (HC.MC.III.3), Quaker and Special Collections, Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania. For more about the Zayante Conference, see Cahill, "Reassessing the Role of the 'Native Helper.'"
15. The history of California Indians in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has been the topic of many works, including Benjamin Madley, *An American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe, 1846–1873* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016); Albert L. Hurtado, *Indian Survival on the California Frontier* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988); James J. Rawls, *Indians of California: The Changing Image*, rev. ed. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986); and Jack D. Forbes, *Native Americans of California and Nevada*, rev. ed. (Happy Camp, CA: Naturegraph, 1982).
16. C. E. Kelsey, "Report of Special Agent for California Indians," in Robert F. Heizer, ed., *Federal Concern about the Conditions of California Indians, 1853 to 1913: Eight Documents* (Socorro, NM: Ballena, 1979), 124.
17. Harry Kelsey, "The California Indian Treaty Myth," *Southern California Quarterly* 55, no. 3 (Fall 1973): 233–234; George E. Anderson, W. H. Ellison, and Robert F. Heizer, *Treaty Making and Treaty Rejection by the Federal Government in California, 1850–1852* (Socorro, NM: Ballena Press, 1978); Robert F. Heizer, *The Eighteen Unratified Treaties of 1851–1852 between the California Indians and the United States Government* (Berkeley: Archaeological Research Facility, Department of Anthropology, University of California, 1972).
18. Kelsey, "Report of Special Agent for California Indians," 124.
19. Mathes, *Divinely Guided*, 91, 97.
20. Larisa K. Miller, "The Secret Treaties with California's Indians," *Prologue: The Journal of the National Archives* (Fall–Winter 2013): 38–45, <https://www.archives.gov/files/publications/prologue/2013/fall-winter/treaties.pdf>. The NCIA learned of the 1851–1852 treaties and searched for them. Because the NCIA had no agent in Washington, D.C., it ultimately called on the Indian Rights Association (IRA) and Senator Thomas Bard for assistance. Brosius of the IRA found the treaties at the Indian Office but was unable to prove that the Senate had not ratified them. At about the same time, Bard's office found the U.S. Senate's copies, and in 1905 the Senate lifted the injunction of secrecy from the Senate's copy.
21. Kelsey bought about 4,315 acres in thirteen Northern California counties—Colusa, Del Norte, Fresno, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Madera, Mendocino, Siskiyou, Sonoma, Tuolumne, and Yolo—as well as sites in Southern California.
22. Joe H. Norris, Upper Lake, California inspection report, September 24, 1910, file 22267-1909-307.4, California Special, Central Classified Files (entry 121), Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (RG 75), National Archives Building, Washington, D.C.
23. Talk before Northern California Indian Association, Mt. Hermon, California, August 3, 1916, box 19, Richard Henry Pratt papers, Yale Collection of Western Americana, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
24. *Indian Tribes of California: Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee of Indian Affairs, House of Representatives*, pt. 2, 67th Cong., 2d sess., 247 (April 28, 1922) (statement of Albert F. James, Weott Tribe).
25. *Ibid.*, 276 (statement of Mr. Edgar B. Meritt, Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs).
26. "Indian Missions in Northern California," *The Indian's Friend* (Philadelphia: National Indian Association), May 1912, 12.
27. *The Hannah E. Bean Memorial Mission* (California Indian Association, 1909), in *Indian Rights Association Papers, 1868–1968* (Glen Rock, NJ: Microfilming Corp. of America, 1974), reel 129, no. 314 (hereafter cited as *IRA Papers*); Cornelia Taber, *California and Her Indian Children* (San Jose: Northern California Indian Association, 1911), 65.
28. *Annual Report of the National Indian Association* (New York: National Indian Association, 1908), 21.
29. "Indian Rights and Wrongs," *Transactions of the Commonwealth Club of California* 4, no. 7 (December 1909): 415–442.
30. *Fifteenth Annual Report of the Northern California Indian Association, January 1, 1910* (San Jose, CA: Press of Muirson & Wright), 2, in *IRA Papers*, reel 132, no. 144.
31. *Hannah E. Bean Memorial Mission*.
32. Cathleen D. Cahill, *Federal Fathers and Mothers: A Social History of the United States Indian Service, 1869–1933* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011), 63–64.
33. *Ibid.*, 2–3, 46.
34. "The attention of our readers . . .," *The Indian's Friend*, April 1908, 9.
35. C. E. Kelsey, *Field Matrons* (California Indian Association, ca. 1909), in *IRA Papers*, reel 129, no. 314.
36. *The Fifth Zayante Indian Conference, Mount Hermon, California, August 9, 1910* (San Jose: Northern California Indian Association), 4.
37. Cornelia Taber, *California and Her Indian Children* (San Jose: Northern California Indian Association, 1911).

38. Mrs. C. E. Kelsey and Miss Cornelia Taber, *How Christmas Came to the Rivers* (California Indian Association, ca. 1909), in *IRA Papers*, reel 129, no. 314.
39. Cornelia Taber to Albert K. Smiley, July 17, 1908, box 20, no. 253, Smiley Family Papers.
40. "Indian Missions in Northern California," *The Indian's Friend*, May 1912, 12.
41. Kelsey, *Field Matrons*.
42. C. E. Kelsey, "The Rights and Wrongs of the California Indians," *Transactions of the Commonwealth Club of California* 4, no. 7 (December 1909): 428.
43. *Northern California Indian Association Assembled in the Zayante Indian Conference: [proceedings]* (Northern California Indian Association, 1907?), Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University; C. E. Kelsey to Albert K. Smiley, October 18, 1907, box 17, no. 241, Smiley Family Papers.
44. Kelsey, "Rights and Wrongs of the California Indians," 427.
45. C. E. Kelsey to Clara D. True, January 16, 1912, *IRA Papers*, reel 25.
46. Kelsey, "Rights and Wrongs of the California Indians," 428. It is not clear exactly what partial support was intended because this project never reached fruition. However, the quotation suggests that Native support would go directly to the Native teachers, not the NCIA. There is no indication that the NCIA collected money from Native Americans, and the NCIA did not charge dues to Native American members, though it is not known whether there were any Native American members.
47. C. E. Kelsey to Clara D. True, January 16, 1912, *IRA Papers*, reel 25.
48. "Only the Self Raised Stay Up": *Indian Industrial School* (Northern California Indian Association, ca. 1910), in *IRA Papers*, reel 132, no. 344.
49. Anna F. Taber to Joshua L. Barton, September 22, 1910, enclosed in Barton to Albert K. Smiley, October 3, 1910, box 28, no. 349, Smiley Family Papers. Adjusted for inflation, \$4,000 would be \$112,703.62 in 2020 dollars. Westegg.com, "The Inflation Calculator."
50. C. E. Kelsey to Clara D. True, January 16, 1912, *IRA Papers*, reel 25.
51. "Only the Self Raised Stay Up": *Indian Industrial School* (Northern California Indian Association, ca. 1910). \$25,000 in 1910 dollars would be \$704,397.65 in 2020 dollars. \$100,000 in 1910 dollars would be \$2,817,590 in 2020 dollars. Westegg.com, "The Inflation Calculator."
52. "The First Indian Conference at Guinda, Cal.," *The Indian's Friend*, October 1911, 12.
53. 61 Cong. Rec. S1296 (January 23, 1911); H.R. Rep. No. 28406 (February 16, 1911) (Conf. Rep.).
54. "Office Notes and Comment," *The Indian's Friend*, February 1911, 9.
55. Cornelia Taber to Albert K. Smiley, September 2, 1910, box 28, no. 350, Smiley Family Papers. Legters is not among the attendees listed in *Report of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples, October 19th, 20th and 21st, 1910* (New York: Lake Mohonk Conference, 1910).
56. L. L. Legters to Matthew Sniffen, May 11, 1911, *IRA Papers*, reel 24. \$25,000 in 1911 would be \$704,397 in 2020 dollars.
57. "The Annual Meeting of the National Indian Association," *The Indian's Friend*, December 1911, 10.
58. Olsen was superintendent, teacher, and resident manager—NCIA sources give him various titles over time. C. E. Kelsey, "Indian Industrial School," *The Indian's Friend*, October 1912, 7.
59. *The Guinda Indian Industrial School* (Northern California Indian Association, ca. 1913–14), in *IRA Papers*, reel 132, no. 344.
60. No records of the student admission process survive. *The Guinda Indian School* (Northern California Indian Association, ca. 1913), 2, Hathi Trust Digital Library, <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/nnc2.ark:/13960/t17m47185>.
61. *The Guinda Indian Industrial School* (Northern California Indian Association, ca. 1913–14).
62. "Quarterly Meeting of Northern California Indian Association Is Held in This City," *San Jose Evening News*, April 26, 1916.
63. Report of the Treasurer, *Annual Report of the National Indian Association* (New York: National Indian Association, 1900–1916).
64. A. Grant Evans to Dear Friend, October 24, 1913, box 24, Incoming correspondence from others than the Commissioner, Round Valley Agency, RG 75, National Archives and Records Administration–Pacific Region (San Francisco).
65. *Annual Report of the National Indian Association* (New York: National Indian Association, 1913), 23.
66. A. Grant Evans to Dear Friend, October 24, 1913, box 24, Incoming correspondence from others than the Commissioner, Round Valley Agency.
67. Although the cause of the fire was not known, there is a history of students setting fire to government Indian school buildings. See, for example, "Commissioner's Report: The First by Mr. Leupp," *The Indian School Journal* (Chillico, Oklahoma), January 1906, 44.
68. C. E. Kelsey letter in "Guinda Indian Industrial School," *The Indian's Friend*, March 1918, 5.
69. *Annual Report of the National Indian Association* (New York: National Indian Association, 1919), 19.
70. C. E. Kelsey letter in "Guinda Indian Industrial School," *The Indian's Friend*, March 1918, 5.

71. C. E. Kelsey to Herbert Welsh, November 12, 1917, *IRA Papers*, reel 32; C. E. Kelsey letter in "Guinda Indian Industrial School," *The Indian's Friend*, March 1918, 5.
72. Mathes, *Divinely Guided*, 150–151.
73. Mrs. C. E. Kelsey to Willard S. Campbell, December 6, 1912, file Christmas Gifts 1912, box 75, Administrative Files, Greenville Agency, RG 75, NARA–Pacific Region (SF).
74. Officers, *Annual Report of the National Indian Association* (New York: National Indian Association, 1919–1922); Mathes, *Divinely Guided*, 151.
75. It is not clear how or why this occurred, but the Colletts changed affiliation from Methodist to Congregationalist in about 1912. Wright, "We Cast Our Lot," 74.
76. They started at Colusa in September–October 1910 and were paid by the NCIA for six months. Then they had a contract with the NCIA for calendar year 1912. There was a gap in between, which was when they first petitioned the county.
77. Wright, "We Cast Our Lot," 73–75.
78. F. G. Collett to L. A. Dorrington, November 29, 1916, exhibit 87, file F. G. Collett, box 2, Investigative records, 1913–1923, Special Agent at Large–Reno (hereafter Dorrington records), RG 75, NARA–Pacific Region (SF).
79. C. E. Kelsey to T. B. Wilson, August 6, 1914, file Missionaries, box 46, Administrative Files, Round Valley Agency, RG 75, NARA–Pacific Region (SF).
80. C. E. Kelsey to Matthew K. Sniffen, January 8, 1920, *IRA Papers*, reel 34.
81. *Annual Report of the National Indian Association* (New York: National Indian Association, 1912), 22.
82. F. G. Collett to L. A. Dorrington, November 29, 1916, exhibit 87, file F. G. Collett, box 2, Dorrington records.
83. C. E. Kelsey, "California Indians Need More Schools," *The Red Man* (Carlisle, PA: U.S. Indian School), June 1912, 472.
84. Cornelia Taber to Dr. Kroeber, November 18, 1910, file Cornelia Taber [sic], box 16, Records of the Department of Anthropology, CU-23, University Archives, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
85. Kelsey, "California Indians Need More Schools," 472.
86. IBC Constitution, file Indian Board of Co-operation by 1913, reel 30, A. L. Kroeber papers, BANC film 2049, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
87. Dorcas J. Spencer, *The Real Indian of the Past and the Real Indian of the Present* (National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, ca. 1913), 4, Hathi Trust Digital Library, <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.31175032014873>.
88. F. G. Collett to L. A. Dorrington, November 29, 1916, exhibit 87, file F. G. Collett, box 2, Dorrington records.
89. Cornelia Taber, letter to the editor, "Collett and Wife and Indian Ass'n: Not Now Field Superintendents of Northern California Indian Organization," *San Jose Mercury News*, June 15, 1913, California Digital Newspaper Collection, University of California, Riverside, <https://cdnc.ucr.edu/>.
90. David Starr Jordan to C. A. Walcott, February 18, 1916, box 364, Commonwealth Club of California records, Hoover Institution Archives.
91. Jordan continued to be listed as honorary president on IBC letterhead and reports through at least the end of the decade.
92. C. E. Kelsey to F. G. Collett, March 6, 1913, exhibit 53, file F. G. Collett, box 2, Dorrington records.
93. F. G. Collett to L. A. Dorrington, November 29, 1916, exhibit 87, file F. G. Collett, box 2, Dorrington records.
94. C. E. Kelsey to C. H. Asbury, July 9, 1914, file Indian associations, box 1, Agency General Subject Records, Reno Agency, RG 75, NARA–Pacific Region (SF).
95. C. E. Kelsey to T. B. Wilson, August 6, 1914, file Missionaries, box 46, Administrative Files, Round Valley Agency.
96. C. H. Asbury to Commissioner, October 21, 1913, file Old Public School File, box 35, Indian and Public School Subject Records, Reno Agency, RG 75, NARA–Pacific Region (SF).
97. Ibid.
98. C. H. Asbury to Commissioner, August 16, 1913, file Old Public School File, box 35, Indian and Public School Subject Records, Reno Agency.
99. C. E. Kelsey to C. H. Asbury, July 9, 1914, file Indian associations, box 1, Agency General Subject Records, Reno Agency.
100. George E. Downey, Comptroller, to the honorable secretary of the interior, October 22, 1913, file Old Public School File, box 35, Indian and Public School Subject Records, Reno Agency.
101. Program, Indian Board of Co-operation Indian Conference, Panama–Pacific International Exposition, August 2–8, 1915, file Indian Associations, box 1, Agency General Subject Records, Reno Agency.

102. Rodman Wanamaker, "The Concept," in Joseph K. Dixon, *The Vanishing Race* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page, 1913), xvi.
103. Program, Indian Board of Co-operation Indian Conference.
104. Northern California Indian Association to Dear Friend, July 13, 1914, file Indian Associations, box 1, Agency General Subject Records, Reno Agency.
105. *Congress on Indian Progress under Auspices of the Northern California Indian Association in Co-operation with the Conference of Officials and Employees of the U.S. Indian Service and the returned Indian Students' Conference, Called by Hon. Cato Sells, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, San Francisco, Calif., August 9–15, 1915*, California State Library, Sutro Branch.
106. "Report of the Conference of Indian Workers at San Francisco," *Indian School Journal* (Chilocco, Oklahoma), September 1915, 36.
107. F. G. Collett to L. A. Dorrington, November 29, 1916, exhibit 87, file F. G. Collett, box 2, Dorrington records.
108. See Joy S. Kasson, *Buffalo Bill's Wild West: Celebrity, Memory, and Popular History* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2015); ALC to C. E. Kelsey, December 10, 1913, box 99, Panama–Pacific International Exposition records, BANC MSS C-A 190, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
109. ALC to C. E. Kelsey, May 14, 1914, box 99, Panama–Pacific International Exposition records.
110. Mrs. J. Fred [Ellen R.] Smith to C. H. Asbury, July 13, 1914, file Indian Associations, box 1, Agency General Subject Records, Reno Agency. There is no record of the dates each NCIA officer served. Smith is listed as president on letterhead in 1914, 1916 and 1917, but her actual begin and end dates are not known. She might have begun her term in 1913 or 1914, and there is no indication whether she served after 1917 (or if the letterhead was out of date).
111. C. E. Kelsey to Matthew K. Sniffen, July 8, 1915, and November 11, 1915, and Kelsey to Samuel M. Brosius, February 14, 1916, *IRA Papers*, reels 30–31.
112. *Indian Board of Co-operation (Incorporated) Report of the Work of the Field Secretaries of Year Ending August 15, 1915*, box 364, Commonwealth Club of California records; F. G. Collett to L. A. Dorrington, November 29, 1916, exhibit 87, file F. G. Collett, box 2, Dorrington records.
113. "Contest for Child Is Waged by Two Women," *San Jose Mercury News*, published as *San Jose Mercury Herald*, April 16, 1916. Court records of the case have since disappeared, possibly destroyed in a 1930s courthouse fire. The case is not among court records at History San Jose, the Santa Clara County Archives, or the San Jose Superior Court Records Department.
114. F. G. Collett to L. A. Dorrington, November 29, 1916, exhibit 87, file F. G. Collett, box 2, Dorrington records.
115. "Fight for a Little Girl Not Yet Given Up, Says the Mother," *San Jose Evening News*, April 20, 1916; "Minister and Wife Finally Successful in Long Fight to Retain Pretty Little Girl," *San Jose Evening News*, May 31, 1916.
116. *Annual Report of the National Indian Association* (New York: National Indian Association, 1914), 30, and subsequent annual reports of the NIA.
117. C. E. Kelsey to E. A. Wolcott, March 9, 1916, box 364, Commonwealth Club of California records.
118. L. A. Dorrington to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, January 30, 1917, file F. G. Collett, box 2, Dorrington records.
119. Carl M. Warner to F. G. Collett, November 23, 1916, exhibit 88, file F. G. Collett, box 2, Dorrington records.
120. L. A. Dorrington to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, January 30, 1917, file F. G. Collett, box 2, Dorrington records.
121. Ibid.
122. *Indian Appropriation Bill, 1920: Hearings before the Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate on H.R. 14746, 65th Cong., 3d sess., 191 (February 14, 1919)* (statement of Frederick G. Collett, Field Secretary of the Indian Board of Co-operation).
123. C. E. Kelsey to Matthew K. Sniffen, January 8, 1920, *IRA Papers*, reel 34.
124. Herbert Jump to Dear Friend, February 13, 1913, file Indian Board of Co-operation by 1913, reel 30, A. L. Kroeber papers.
125. "Indian Board of Co-operation Annual Financial Report from January 1st to December 31st, 1913," in C. M. Warner to Dear Friends, July 30, 1914, exhibit 59, file Baptist Mission, box 1, Dorrington records.
126. Report of field secretaries, October to December 31, 1913, file Round Valley, box 11, Dorrington records. By 1915, Beryl Bishop-Collett was no longer actively involved with the IBC. The couple divorced in 1924. Wright, "We Cast Our Lot," 18, 141.
127. Treasurer's report, Indian Board of Co-operation, September 1, 1918–September 30, 1919, inclusive, box 24, David Starr Jordan papers, Hoover Institution Archives; F. G. Collett, "Mr. Collett's Reply to Helen Dare," *California Indian Herald*, January 1923, 4.

128. Helen M. Bannan, "The WNIA in the Context of Women's History," in Mathes, *Women's National Indian Association*, 241; Francis P. Prucha, "The Decline of the Christian Reformers," in *Indian Policy in the United States: Historical Essays* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1981), 260.
129. Mary Ann Irwin, "'Going About and Doing Good': The Politics of Benevolence, Welfare, and Gender in San Francisco, 1850–1880," *Pacific Historical Review* 68, no. 3 (August 1999).
130. Beryl Bishop-Collett was about ten years older than Frederick Collett. The birthdates of both are discussed in Wright, "We Cast Our Lot," 12–14, 23.
131. See Stephanie Gorton, *Citizen Reporters: S.S. McClure, Ida Tarbell, and the Magazine That Rewrote America* (New York: Ecco, 2020).
132. F. G. Collett to L. A. Dorrington, November 29, 1916, exhibit 87, file F. G. Collett, box 2, Dorrington records.
133. Khal Schneider, "A Square Deal in Lake County: *Anderson v. Mathews* (1917), California Indian Communities, and Indian Citizenship," *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 18, no. 3 (July 2019): 263–281.
134. Kelsey, "California Indians Need More Schools," 472.
135. *Fifteenth Annual Report of the Northern California Indian Association, January 1, 1910*, 4.
136. Kelsey, "Rights and Wrongs of the California Indians," 427.
137. C. E. Kelsey to Albert K. Smiley, October 18, 1907, box 17, no. 241, Smiley Family Papers.
138. C. E. Kelsey, "State and Federal Responsibility for the Indian," *The Red Man* (Carlisle, PA: U.S. Indian School), October 1915, 82.
139. "*Only the Self Raised Stay Up*": *Indian Industrial School* (Northern California Indian Association, ca. 1910).
140. Kroeber to A. W. Mell, June 20, 1913, reel 5, A. L. Kroeber papers.
141. Wright, "We Cast Our Lot," 61.
142. *The Northern California Indian Association, San Jose, California*, ca. 1907–08, in *IRA Papers*, reel 132, no. 144.
143. S. M. Brosius to F. G. Collett, June 10, 1922, *IRA Papers*, reel 38.
144. C. E. Kelsey to Samuel M. Brosius, May 17, 1922, *IRA Papers*, reel 38.
145. "Indian Board of Co-operation Annual Financial Report from January 1st to December 31st, 1913," in C. M. Warner to Dear Friends, July 30, 1914, exhibit 59, file Baptist Mission, box 1, Dorrington records.
146. Castillo, "Twentieth-Century Secular Movements," 715; *Survey of Conditions of the Indians in the United States: Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate, Part 33, San Diego and San Francisco, Hearings June 29 and July 2, 1934*, 73d Cong., 17333–34 (September 29, 1934) (supplemental statement of F. G. Collett, executive representative, Indians of California, Inc.).
147. *Annual Report of the National Indian Association* (New York: National Indian Association, 1918), 17.
148. No financial reports from after 1916 survive.
149. *Annual Report of the National Indian Association* (New York: National Indian Association, 1920), 17.
150. Mathes, *Divinely Guided*, 151.