

SUMMER INSTITUTE 2010

MONDAY JULY 12 - FRIDAY JULY 16, 2010

Our theme for this concluding year of our grant is Federal Recognition and Contemporary Native American Voices

MONDAY JULY 12:

Present: *Thomas Doughton, Jason Mancini, Leslie Chocquette, Amy Gazin-Schwartz, John Daly, Philip Hureau, Sandra Gibson-Quigley, Brian Morse, Henry Zussman, Kelly Davila, Michael Penney, Rosemary Ward, Edward Belbin, Sarah Kaye, Ann Weeks*

Tom Doughton & Jason Mancini—A Broad Introduction of the 20th Century

(Dr. Doughton is Project Academic Leader and Senior Lecturer, Center for Interdisciplinary and Special Studies at the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, MA ; Dr. Mancini is a Senior Researcher at the Mashantucket Pequot Museum Research Center)

SESSION 1: **Understanding 20th Century Native New England**..... Dr. Jason Mancini

Review of situation mid 19th to mid 20th century

- 1849 Bird Report (MA)
- 1851 Deforest's History of the Indians of Connecticut
- 1855 Niantic detribalization
- 1858 "Citizen Crows" in the eastern part of Connecticut or "Egypt" (CT)
- 1858 Narragansett Commissioners' Report (RI)
- 1861 Earle Report (MA)
- 1870—first Federal census in which Indians appear
- 1880 Narragansett detribalized
- 1909 Montauk lose all rights to land (1909)
- 1924 Indians become US citizens
- 1931 American Indian Federation formed
- 1934 Indian Reorganization Act

Map of regional Indian population in southern New England

- Communities that remain in 20th century New England
- Shinnocock (Long Island NY)
- Pequot & Niantic in Eastern CT
- Paugussett and Skatacoke in NW CT
- Nipmuc in Central MA
- Mashpee, Aquinnah, in Eastern MA and islands

Map of 1856 land sale map from Mashantucket (Pequot)

- In 19th century Mashantucket were described in extremely derogatory ways.... “houses barely fit for human habitation..... gardens look like they were kept by swine” described marriages of women to blacks and to one white who “disgraced his Saxon race”
- Mashantucket responded to the sale of their land (when they found out after the fact) in very eloquent terms.
- All but 76 (?) acres of Mashantucket land was sold and what remained was mostly rocky and barely arable.
- Indians were buying land more often than selling until about 1820; after that sales outnumbered purchases and it became harder and harder to purchase land for a variety of reasons (some of which had to do with racial attitudes on the part of the dominant population/state)
- Indian land acquisitions tended to be near the border of reservations and tended to be integrated into the ancestral lands.... these types of acquisitions were often larger and longer lasting than those away from the reservations.....families and familial groups tended to buy land in the same areas

Race in Indian New England

- Amasa Lawrence ca 1811-1879
- 1832-06-30---new London customs records---“dark”—age 20
- 1833 12-13---on list of the Pequot tribe—mixed negro and white—age 22
- 1834 new London customs records—Indian---age 30
- 1838—new London customs Indian age 30
- 1840—federal census “free colored”
- 1856—court record Indian
- 1864—civil war records—chief of the Pequots
- 1864—civil war enlistment 29th Connecticut volunteers----colored
- 1870 federal census Ledyard CT “Indian” age 60
- 1876 vital records Clinton CT “Indian” age 76
- 1880 civil war pension of Azariah Freeman “an Indian doctor” (son?)
- 1934 westerly sun (grandson’s obituary)—Indian medicine man

Survivance Beyond The Reservations—20th century

- Community at Westerly RI became a center for a number of Indian tribal groups (Montauk as well as Pequot)...the Montauks were in a four block area, as were the Pequots, Narragansett, Eastern Pequots... People from at least six different Native American communities living in this town
- The neighborhood was north of the railroad tracks
- Also a large number of blacks and Italians in the neighborhood (because of quarries in the area—many Italians were stone masons)
- A service and labor neighborhood
- Indians begin to be more associated with urban service-labor industrial centers versus farming and seafaring economies
- There was no way to survive on the reservations because they were so reduced in size; it was essential to find work (and community) in urban centers
- The American Indian Federation was founded in Westerly RI in 1934 because it was a center of the southern New England Indian community
- 1930's pictures—Eastern Pequots with teepees and in Plains regalia on reservation
- Powwows are beginning to take place—in two cycles for the “reservation/rural” Indians and those held by urban Indians
- Pictures from the period show people who “look like Indians” and others who look more “black”
- Question about powwows---are they for tribal people or the general public--- generally for everyone---brings public recognition that Indians continue to exist, which may explain the Plains regalia
- Why Westerly? Lots of wealthy people living/vacationing in Watch Hill (RI) and Stonington (CT). These people provided labor/service jobs. There was quarrying in Westerly (attracted Italians, but also a considerable number of Narragansett) and the mills.
- Importance of political divisions (over the meaning of community, etc.)

SESSION 2:

Tom Doughton

- “Suicide was 105 years old” NYT Jan 7 1900 (Lucy Boston Johnson, last of “Nipunk” tribe)..... “last remaining”decided to “do herself in” rather than be taken to the poor house....was scheduled to go to the poor house the next day.....threw a candle into a pile of rags in the corner of her dwelling (page 5 of the NYT)

Nipmuc in the 20th century

- Tom is becoming very controversial in the community for repeatedly stating that there was never such thing as a “Nipmuc” tribe
- Received an invitation to come to a meeting to discuss what would be appropriate to wear for a “pre-contact” casting for a documentary about the *mishoon* (very large 20-40 foot dugout) found in Lake Quinsigamond

- This illustrates something about the issues facing Indians native to Central Massachusetts. The evidence points toward the existence of an inland Massachusetts people (a freshwater versus coastal Massachusetts people). 16th and 17th century Nipmuc (meaning “freshwater people”—Nipi-net—“land of the freshwater men”) acknowledged that they were under the sovereignty of the coastal Massachusetts.
- The Nipmuc tribe probably never existed....nor was there a “Nipmuc” language; it is an invention of the 1980’s—by a person who called himself Kit Little Turtle (whom the BIA stated had no evidence of Nipmuc or any other Native American Indian ancestry). Little Turtle seems to have taken his “language” from 17th Massachusetts writings and grammars.
- In the 19th-20th centuries, Worcester and Windham County in northeastern Connecticut is the center of Nipmuc community until the 1960’s-1970’s. In the 1970’s and afterwards there has been an effort to shift the center of Nipmuc community to Grafton/Hassanamissit/ “Place of the Little Stones” (which was never a center until John Eliot began a praying town there; likewise the Webster-Dudley area)
- In 1930 one of the Grafton/Hassanamissit families (the Cisco’s) managed to convince the tercentennial committee to place a marker on Brigham Hill Road commemorating the Nipmuc “reservation”.
- From the 1920’s until the 1960’s there was never a question but that Worcester was the center of Nipmuc community. There were dozens of families in Worcester but only two or three families in Grafton....
- In Worcester there was also a big mixture of Abenaki, Mohegan, and other Indian people (similar to Westerly in RI)
- Zara (Sarah) Cisco was successful in gaining public recognition in part because she was able to attract a lot of “light, bright, people” who “looked” Indian
- Many Nipmuc who intermarried with euro Americans during the late 19th and early-mid 20th centuries distanced themselves from darker relations.... Darker people often were willing to be “Cape Verdean”etc. because of hostility and contempt shown toward Indians (who were seen as lazy, shiftless, etcetera)..... when it became OK to be Indian again a number of the “light-bright” people associated with Zara Cisco’s Grafton/Hassanamissit ‘tribe’ and remained distant from other Nipmuc who had intermarried with African Americans, etc.
- Until the mid 20th century communal identity tended to be associated with family and other cultural values.... Much of this was inter-tribal as Nipmuc, Abenaki, Mohegan, and others often lived in the same neighborhoods and tenements.
- Mohawk Club (1914-1930) and its follow up the Hassanamissit Club affirmed Indianness in the Worcester area. There was a tendency to avoid “Nipmuc” because they did not want to be referred to pejoratively as “Nigmuck”
- A lot of what happened in Worcester was similar to what happened in Westerly—a mix of tribal peoples (mostly from New England).
- In the 1950’s there were two competing organizations in Worcester (one more Indian than the other)..... A number of Nipmuc objected to the state granting recognition to a group whom they considered poseurs. In the 1950’s the objectors joined the National Algonquian Council as a “Nipmuc” group

- Sarah Cisco Brough (Zara) created a Hassanamissit organization; an organization was created in Webster/Dudley (Chabunagungamaug); also, a “Historic Nipmuc Tribe” of people rejected by almost everyone who demonstrate no historical connection to any Indian people, but “look” Indian....
- In the 1960’s and following when Nipmuc tribal rolls were being drawn up there were cases of families being split with those who “looked” Indian enough were admitted while others who were “too dark” were rejected. In one case a mother and her children by a first marriage were accepted while the children of a second marriage were rejected.
- In Worcester the Native American community tended to live on specific sections of specific streets within the African American community (perhaps four or five houses)....

SESSION 3: Exercise: selected readings taken from the New York Times from the years 1900, 1930, 1950—3 small groups of 3-4 participants were asked to read several selections from each year and discuss changes in point of view over the course of time.

- In discussing the 1900 articles there is still evidence of the frontier—“good Indians helped settlers”, recollections of Indian savagery
- In the 1930 articles there is discussion of the relationship of Indians to other “colored” people vis a vis the Jim Crow laws (the expansion of Jim Crow laws to Indians in Virginia, though already so elsewhere in the South)....Indians begin protesting being put in the same category as blacks.
- 1950’s more articles about Indians being concerned about their rights. Still a lot of stereotyping. More objections by Indians against stereotyping, more monetary settlements.

How could these articles be used in class?

- Change over time
- Use of Indian names
- Racial terminology

TUESDAY JULY 13:

Present: *Thomas Doughton, Amy Gazin-Schwartz, Leslie Chocquette, Marge Bruchac, John Daly, Philip Hureau, Sandra Gibson-Quigley, Brian Morse, Henry Zussman, Kelly Davila, Michael Penney, Rosemary Ward, Edward Belbin, Sarah Kaye, Ann Weeks, Nora Werme, Landy Johnson*

AM—Marge Bruchac (art, Avery Point Project)

(Dr. Margaret (Marge) Bruchac, of Abenaki Indian descent, is a scholar, performer, and historical consultant who specializes in interpretations and representations of northeastern Native American Indian peoples, from the colonial era to the present.)

SESSION 1: INTRODUCTION TO TOPIC---Tom Doughton

- Grafton/Hassanamissit is not a site that was occupied by the Nipmuc prior to the arrival of the colonists. It was one of John Eliot's "praying towns"
- The area was referred to as "the place of the small stones" (Hassanamesit/ Hassanamisco)
- There is no evidence that there was permanent settlement in the area for at least several hundred years before contact because it wasn't good farm land. There were permanent settlements in what is now Brookfield, MA, Woodstock, CT, and in parts of what is now Worcester, MA
- The modern Nipmuc claims about the "reservation" at Hassanamesit don't hold up. The Cisco family's land on Brigham Hill Road is on the other side of town from the praying town settlement.
- In the 18th century the Indians became landowners (under guardianship). They were referred to as "Indian Proprietors". The Cisco land is a very small piece of a much larger piece of land owned by a proprietor family.

SESSION 2: Marge Bruchac

- PLACE---auke/aki = that which brings forth
- PEOPLE -ak = animate plural
- KNOWLEDGE
- KINSHIP wobekiak = people of the dawn/east (Wompanoag is a dialectical variation)
- HIGAN = container
- Akwikhigan (book) akwikhiganak (books).... Animate endings that suggest that ideas are animate

A close reading of a 1634 Jesuit document—*On the Language of the Monagnais Savages*

RECIPROCITY—related to kinship but not the same—the land and everything on it is part of us even though not the same

- A close reading of *Toksoose family making baskets in Vermont—mid 1800's*
- Algonkian terms from Roger Williams and from dictionary sources

SITUATED KNOWLEDGES: knowledges contained within communities/cultures/ecosystems—the “natural” mind

- References to Gregory A Cajete (1999) ideas about *bicultural learning*.....
- Motivations, core values, personal motivation/values
- Cognitive maps: we often use them without realizing it.....the pathways knowledge travels along....learning how to modulate sensory input.....
- Connection to multiple intelligences.....how does learning get done.

ALGONKIAN “FRIENDSHIP” DANCE

- The group did a “friendship” dance in the foyer of the Testa building. The dance was done to Native American rhythms and song but had elements of French contra-dancing, too. The dance came from a region in Canada dominated by the French.

PM—Grafton sites (Cisco family site, ancient 17th century cemetery, Hassanamesit Woods site

- The group visited the Indian Burial Ground in Grafton, the Cisco homestead, and Hassanamesit Woods.

WEDNESDAY JULY 14:

Present: *Thomas Doughton, Amy Gazin-Schwartz, Leslie Chocquette, Mariella Squire, John Daly, Philip Hureau, Sandra Gibson-Quigley, Brian Morse, Henry Zussman, Kelly Davila, Michael Penney, Rosemary Ward, Edward Belbin, Sarah Kaye, Ann Weeks, Nora Werme,*

Mariella Squire-- Associate Professor of Anthropology and Sociology coordinator, Native American Scholarship program, University of Maine at Fort Kent

(Dr. Squire's research interests include symbolic anthropology, psychological anthropology, and identity theory. She is particularly interested in comparative religion, spiritual traditions, magic, and folklore, as well as ethnic identity in North America)

WILL THE REAL INDIANS STAND UP?

- Mariella began with an anecdote about a Congregational Church conference in Vermont in which one of the aims was to do outreach to the Abenaki people. When it was brought to the attention of the participants that 1 in 10 Vermonters had Indian ancestry the leader of the

program was astonished. When the participants in the convocation were asked to stand up if they had Indian ancestry, nearly $\frac{3}{4}$ stood up.

- About 400 federally recognized tribes, about 400 state recognized, about 400 non recognized communities
- In Canada about 1600 tribal communities
- Dawes Act determined that Indianness (1887) was determined by blood quantum. One ceased to be an Indian once he/she had less than $\frac{1}{4}$ Indian blood (a grandparent)
- 1973 Indian Sovereignty Act (?) allows tribes to determine blood quantum. According to the federal guidelines, MINIMALLY, one must have “any known Indian ancestry plus community affiliation”
- “*tigu/tegu/tekw*”=river
- The “gypsies”---migrating Native Americans who were labeled “gypsies”camps were identified in pictures by tipis....this appellation was broad so it did include non Indian travelers
- In 1929 Vermont was one of the states that passed eugenics laws.... In many places all Indians (and blacks)... along with those identified to have antisocial behaviors (alcoholics, unwed mothers, homosexuals, etc.) were forcibly sterilized.
- In Vermont many ‘gypsies’ were sterilized..... Mariella speaks of a woman who kept her “gypsy” (Indian) heritage hidden from her husband of 60 years. This woman’s mother hid her children in the basement so that others wouldn’t see that they were as dark as the ‘gypsies’
- Discussion of familial connections Jean Baptiste Masta (who was a “gypsy” Indian) who came down into Vermont in the early 19th century... by 1920 when they moved to Massachusetts they claimed to be Franco-American (whites).... After the 1970’s they reclaimed an Indian (Abenaki) heritage.... Are they “real” Indians? The Odonak—Abenaki include them in their rolls (after 1980)

RACE AND IDENTITY

- Mariella drew a family tree which included a number of “people of color”, Chippewa, “nearly white”, Métis, “Malaga Island (Maine) negro”, and included a person who received a bible from a Methodist community that read, “To brother Rollins on his giving up of his Indian ways”
- How is Indianness determined? Federal rules require: political/ social/linguistic/ religious cohesion/endogamous (marry within the group),/have a territory

AFTERNOON SESSION

- Wabanaki baskets—from Odonak, some Maliseets, some Penobscot. Mariella discussed differences in details of decoration and how to make the splines from a log to make the splints for weaving into baskets. (images of pounding a log to make splints for baskets can be found at: <http://www.abenakibaskets.com/>)

- Most Northern New England baskets were made out of ash, but some were made out of birch bark
- One could boil water in a basket, by dropping hot rocks in until it boiled, or even over the fire so long as the water is higher than the flame.

Some notes on Algonkian languages

Connecticut= tegu (fast moving river)+kwinne(long time to travel it)

Algonkian languages are agglutinative... they are comprised of words put together that might not break down individually.

Gamuk=log cabin

Gamukigog=many log cabins (village)

Wobigamikog (village of white cabins)

N'wobigamkog (my village of white cabins)

K'wobigamikog (our village of white cabins)

THURSDAY JULY 15:

Present: *Thomas Doughton, Amy Gazin-Schwartz, Leslie Chocquette, Siobhan Hart, Mitch Mulholland, Kevin McBride, John Daly, Philip Hureau, Sandra Gibson-Quigley, Brian Morse, Henry Zussman, Kelly Davila, Michael Penney, Rosemary Ward, Sarah Kaye, Nora Werme,*

Mitch Mulholland, Kevin McBride, Siobhan Hart (Anthropology/Archeology)

(Dr. Mitch Mulholland is founding director of UMass Archaeological Services (UMASS), part of the Anthropology Department of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences; Dr. Kevin McBride is Associate Professor University of Connecticut Department of Anthropology; Dr. Siobhan Hart, Visiting Assistant Professor at the University of Binghamton, NY received her PhD in Anthropology in 2009 from the University of Massachusetts Amherst)

RESOLVING THE PAST FOR THE FUTURE: AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE NAGPRA ERA
(Siobhan M Hart, PhD. Visiting Assistant Professor Department of Anthropology, Binghamton University)

- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)—a very important context for archeology in the United States

- Since its passage NAGPRA has generated a lot of controversy about property rights, human rights, identity politics and more
- Very important for the relationship between Native peoples and archeologists
- Background: worked in Peabody Museum before grad work cataloguing their NAGPRA artifacts



Archeology and US law

- Due to primacy of private property, site and artifacts recovered are generally the property of the land owner. In most of the world, sites are the property of the nation-states. US federal laws on apply in cases involving federal lands, permits, or monies.

US Heritage Legislation:

1. Protects sites from destruction
 2. Mandates planning process for development
- **Antiquities Act 1906:** protects sites on federal lands—sets up process for who may and who may not collect on federal lands (private investigators, antiquities dealers, curiosity collectors were generally not permitted; educational institutions & museums generally were)
 - **National Historic Preservation Act 1966 (NHPA) & National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA):** archaeology part of planning process for development
 - Must assess extent and impact on sites and develop a plan for mitigation (reducing impact)

- This caused a shift in how archaeologists are employed. The bulk today, about 2/3, are employed as consultants for developers, big firms, etc, and about 1/3 are employed by universities and museums.
- Archaeological Resource Protection Act 1979 (ARPA): provides criminal penalties for damaging sites on federal or tribal lands
- State laws (e.g. Massachusetts Unmarked Burial Law): procedure in event that human remains are uncovered on private or public lands.

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)—1990: result of a long term movement to treat native American human remains and cultural objects in the same respectful way we treat other human remains and cultural objects.

Spirit: to find equitable and just solutions to the complex legacy of museum collecting, colonialism, and racism.

Goals:

1. Graves Protection: protect Native American graves on federal lands and tribal lands intentionally or accidentally discovered after 1990. Also makes it illegal to traffic in NA human remains without right of possession.
 2. Repatriation: provide for inventories, and in some cases repatriation, of Native American human remains and certain kinds of objects.
- Graves protection is pretty clear cut, but the repatriation issue is much less clear at times (origin, Latin, *re-*'back', *patria* 'native land')
 - NAGPRA: to return something or someone to those people to whom it or s/he is most closely culturally affiliated. A good example is the repatriation of wampum belts to the Onondaga (Haudenosaunee, Six Nations people). The belts had been sold to a US census agent by Chief Thomas Webster in 1891 and were finally returned in 1989.

How does NAGPRA work?

Jurisdiction: who must comply?

- **Federal agencies:** any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States (e.g. National Park Service, US Army, etc, but does not include the Smithsonian Institution which has a separate law)
- **Museums:** any institution or state or local government agency (including any institution of higher learning) that receives federal funds and has possession of, or control over, native American cultural items (e.g., libraries, zoos, universities, etc.)
The lack of funds for repatriation has made it difficult for institutions to complete the requirements.

- **Who is not covered?** Institutions that don't receive federal funds, private arts and antiquities dealers (unless the objects came from federal collections), privately funded institutions

Standing: who may claim?

- **Lineal descendant:** trace direct relation or ancestry without interruption
- **Indian tribe:** federally-recognized tribe (political organization created by US Indian policy)
- *Non-federally recognized groups do not have status under the law. This is an issue in New England because many of the tribes are not federally recognized. Coalitions and confederacies have been formed to pursue repatriation. There are concerns about NAGPRA reinforcing the idea that Indian identity is dependent on federal recognition.*
- **Native Hawaiian organization**

Purview: what is covered?

- Native American
 1. Human remains (e.g., bones, scalp, hair, ashes, things not "feely given" or naturally shed)
 2. Funerary objects (beads, pottery, jars basketry, etc.)
 3. Sacred objects (things necessary for CURRENT religious cult)
 4. Objects of cultural patrimony (things collectively or communally owned—things that cannot be alienated, appropriated, or conveyed by any individual)

<http://www.peabody.harvard.edu>

Cultural affiliation is based on preponderance of multiple types of evidence: preponderance is not, in legal terms, beyond a reasonable doubt—but in accordance with civil law—an issue of degree.

- **The Kennewick Controversy:** Can living tribes claim affiliation with nearly 9500 year old human remains, especially when scientists claim that those remains do not "look Indian" from a biological perspective? Can such ancient remains be culturally affiliated to contemporary tribes? The courts ruled that the Umatilla tribe's claims were insufficient to determine a connection current native people or to ancient people's elsewhere.
- What are the issues if remains are not actually part of a particular cultural group? Sometimes it is a spiritual/religious issue—that the remains should be honored and respected; there is an issue of stewardship over the places where Native people currently live.

Outcomes:

- Improved documentation and control institutions have over collections
- Systematic approach to working with tribes instituted

- Consultation has led, in many cases, to increased communications between archaeologists and Native Americans and the formation of new relationships
- NAGPRA has changed the context of relationships among native peoples and archaeologists
- Researchers are paying more attention to the political implications and multiple contexts of their research

AFTERNOON SESSION:

Mitch Mulholland, Kevin McBride

TURNERS FALL AIRPORT AND FIELD STONE FEATURES: Montague, MA, UMASS Archeological Services

- Does surveys of archeological sites....in early years (started in 1986) there were almost no Native Americans involved. This has changed significantly over the past years. Now, Native Americans are involved as soon as the National Historic Preservations Act comes to play.
- One thing that was a surprise was that the Native Americans had different interests from those of the archeologists. A site that went back 10, 000 years proved to be of less interest that expected. Dr. Mulholland has found that they are more concerned with ceremonial finds. Often, due to small Native American staffs, the Native American consultants will spend only a day or so with the archeologists
- The relatively small number of Native Americans living in the Connecticut valley of Massachusetts means that representatives from other federally recognized tribal groups in southern new England.
- Surprisingly, there has been greater interest in stone piles and plants (ceremonial herbs)... archeologists also have to look at things from an anthropological perspective.... There arises the issue of things being claimed as “sacred to our ancestors” which have no real connection to Native Americans (e.g. stone walls that were built by Euro-Americans to mark property or field lines). The burden of proof, though, lies with the archeologists, etc. The government reasons that that the Native Americans know best about what is “sacred” or meaningful.

SLIDE SHOW ABOUT TURNERS FALLS AIRPORT

- Images of the Paleo-Indian site with a Narragansett monitor and a “Friends of Wissitinamot” (?) (non Indians who have an interest in protecting things Indian)
- There is a hill near the proposed new runway that became the focus of controversy— however the local (Southern New England) Indians were not too interested in the 10000 year old site in the path of the runway.
- A number of disorderly stone piles were found near the end of a stone wall and in the fields. It was apparent to the archeologist that the stones were dumped to get them out of the way for farming/haying purposes.

LINES OF EVIDENCE FOR EURO-AMERICAN INTERPRETATION (of stone walls)

- ¾ piles aligned with stone wall—for future construction

- Typical of Euro American wall building practices
- Fourth field piled close to field edge
- Marked known property lines
- Narragansett representatives contended that the stone piles were culturally significant...Narragansett applied to the National Park Service to designate the place as a National Register site. The Park Service rejected the first application but instructed the tribe how to re-write it in order to be successful, which they did and were, indeed, successful.
- The counter-factual histories being created are politically correct and have to be taken into account as just part of the realities of the day
- Why is it important to get Native Americans involved—even if they don't really know the actual archeological/anthropological significance of actual objects? (question asked by a participant).... Because they are among the stakeholders....

Kevin McBride: has worked since 1983 with the Native American tribes....has encountered the Native appropriation of colonial sites as meaningful and ancient Native American sites (similar to how Euro-Americans moving west attributed the Native American mounds in the Midwest to the ancient Israelites).

- Discussed how Native American “experts” came up with explanations for things that clearly were not as they explained them
- However, there was the concern for the “cultural landscapes”--- Many archeologists had formerly accepted the Euro-American interpretation of history as definitive..... need to “unpack materialness” of archeological evidence...
- There are examples of unhappy abutters of prospective building projects turning to Native Americans to raise objections that it is a sacred landscape....even when the evidence is overwhelmingly opposed
-

FRIDAY JULY 16:

Present: *Thomas Doughton, Jason Mancini, Dr. James Cossingham, Leslie Chocquette, Amy Gazin-Schwartz, John Daly, Philip Hureau, Sandra Gibson-Quigley, Brian Morse, Henry Zussman, Kelly Davila, Michael Penney, Rosemary Ward, Edward Belbin, Sarah Kaye, Ann Weeks*

MORNING SESSION 1: Jason Mancini presenting on Mashantucket Pequot Museum and its role in presenting Pequot history

- Images of Indian people in the 20th century from Aquinnah (period between 1908-1915)—sports clubs, powows (1920's and after—often in Western regalia)....portraits taken in Rhode Island of intertribal peoples (Narragansett, Pequot, Wampanoag, etc.). A large

gathering at Cranston in 1926....the New England Indian Council portrait (October 8, 1924)... lots of photographs about the Mohegans

- The Mohegans acquired a more favorable presence in the public (non-Indian) eye than the Pequots...partly due to the high profile they maintained....and the efforts of the **Tantaquidgeon** family. Some of this may be due to racial perceptions as the Mohegans tended to have a lighter skin color than the Pequots (*this is an extremely broad brush statement and should be regarded as such*)
- **The Contemporary Era:** The Pequot Museum described.... There are some problems/frustrations with the museum on the part of the tribe (and public)....the stories of many of the people are not heard because of the dominance of the two families that had remained on the reservation. Something missing from the reservation period is the sense of community and identity. The strength of community and identity in the village display is lost. The photos in the modern portrait gallery often confuse outsiders because so many of the people in them look stereotypically “black”, “white”, or somewhere in between. This needs to be addressed more fully. Issues of race and identity for Southern New England Indians were addressed in “The Lost Century Exhibit” shown in the summer of 2009.
- During censuses “clear-blooded” Indians were not listed during the early-mid 19th century though more and more “blacks” were registered and there was talk about black squatters moving onto Pequot land.... This will be shown in a new exhibit as part of a discussion about how the racial perceptions of outsiders contributed to the “disappearance” of the Indians— even though.
- In a new exhibit there will be interpretive panels that show photographs of the actual people who lived in the Pequot territories, their homes, gatherings, etcetera, and who continued to identify themselves as Pequot. Only then will the public see the images of the reservation in the 1960’s (the trailers, conflicts with the town over dog licenses on the reservation, etc.)
- The life of Matt Langevin is well portrayed in pictures and her life (mostly on the reservation, but not all the time) will be traced out.
- There is a move away from a single narrative to the multiple narratives of people as they were lived out.
- American Indian Community House in New York played a major role in bringing various people together (it was very substantially funded by the federal government). The Community House is still there and has a website: <http://aich.org/index2.php>
- Video shown: “*Almost Vanished: Pequot Lives in the Lost Century*” --- Mott Langevin’s house....other pictures....1856 land sale... descriptions of the people who lived in Mashantucket.... “Vanishing Indian” stories....issues of colorAmerican Indian Federation...”a welfare problem”1953 proposed Connecticut legislation to deprive Indians of land....the urbanization of some Pequot (connection to Westerly Rhode Island)

MORNING SESSION 2: FEDERAL RECOGNITION Tom Doughton discussing the failure of the Nipmuc petitions

- Tom holds that the Nipmuc petitions rightly failed on grounds of “governance”—which resulted in the creation a “bogus” government.
- BIA refused to consider several hundred Nipmuc Indians in a number of large extended families
- An extended discussion of the failed process of the federal acknowledgement in the case of the two Nipmuc communities and the problems created by the attempt to prove tribal governance.
-

AFTERNOON SESSION: Dr. James Eaglehawk Cossingham

- Nipmuc Tribal Acknowledgment Project (1980’s) was a very positive experience to begin with but was profoundly warped by the issue of gaming. The federal government doesn’t want too much gaming going on and the tribes that already have it don’t want the competition.
- New England is not a very large area. Historically, the Nipmucs occupied territory in central Massachusetts (from the Connecticut River to about 20 miles west of Boston), Rhode Island, and northeastern Connecticut.
- Early on the Nipmucs discussed getting acknowledgement through the same political process as the Pequots and get it through Congress (versus the BIA). This was resisted by those in the community who wanted to go other ways. Two chiefs, Wise Owl (Dudley/Webster) and Natashamin, opposed the political route (with a very sympathetic Ted Kennedy).
- The result of the dissention in the community led to the writing of a poorly constructed petition. Chief Wise Owl claimed that he was appointed chief for life by his father (though it was his mother who was the Nipmuc—his father was white). There was some resistance from those who said that he had not been part of the actual community until about 1980. Natashamin was connected with Zara Cisco Brough which gave him credibility with the federal authorities. (An aside made by Dr. Cossingham was that Zara Cisco deserves credit for keeping the Nipmuc in the news and creating a paper trail to the government, even though she inflated her role)
- The existence or non existence of a reservation is not important since there are much smaller groups than the Nipmuc who are federally acknowledged even though they don’t have a “reservation”.
- The Nipmuc in Massachusetts were widespread at contact times but had no overall chief/confederacy. There were a number of communities with local leaders and interconnectedness through relationships. The claim that there are modern chiefs connected to ancient times was a major political mistake.
- Dr. Cossingham reported having been advised to start with economic development plans in order to establish for the federal government that an actual cohesive community exists.
- Shinacook in New York (Long Island) just got recognized—but were helped by having a reservation.

READINGS FOR THIS SUMMER'S INSTITUTE

(Please check this site regularly for updates)

Philip J Deloria, Indians in Unexpected Places (2004, University of Kansas Press)

NIPMUC NATION FINAL DETERMINATION (access links below)

<http://www.bia.gov/WhoWeAre/AS-IA/OFA/ADCList/PetitionsResolved/Petition69a/index.htm>

<http://www.bia.gov/WhoWeAre/AS-IA/OFA/ADCList/PetitionsResolved/Petition69b/index.htm>