

# Representation and Misrepresentation: The Challenge of Native Identity in 19<sup>th</sup> Century New England

Michael Penney  
Teaching American History Grant  
Worcester State College  
19<sup>th</sup> Century Native American History  
Professor Haller

## *Preface*

The focus of the seminars over this academic year has dealt mostly with the idea of identity and histories. We have focused greatly on the changing identity of native people in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and have looked in great depth at how those issues of identity created conflict for both whites and natives. When the whites looked to construct a history of native peoples through collections, writing and through created histories, they were blind to the natives who still remained. This created a sort of identity crisis for the natives of New England. On the one hand you have all the histories of the area saying that the natives are a perished people or the remnants of a once great nation while still trying to struggle with an identity they saw as continuing on from their ancestors. The whites looked to debase and destroy any remnants of native peoples while at the same time glorifying native culture in their literature and museums which portrayed the natives as a precursor to their own history.

Identity is a tricky issue in itself. It is difficult to say exactly what “one is” when we think of all the factors that go into that statement. For natives, the issue is even trickier due to the fact that they became the non-dominant group in a society and land which they had controlled for thousands of years. The group that replaced them in terms of power and control, the Europeans then became the holders of the native story and legend. As we know, oftentimes history is written by the winners. In the case of the natives, not only was history being written by the winners, it was being used against those that remained to take their land, rip away their identity and completely remove any power structure or control of any political or tribal organization to which these natives belonged. The whites used their history of the natives to deny that the natives even existed anymore.

The natives who remained in the 19<sup>th</sup> century had to deal with all of these factors that the Europeans were throwing their way. They were being told that they weren't the same as the natives who were here before European contact. Those were noble people while these Indians were rag tag gypsies and drunks who were more of a nuisance than anything. They had to be ripped of their tribal identities and assimilated, if not removed altogether from white society. These issues of identity plagued the native of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and were certainly issues which they had to grapple with, not only in the Europeans representation of them, but in their own representations of themselves.

### *Contact and Removal*

Any narrative of Indian identity as seen by the Europeans should start with the Europeans arrival in North America. While we covered that extensively in the previous academic year and summer institute, it is still worthwhile before moving on to the 19<sup>th</sup> century to review what happened in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and even prior to that. We all know about the Pilgrims and have discussed in great length the history of Plymouth and the Mayflower. However, when discussing Indian identity in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, it is logical to look at what happened prior which affected those issues of identity.

Many took the view that the lands in North America were given to Europeans by God and that he had cleared the way for them through the plagues that killed a great deal of the natives who inhabited the Northeast of what would become the United States.<sup>1</sup> They were given a sort of religious mission by God to replace the pagan inhabitants and build a new society based on religious values and morals and supersede the societies and farms already established by Native peoples. When constructing a history of New England, the disappearance of the Indians is a central piece. You have to explain why the natives

---

<sup>1</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 10/2/08

didn't last and so by explaining it was God's will for them to perish in plague and have the whites take over and carry on in this land is a convenient explanation. Historians would also justify the taking of native lands by explaining how they didn't fence the land and weren't properly utilizing the land.<sup>2</sup> It is very easy to use religion as a means to taking what you want, especially when the people you are taking it from have a completely different set of beliefs and customs. Those that wrote the histories of these people did not do much to tell the story of what actually happened, as we see that,

In...the first published American Indian autobiography (1826), Pequot William Apes leveled the double charge that Euro-Americans had violently seized Native homelands, then deliberately justified their outrageous conquest through their creation of historical memory...These histories which would become a nineteenth-century cottage industry in New England that moved well beyond justifying Euro-American conquest, pressed another insidious claim: that New England Indians were in the verge of extinction, of they had not already passed from the scene. It is somewhat puzzling that an army of antiquarians could so uniformly conclude that disappearance was the inevitable fate for New England Indians. If this scenario had played out, then why did Massachusetts and other New England states need bureaucracies for Indian affairs, and why did Massachusetts extend official recognition to the still surviving groups in the commonwealth until ending the of Indians' 'wardship' status in 1869?<sup>3</sup>

If so many perished in the plagues then clearly God had intended for the Europeans to supplant them and make this land into a New Jerusalem where a religious society could flourish.

This version of history, that the Europeans were meant to replace the native people, is one of the origins of the myth of the disappearing Indian. If God intended to wipe them away, then clearly, in further times the people who still call themselves Indian can't be real natives and they must be something else. Many Europeans would rationalize that they were a wandering band of gypsies and were nothing more than a debased remnant of

---

<sup>2</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 10/2/08

<sup>3</sup> Obrien, Jean M. "Vanishing" Indians in Nineteenth Century New England Page 414-415

a once noble people.<sup>4</sup> They could not be the same group as the noble savages whom the Europeans had fought and replaced. All of those noble Indians were gone from New England and the remaining natives should not even be considered the same. They were seen as an inferior mongrel people and ones who did not deserve to even be called Indian, because all the real Indians were gone. Whatever remained was hardly the same. Some sought to show a legal transference of land, as we are told,

Local stories found places in varying proportions for a cast of Indian sachems, warriors, diplomats, converts, and lone survivors. But...the central obsession of local narration focused on the issue of 'just possession' of the land. In narrative after narrative historians went to great lengths in recounting the stories of how English people 'legally' transferred Indian ownership of the land to themselves.<sup>5</sup>

The other issue in the 19<sup>th</sup> century when continuing the myth of the disappearing Indian in the 19<sup>th</sup> century was one of interracial mixing. By the time the 19<sup>th</sup> century rolled around, many natives had intermarried with African Americans. This only further enhanced difficulties and challenges to identity. It further complicated an already tricky issue. If these natives and blacks were intermarrying, what were they? Europeans would most likely deem them black and move on since there weren't any natives left anyways. This idea, as we discussed in great length, is an extremely important one to discuss and talk about, especially with our students when discussing natives in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. If natives and blacks are intermarrying and have changing identities, how do they hold on to those identities, especially in the face of all the Europeans are doing to destroy any continuing native identity? If the whites are saying there aren't any more Indians around for their own gains, then does it make more sense to identify as black if you have intermarried or had children with someone from a different race? There are no easy

---

<sup>4</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 10/2/08

<sup>5</sup> Obrien, Jean M. "Vanishing" Indians in New England page 422

answers when discussing these continuing challenges and issues over representation, but they are extremely important to delve into and interpret if we are to have a clear picture of what the New England Indians experiences were in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. However, identity wasn't at the root of all the conflict and the reasoning behind declaring the natives gone and perished. As with most cases throughout history, the real conflict was over land, money and power.

The myth of the vanishing Indian had a purpose. If all the Indians were gone and whatever remained was a subhuman group of immoral, drunk, debased gypsies, then the Europeans could finalize what they had intended from the beginning, and that was the conquest and taking of the land. As we have studied,

In order to root itself firmly on the continent, the United States at once created a vacuum by removing or destroying the indigenous inhabitants and absorbed them into its nascent national culture. The images white Americans formed of the vanquished Native peoples helped them form an original conception of the world and of themselves as a collective entity.<sup>6</sup>

If there were no natives left it was perfectly ok to take whatever lands they had controlled, and inherit what was once theirs. Some whites used the myth of the vanishing Indian to claim that they were descendents of the once great now vanished natives of New England.<sup>7</sup> It became a convenient way to take land if one were to claim that their ancestors had been the noble children of the forest and now as a descendent it was only fair that these Europeans would take and control that land. In literature of the 19<sup>th</sup> century it became a fashionable topic and the narrative of natives was recast as one of the noble Indians who once lived in New England but were now a thing of the past. People would claim to be descendents of King Phillip or other great Chiefs as a conversation

---

<sup>6</sup> Marienstrass, Elise. The Common Man's Indian Pages 261-262

<sup>7</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 10/2/08

piece or a link to the storied natives. Long legends, like that of Thundersquall were written with excerpts that might, “Give some account of the extraordinary story of Miss Carter, (daughter of one of the first settlers) and Thundersquall, a celebrated Indian Chief.”<sup>8</sup> These narratives would tell stories we know would not have possibly been true. But when these natives were talked about they would not be thought of as the same as the natives who were still around. They were just drunks and gypsies, not noble like the Indians of the past. In literature, they might be whisked away in passages that stated,

What a great change has taken place in America since 1630. From a weak and feeble colony, we have become a mighty and flourishing republic. Here where the Indian race once flourished, is a city, famed for its intelligence and hospitality.<sup>9</sup>

It wasn't just society or literature however which sought to eliminate the natives who were still around. Even the government did their part to deprive the natives of their land and identity.

In 1869 the Commonwealth of Massachusetts enfranchised the native people who still remained. The main goal of this was to detribalize the natives, therefore opening up whatever lands they had owned through guardianship to make available for whites to settle. Not only was the land of the remaining natives taken, but it also meant now that the Indians could be taxed. Many natives opposed these measures unsuccessfully, for just this reason. They saw the writing on the wall and knew if their tribal identity was taken away, then so would their land, or what was left of it. This fit in very conveniently with the idea that there weren't any real Indians around any more anyways. If there weren't any real Indians then those that remained must be vagrants and shouldn't have

---

<sup>8</sup> Boston Two Hundred Years Ago Page 3

<sup>9</sup> Boston Two Hundred Years Ago Page 14

sovereignty over their people or lands. If there weren't any real Indians left, then there was no conflict and no one to oppose the taking of the land or the tribal identities.<sup>10</sup>

The removal of a tribal identity through enfranchisement was a big blow to native identity. No longer could they claim their tribal identity and the protection of their lands that came with that recognition. Europeans basically said, you are not real Indians, and even those of you still remaining who claim that identity are no more than a debased wandering band of gypsies. Talk about kicking a group while they are down. Another issue the Natives had to contend with was the comparisons to the tribes of the West. The natives of New England weren't the same as the wild uncivilized noble savages of the West. They simply weren't viewed as the same even though both were legitimately native peoples. The Europeans used enfranchisement to take the native peoples land and to claim that there weren't any Indians around any more. Enfranchisement struck a blow to native identity, and was an issue the native people had to grapple with when perceiving and organizing themselves. One thing is for certain, the myth of the vanished Indian was certainly used ruthlessly by the Europeans to take whatever was left and held by the remaining native peoples.

### *Manifest Destiny*

Although it is more focused with the expansion of the United States in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the concept of Manifest Destiny can also be applied when looking at the natives of New England. As previously discussed, many of the first settlers used the idea that God had cleared the way for them by eliminating a large portion of the native population with plague. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, many who used Manifest Destiny as a justification for westward expansion and the taking of native lands would employ the same strategy. The

---

<sup>10</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 10/2/08

idea of Manifest Destiny basically says that the Americans should dominate and control the continent because it was their religious and cultural duty to do so as ordained by God.

In New England we can relate some of the concepts that would come to encourage westward expansion by looking at some of the justifications and ideas used when taking native lands in New England. When Europeans came to this country, they didn't really consider those that were already here, because they did not fit in with the idea of a Christian civilization.<sup>11</sup> The whites looked at themselves as chosen people in both cases whether it was taking lands in New England or as America moved west and continued to supplant and conquer natives of the west. People used this moral justification as proclaimed by God that they should be the ones to control and take over this land from coast to coast.

#### *Government Interaction and Census Material*

The role of state government, especially in Massachusetts sought to reinforce the idea that there weren't any more real Indians around and those that remained were a child like group of gypsies who had no legitimate claims to land or money owed to their tribes. They looked at the real natives as being part of the prehistory of New England, that is, before contact and just as much a part of the landscape as flowers, trees or animals. Through legislation and census material, the whites in power in the governments of Massachusetts and other New England states sought to reinforce this narrative that the Indians were gone for their own financial and land gains.

John Milton Earle is a key figure in the history of natives in Massachusetts. He was the Indian Commissioner and was appointed to compose a report on whether or not native

---

<sup>11</sup> Alice Nash lecture 10/2/08

people should be enfranchised in 1862.<sup>12</sup> He recommended in his report that the Indians be enfranchised, but that action was not taken by the state until 1869. There are several issues and problems with the material that came out of the Earle report. The first of which being that it only considered plantation tribes, or those that had reservations recognized by the government. This left out native people who either didn't live on reservations or lived in an area further west than Earle conducted his report in. Another problem is that in many native communities, people had left and avoided being identified as native when they went to new communities. It was to their advantage to be considered black or white if they could pull it off and so they simply abandoned their native identities in public or in official transactions or business.<sup>13</sup> This gave them the advantage of voting, making contracts and other privileges that blacks and whites had which natives did not. Those that abandoned native identity, at least publicly certainly had some conflict or issue which led them to do so. One does not usually make such a decision lightly, but we can see that it was so disadvantageous to be native that some chose to abandon that identity in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

An important facet of the Earle report was an enumeration, but not complete census, of native people in the state. However, this information is certainly valuable but not perfect, as it was collected by contacting guardians and town clerks. They were asked to respond to the question, "Do you have any Indians in your town?"<sup>14</sup> With all the issues concerning native identity at the time, we can reasonable conclude that many simply responded no because of the idea that the real Indians were a thing of the past and had been replaced by this degenerate group who called themselves Indians. It also left the

---

<sup>12</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 11/15/08

<sup>13</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 11/15/08

<sup>14</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 11/15/08

clerks and guardians on their own to determine who was Indian based on a classification basically made by themselves. In the activity done at the workshop, we found that the ways in which people were classified can cause several problematic issues when trying to classify people. We can assume that these clerks and guardians were mainly judging by superficial characteristics when determining who was Indian. This can lead to some very wrong and inaccurate assumptions and records being kept by these clerks. This led to a common classification in Earle's report that people were legally Indians by descent but did not look or behave like noble savages.<sup>15</sup>

Earle's report was used in conjunction with attitudes of those in power at the time to further progress the idea and plan to make the Indians disappear. Through assimilation, enfranchisement and detribalization the state was trying to make it impossible for people to identify as native any longer. Those that remained were in many cases deemed debased, promiscuous or racially and morally no longer Indian.<sup>16</sup> This delegitimized those natives that still remained. If the whites were morally superior then it was only fair that they be able to take the land they still had claims to. After all, these were just the remnants of the once great noble savages and were only immoral debased gypsies. The whole flaw of the enumeration contained in the Earle report is that most of it comes second hand. If instead of visiting each town and surveying and conducting interviews you simply ask the town clerks for how many Indians they have, problems are going to arise.

Census material is very problematic in the first place. How people identify themselves and how they are perceived by others are often two very different things. If

---

<sup>15</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 11/15/08

<sup>16</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 11/15/08

we only use superficial attitudes to determine what ethnicity people are, there would be a lot of mistakes made. Yet that seems to be what happened in the Earle report. Towns were asked to report on the status of their natives and what came back was either “We don’t have any Indians” or “The Indians we have are all immoral and aren’t real Indians anyways.” This is very convenient if the goal of the government was to remove their Indian identity and take their land. Even those that had an income and a job were often classified as living debauched lives.<sup>17</sup> In some cases, Indians were removed off reservations so they could be watched because of their immorality.

Another issue that involved the governments was payment for lands. Many times the state would take reservation lands and auction it off with none of the profits and proceeds going to the tribes. This was because enfranchisement had made the tribe nonexistent. They also viewed the Indians as not really Indian, just a rag tag group of mixed race degraded people with no claim to being real Indians.<sup>18</sup> Even when Indians sued the state and won they were paid off at a rate much lower than the value of the land. They also were forced to sign agreements releasing the state from future responsibility and liability. Basically, the state was saying, here is some money for the land but that’s it and you are on your own. One can imagine that a great number of these people did not have the education, skills or training to become successful members of the economy. When the state said they didn’t exist as tribes any more, it created some real problems, not only of identity, but of survival and existence in the society and culture which had cast them off as nothing more than a problem of society.

---

<sup>17</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 11/15/08

<sup>18</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 11/15/08

The state in its census findings and legislation on enfranchisement basically succeeded in getting what they wanted, which of course was the land that those who remained held. By saying they did not exist anymore and using the enumeration data to back up that claim, the state was able to take the lands that had been held as reservations and sell it off. They didn't have to worry about the natives who remained because they had the census to say they didn't exist. This, combined with enfranchisement made it awfully difficult to remain an Indian. However, some were able to retain their identity, even in the midst of all this adversity and conflict with the state. It is nothing short of remarkable that with all the state was throwing at the natives who remained that some were able to retain their identity and endure and survive.

#### *An Unavoidable Fate*

As native peoples struggled with their own identities, so too did the dominant white culture struggle also with the fate of the Indians. Not every one had the same perspective or thoughts in the disappearance of the native people from New England. However, what seems to be a dominant theme is that acceptance and idea that their demise was somehow unavoidable, whether by Providence or circumstance. The idea that the native people were destined to perish, even as they remained in New England, was a commonly held belief that was reinforced by the histories, literature and art of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

One of the ironic things about how white society viewed native culture in the 19<sup>th</sup> century is that scholars were proclaiming the native people gone from New England, even before enfranchisement when they were under guardianship. This stands as a curious case of history and we know that

In reality, New England Indians persisted, and they did so in ways that actively were constructed as "disappearance." Nineteenth-century antiquarians claimed

the voice of authority about history and participated in the erasure of Indians by literally refusing to recognize New England Indians as ‘authentic’ Indians. They did this especially by mustering particular formulations of race and deep-seated assumptions about Indian cultures as static and fixed in the past. In this formulation, race and culture became rigid and artificial categories that could not contain the histories or identities of real New England Indians, and could not narrate a story of persistence and change.<sup>19</sup>

They viewed those who claimed to be native as a people without a history or place, even as they revered their earlier ancestors who inhabited New England.<sup>20</sup> Many historical sources of the 19<sup>th</sup> century claimed the disappearance of the natives from New England was unavoidable. While some may have blamed the whites for their demise, most would agree that the Europeans had the right to occupy and improve the lands that the natives had previously held.<sup>21</sup> Whether they saw it as moral or immoral, the scholars of the day agreed that their fate was sealed from the moment the Europeans arrived. They were doomed and whether or not it was human, it was inevitable that the natives would perish. The ironic thing is that many servants in these scholars’ homes would be of native descent. However, the scholars sought to justify the removal and extinction of the native people, clearing the way for the progress and expansion of the Europeans.

The reality of it is that even as scholars sought to proclaim the Indians dead and gone from New England, there were still several natives in the area, struggling with their own sense of identity. While many had perished due to war and disease, they were not all gone. However, the scholars, in seeking to record the narrative of the fall of these people chose to ignore the natives or classify them as not being real Indians, for convenience sake as well as to degrade those still remaining. These same scholars who had native servants sought to explain why there weren’t any more natives around. It can be argued

---

<sup>19</sup> O’Brien, Jean M. “Vanishing” Indians in New England Page 429

<sup>20</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 1/22/09

<sup>21</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 1/22/09

they did this because the natives remaining didn't fit their idea of what an Indian was, or because it was a moral justification for taking their land, or because their racial purity had been diluted. Whatever the reason, it was effective in convincing the dominant society and future generations that the Indians had vanished.

### *Enfranchisement as a Tool of Destruction of Identity*

One of the consequences of enfranchisement for native people, which happened in 1869, was a huge blow to Indian identity. The aftermath of enfranchisement left many native people with no roots, no home to return to and no community or family with which to practice and keep alive traditions and culture. The hardships of enfranchisement were not only economic, but were cultural as well.

When enfranchisement eliminated tribes, it also took with it many funds from trusts that had come from the sale of Indian land. This was a main source of income for many of the natives who had remained in New England. They not only lost income, but also lost tribal recognition. They were given welfare for one year after enfranchisement, which was hardly sufficient for a people who had not been given education or any real skills prior to this happening. There was not an uprising or fight for rights of native peoples by the rest of white society, because they believed that Indians weren't a factor any more. They didn't view the remaining natives as Indian and further believed there hadn't been any real Indians since King Phillip's War.<sup>22</sup> They viewed natives who remained as mixed race who were not pure blooded natives.

Enfranchisement left the remaining Indians without skills or land. They lost ties with community members in many cases and had to work at whatever unskilled occupation they could find. The Indians became w memory to white society, a part of nature. They

---

<sup>22</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 3/21/09

were simply a prehistory of European contact. They did not significantly care about the natives that remained because they weren't authentic in their opinion. Another outcome of this dispossession of native people in the 19<sup>th</sup> century was a struggle to hold on to their cultural identity. If there are no roots and no community then some people might struggle to retain authentic parts of that culture. New ceremonies and traditions might be created and take the place of authentic native culture. There was a need to reconnect to the history of their people and many times this reconnection, especially later in the 20<sup>th</sup> century had nothing to do with native culture dating back to pre-contact times.<sup>23</sup> However, this was a consequence of robbing the natives of their identity and land through enfranchisement.

### *Collections*

A trend that emerged in the early part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was a fierce desire to collect native artifacts. There were several individuals, groups and societies which sought native artifacts. The question remains of why they were so interested in collecting native artifacts? If there were still natives around whom the dominant white society cast a blind eye towards, what is the purpose of building collections revolving around native culture? The answer may be that it ties in with the romanticized version of viewing natives simply as a part of the prehistory of America and explaining them as more a part of the landscape than a people who still existed.

Remains, artifacts and other relics were sought by collectors seeking to build huge collections of Indian material and artifacts. Some sought to further enhance their own rightful link and inheritance from these extinct people. It would be very common for a wealthy white person to claim to be a descendent of King Phillip or some other Indian

---

<sup>23</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 3/21/09

chief or noble.<sup>24</sup> The likelihood of this being true is not very believable, but through a connection to the Indians as a prehistory, it only further enhances the justification for an inheritance of their land and culture. Forget that there are still natives around and it makes the whites seem moral and justified in taking their land, despite those that remain. If they are vilified as debased and degenerate, then they aren't real Indians anyways. The whites used artifacts to justify their own inheritance of Indian lands.

There are some other reasons why collecting became such a mania in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. One reason is that it sought to preserve a romanticized version of the native people. Another reason is that there weren't any more conflicts with tribes in this time period, and so it was safe to bring it up again without fear of a war or other conflict. We can see that this was an, "Era in when Indians were exhibited regularly as examples of America's past or of primitive types in a great evolutionary chain of human progress."<sup>25</sup> All the Indians were gone and so their identity could be looked at as a precursor to the Europeans. It also enhanced the mythical tie between the Puritans and the Indians.<sup>26</sup> It is almost as if the Indians handed off their culture as they became extinct.

These collections and museums only reinforced the stereotypes and romanticized version of the natives as prehistory. If one did not know better they would be trusting of what they learned from these collections and wouldn't question that the Indians were in fact gone from New England. Even if one had seen a native, they would not classify them in the same group as the noble savages because there was a difference based on the artifacts between the two groups. This nature of collecting only reinforced the narrative that the Indians were gone and their doom was inevitable.

---

<sup>24</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 5/14/09

<sup>25</sup> Kidwell, Clara. Every Last Dishcloth Page 234

<sup>26</sup> Tom Doughton lecture 5/14/09

### *Conclusion*

The 19<sup>th</sup> century was a time of conflict in identity for native people. On the one hand, they were being told they were not real Indians. All the real Indians had perished and those that remained were inauthentic, mixed race degenerates who were unlike the noble savages who were the children of the forest. On the other hand, they knew from family connections and living on reservations that they were in fact native people. All of the forces and tides sought to eliminate their identity as native and construct a romanticized version of the past which justified the elimination of native people and the occupation of their lands.

The enfranchisement of native people severely damaged their cultural ties and past as native people. The state was telling them their tribes didn't exist and their land was not their land any more. This creates a severe cultural and identity crisis. It is a miracle that any of these native people were able to survive at all, let alone continue and keep their native identity. With all the obstacles, however, native people did endure, even in the face of being told there were no Indians left. They were able to keep some semblance of their heritage intact and had to adapt and adjust to a world which was against their success from the start. In the face of all the adversity and all of the untrue statements about the extinction of natives from New England, there were some who were able to survive and endure and keep their own identity, which they knew was being a native of New England. It is a tragic thing that white culture did to native people in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, stripping them of the identity which they knew was theirs. Some though, were able to endure that tragedy and over time and through reexamination of the information we have about the time, we can see that the natives were not in fact gone, and we can

look at what was really happening at the time. That information is crucial if we are going to create a generation who looks at the past critically and does not keep repeating the same common misconceptions about native people in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in New England.