

Introduction

Toward “Hopeful” Research: Community-Engaged Scholarship and New Directions in Native American and Indigenous Studies

CHIEF BENJAMIN J. BARNES AND STEPHEN WARREN

Collected within the pages you now have in your hands are seeds that began to grow at the 2014 annual conference of the American Society for Ethnohistory in Indianapolis, Indiana. For scholars in attendance that work in and with Indigenous communities, the conference proceedings had the feeling of lightning in a bottle: a rare moment when attendees from across “Indian Country” collaborated on equal terms with scholarly experts. The winds of change were blowing, and we could all feel that a power shift was taking place. We hoped that Native nations, citizen-scholars, and academics would leave the meeting committed to the task of inverting the traditional power dynamic. We hoped that Indigenous nations might finally arrest more than a century of ethnological, historical, and economic plunder. Galvanized by the moment, we felt emboldened to demand that the settler-colonial academy—universities, museums, and public institutions—work collaboratively with Native nations and reexamine the cultural riches contained in their archives, seeding a new era of cultural revitalization.

Our hope for a new era of collaboration was premature. We realized that if we wanted to see the changes we desired, we were going to have to work for it. Hundreds of emails, phone calls, personal meetings, and

numerous conferences later, you now hold in your hands the fruits of those seeds. It was during the intervening time that some of our cabal traveled to the 2016 meeting of the Canadian Historical Association in Calgary, Alberta, to work more closely with Keith Thor Carlson, then at the University of Saskatchewan. Keith's work with Albert "Sonny" McHalsie and the Stó:lō has been an inspiration for like-minded scholars in the United States and Canada. They didn't need to be proselytized into our movement, as they had for nearly two decades been practicing community-engaged scholarship within the Stó:lō community along the Fraser Valley of British Columbia. It was perhaps seeing these ideas in practice that renewed us, encouraging us that not only could we bring change to our own tribal communities, but change the way that universities see and treat Native Americans and First Nations peoples. Being exposed to the success of the partnership between the Stó:lō and the University of Saskatchewan gave us momentum. We then hosted a 2017 conference on community-engaged scholarship (CES) in Oklahoma, split between the University of Tulsa, the Helmerich Center for American Research, and the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma. We moved between metropolitan Tulsa and Miami, up in the extreme northeastern corner of the state that so many tribes call home. We chose these locations because we wanted to share our work with the communities that are the subject of our research.

The authors included in this volume presented their ideas at our CES conference and have been working with Native nations on collaborative projects directed by Native nations. The seeds of their ideas, like all seeds, have grown out of the efforts of previous "gardeners," choosing the best and strongest crops that will sustain and nourish us. It is from the mistakes and successes of previous forays into Native communities that we have winnowed out selections for your consideration. We feel that despite the missteps of the past, the promise of improved research outcomes for Indigenous peoples and universities alike is long overdue. Together, we need to ask Native peoples, "What do you want to know?" while, at the same time, keeping in mind the mistakes of past efforts.

Most of the authors included in the volume focus their research on some aspect of the Indigenous Midwest. Two Native nations, the Miami and Shawnee, are a focal point of our research. However, these nations have collaborated with universities and institutions far beyond their former homelands, the land between the Wabash and Ohio River valleys. These collaborative partners include the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, the Newberry Library, the Ohio History Connection, Indiana University, and

the University of Iowa. Contributing essays by scholars such as John Bowes, Buck Woodard, Brian Hosmer, April Sievert and Jessie Ryker-Crawford, and Jacki Rand represent the florescence of scholarship on Native nations from the Midwest, before and after removal. Thankfully, these scholars, and their allied institutions, have embraced community-engaged scholarship and fostered new and productive lines of inquiry as a result.

Our concentration on the Indigenous Midwest grows out of a long history. Native Americans from the Midwest have long been a focal point of non-Native research, centuries before community-engaged scholarship became part of our scholarly lexicon. In 1824, C. C. Trowbridge, a New Yorker then living in Michigan Territory, traveled to Northeastern Ohio to record the oral traditions of the Miami and Shawnee. It was the eve of Indian removal, and Trowbridge was anxious to collect their histories before they vanished from the earth. Trowbridge arranged interviews with two of the most important men in the tribe. Tenskwtawata, the brother of the Shawnees' most famous warrior, Tecumseh, sat for an interview, as did Black Hoof, Tenskwtawata's rival. In Indiana, Trowbridge interviewed Meehcikilita, or Le Gros, the principal chief of the Miami at the time. Nearly a century later, in December 1909, the ethnologist M. R. Harrington wrote to the US Indian agent for the Sac and Fox Agency. He needed permission to visit the Midwestern tribes living in Oklahoma, including the Miami, Peoria, Shawnee, Kickapoo, and Sac and Fox. Harrington asked the agent to help him acquire "ethnological specimens" for a museum exhibit at the University of Pennsylvania. "If you know anyone who has any old specimens," Harrington explained, "especially in the line of 'sacred bundles' and other 'medicine' articles I would be pleased indeed to hear of them." Harrington was wildly successful. Over several decades of traveling through Indian country he acquired tens of thousands of artifacts. In 1911, near Peru, Indiana, yet another collector of Native American history, Jacob Piatt Dunn met with the Miami elder Gabriel Godfroy to help him explain Indiana's history to Hoosiers in anticipation of the state's centennial celebration. Dunn positioned American Indians, and Godfroy's Miami people, at the beginning of his narrative, *Indiana and Indianans*. Godfroy thus became a human artifact, an embodiment of the state's progress from primitivism.¹

To Native Americans, ethnologists on quests for their culture—men such as Harrington, Trowbridge, and Dunn—must have seemed relentless. They visited Indiana, Ohio, Ontario, and Oklahoma to collect the cultures and histories of people who had been subject to the successive genocidal

campaigns since the eighteenth century.² Confident that Native Americans were doomed, Lewis Cass, the territorial governor of Michigan and ardent Jacksonian, commissioned Trowbridge's oral histories. In contrast, Harrington worked for George Gustav Heye, an engineer and heir to a fortune generated by Standard Oil Company, whose artifacts now make up 85 percent of the collection housed by the National Museum of the American Indian. A contemporary of Harrington's, Dunn traveled back and forth between his Indiana home and Oklahoma in an attempt to save the Miami language from becoming dormant. He argued for the "intrinsic worth" of Native American languages, believing that "any man who wishes to leave a monument more enduring than marble" should consider working to preserve Indigenous languages and local histories. Trowbridge, Harrington, and Dunn had complicated and divergent perspectives on federal Indian policy and the capacity of Native Americans to reconcile themselves to modernity. Sometimes, though not always, they worked in concert with state and federal officials. Historians have been slow to understand how their patrons and their individual beliefs shaped the material, archival, and oral histories they collected. Indigenous studies scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith explains that "the ways in which knowledge about Indigenous peoples was collected, classified and then represented" became part of the "collective memory of imperialism." Native scholar-activists are now reinterpreting their findings, unpacking how the secondary source literature has been shaped by the first ethnologists and archivists whose work often acts as the foundation for research on Native peoples.³

Unlike Trowbridge, Harrington, and Dunn, the essayists included in this volume answer questions posed by Indigenous communities themselves, and the audience for their work is primarily, though not exclusively, Indigenous. The community-engaged scholars gathered here represent what the Métis-Canadian Indigenous studies scholar Adam Gaudry describes as "insurgent research," because their research "bases itself in Indigenous communities and Indigenous knowledges, both of which are, at their core, relational." Community-engaged scholarship thus marks a significant departure from what Smith describes as the "traveller's tales" of yesteryear.⁴

The people published in these pages understand the long, tumultuous history of scholarly engagement in Indian country. For example, many of us first met through the American Society for Ethnohistory, a society founded by anthropologists and historians funded in part by the Indian Claims Commission, a branch of the US Department of Justice. Before joining the Claims Commission, American Society for Ethnohistory's founder,

Erminie Wheeler-Voegelin and her husband, Carl Voegelin, worked for the pharmaceutical magnate Eli Lilly. Lilly defined the aim and scope of their scholarship, and he asked them to adopt a team-based approach to the study of American Indian cultures. The archaeologist Glenn Black and the historian Paul Weer worked with the Voegelin's on a variety of Lilly-funded projects. In their view, "triangulation" promised to unlock the mysteries of Native Americans from the Midwest and beyond. Between 1953 and 1978, many ethnohistorians accustomed to triangulated research hired on to the Indian Claims Commission. Created by the US Department of Justice and intended to settle disputed land claims between the United States and federally recognized tribes, the Indian Claims Commission leaned heavily on scholars affiliated with the American Society for Ethnohistory. Teams of historians, anthropologists, and linguists researched the documentary and, to a lesser extent, oral record of Native Americans. For these scholars and the graduate students they supervised, ICC-funded research created yet another baseline of knowledge about American Indian history.⁵

In the 1950s and 1960s, ethnohistorians thought of themselves as social scientists. They never fully reflected on the moral and ethical problems that grew out of conducting research for the United States on the country's first peoples. They produced knowledge for wealthy industrialists, hobbyists with cash to burn on their obsession. When these funds dried up, the US Department of Justice, and the Indian Claims Commission, put them to work. Hired by a government eager to demonstrate "the utmost good faith" in its treatment of American Indians, ethnohistorians furthered American interests in the context of the Cold War. They privileged the archival record over community knowledge, the scholar over the informant, and the Western legal tradition over Native understandings of diplomacy and land holding. The anthropologist Shannon Speed has shown how these early practitioners are guilty, at minimum, of "collusion with colonial power." Ethnohistorians played a determining role in what the cultural theorist Stuart Hall describes as the ways in which "the West represented itself and its relation to 'the other.'"⁶

Cracks in the facade of objectivity began to emerge almost immediately. Among anthropologists, Sol Tax raised questions about the close allegiance between scholars and the United States government. Tax founded "action anthropology," an essential precursor to the community-engaged scholarship described in this volume. Regarding his colleagues affiliated with the ICC, Tax believed that "people are not rats and ought not to be treated like them. Not only should we not hurt people; we should not use

them for our own ends.” Tax was a Jewish anthropologist working in the wake of the Holocaust. He understood that scientific research often became a racist tool of the nation state, and he called for ethnology grounded in the needs of vernacular cultures. “Community research,” he wrote, is “justifiable only to the degree that the results are imminently useful to the community and easily outweigh the disturbance to it.”⁷

Research produced immediately before and after World War II informed Tax’s rejection of positivism, or the “notion of research as an objective, value-free, and scientific process for observing and making sense of human realities.” Tax understood that intersubjective realities shape how we view and interpret the world, and so he became cautious of Western universalism. He began describing himself as a “clinical” scientist. According to anthropologist Douglas R. Foley, “Tax’s notion of a clinical science challenged the positivist notion of social scientists as neutral, emotionally detached, objective recorders of social facts.” Linda Tuhiwai Smith argues that positivism is anathema for Indigenous communities, because it lacks an ethical grounding in the host community and confuses means with ends. She writes, “As the ways we try to understand the world are reduced to issues of measurement, the focus of understanding becomes more concerned with procedural problems.”⁸

Tax’s “action anthropology” was far from a perfect reply to positivism. The Meskwaki Nation in Tama, Iowa, became a central site for Tax’s methodology. In all of the years that Tax and his graduate students maintained a research station there, neither he nor his students ever received formal approval from the tribal council for their research. Tax developed his program in conversation with a small number of tribal leaders who he counted as friends. These informal relationships shaped his perspective on the Meskwaki as well as this nascent methodology.⁹

Among historians, Angie Debo was a contemporary of the ethnohistorians and, like Tax, a frequent critic of scholarship conducted on behalf of the settler-colonial state. Just as Wheeler-Voegelin and other first-generation ethnohistorians worked for the Indian Claims Commission, Debo became convinced of “the interrelationship between her country’s treatment of people of color and its moral authority in the larger world.” For Debo, scholar-activism meant letter writing campaigns on behalf of the world’s Indigenous peoples, standing up to peer-reviewers who intended to censor her scholarship, and advocating for African Americans in Oklahoma as the civil rights movement began to flower in the postwar United States. Debo was an independent woman who spoke truth to power. Consequently,

she spent most of her career outside of the professorate, as university and state officials tried to suppress her voice.¹⁰

Today's community-engaged scholars have studied how academic institutions and federal agencies use the specter of objectivity as a cudgel to prevent scholar-activists from applying their research to the world's Indigenous peoples. Tenure and promotion standards emphasize single-authored scholarship and the principle of peer review; criteria that leave Indigenous communities on the outside looking in. Anthropologist Charles R. Hale has challenged scholars working on behalf of Indigenous communities to claim "methodological rigor while rejecting the positivist notion of objectivity" that guided anthropologists and historians for most of the twentieth century. Hale's concern for "rigor" grows out of the frequent canard that activist-oriented research is facile and beneath the standards of most academic disciplines. Still today, few question the ethics of receiving grants designed by the US government or philanthropic institutions; awards created and implemented at a distance from Indigenous communities. The exclusion of Native voices from powerful philanthropic and government institutions has consequences for Indigenous communities and community-engaged scholars alike. Until community partners are treated as intellectual equals—sharing in writing, research, and publication—engaged scholarship will occur at the margins of the professorate.¹¹

Triangulated, or team-based research conducted on behalf of Indigenous communities raises alarm bells for scholars accustomed to single-authored, positivist approaches to history and anthropology. Accustomed to third-person omniscient narratives, wherein scholars assume an "objective" perspective on American Indians, these scholars worry that community engagement compromises a fundamental tenet of scholarship: the pose of the disinterested observer. Scholarship written by, and sometimes for, Indigenous communities seems to undermine this basic tenet of historical methods. Community-engaged scholarship and its practitioners are not advocating for the abandonment of single-authored scholarship. Single-authored scholarship is appropriate for a wide array of scholars and circumstances. Rather, we are advocating for the integration of team-based research into the scholarly canon. Single-authored and team-based research are not mutually exclusive.¹²

We also advocate for Indigenous nations to ask their own research questions; questions that academics take seriously and endeavor to answer. When Native communities ask questions in this way, the scholarship produced in response is restorative and inspiring. The fullness and richness

of Indigenous cultures comes into view. Community-engaged scholars in Indian country also seek to understand the trauma of settler colonialism. Its practitioners know that painful histories must be recovered and understood if the foundation of cultural recovery is to stand for future generations. Critics of community-engaged scholarship might think that Indigenous people want to recast history with themselves as the heroes. Such hagiographic portrayals lead to foundations made of sand. Scholarship with rigor and integrity is essential to the work of decolonization.

In part 1, “Community-Engaged Scholarship with the Three Federally Recognized Shawnee Tribes,” four chapters explain the fruits of ongoing partnerships between Shawnee and non-Native scholars. In chapter 1, Ben Barnes, chief of the Shawnee Tribe, desires to understand the meaning of his long relationship to the White Oak Ceremonial Ground while, at the same time, his Shawnee relatives made very different choices about community and identity. In all of their manifestations, Shawnee individuals and communities refused to conform to the two-dimensional cardboard cutouts of conventional history books. In chapter 2, Sandra Garner, professor of American studies at Miami University, Ohio, describes her career, from working with the Lakota to her subsequent engagement with the Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma. Through culture camps for Eastern Shawnee children, Sande has managed to bring Miami University students to Oklahoma, where they work with Eastern Shawnee children and learn while doing, in an immersive field school experience. In chapter 3, Glenna Wallace, the chief of the Eastern Shawnee Tribe, is a force of nature who has worked tirelessly to reverse the legacy of removal in Ohio. In “Earthworks Rising,” she collaborates with Christine Ballengee Morris and Marti Chaatsmith (Comanche/Choctaw). Together, they focus their attention on Newark Earthworks, a Hopewell mound complex of great magnitude that was defiled by the Moundbuilders Golf Course for most of the last century and is now a UNESCO World Heritage Site. In chapter 4, “New Paradigms of Integration: Historians and the Need for Community Engagement,” historian Stephen Warren challenges readers to consider how the “knowledge claims of the traditional disciples” and the demands of non-Native audiences often ignore or undermine the needs of Native communities. His retrospective analysis of previous efforts at community-engaged scholarship show why it is difficult to reconcile the needs of Indigenous communities and the integrationist demands of the discipline of history.

Part 2, “The Myaamia Center: The History and Practice of Community Engagement,” tells the history of this pivotal site of linguistic and cultural revitalization in Oxford, Ohio. In chapter 5, “neepwaantiinki (Partners in Learning): The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, Miami University, and the Myaamia Center,” George Ironstrack (Miami Tribe of Oklahoma) and Bobbe Burke explain the unique history of this interdisciplinary research center, housed at Miami University, Ohio, but staffed and funded by the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma. The remarkable story of this partnership, which grew out of many difficult conversations regarding the university’s racist mascot, has not been told before. Once the mascot had been jettisoned, both the Miami Tribe and Miami University built a remarkable partnership out of a long history of painful misrepresentations. The center has become a magnet for language revitalization, historical research, and Miami citizens enrolled at Miami University. In chapter 6, “Community-Engaged Scholarship from the Perspective of an Early Career Academic,” non-Native ally and PhD in history Cameron Shriver describes how early career academics can establish meaningful ties to Indigenous communities. Finally, in chapter 7, “Community-Engaged Scholarship as a Restorative Action,” G. Susan Mosley-Howard, and three Miami Tribe of Oklahoma citizens and Miami University scholars, Haley Shea, George Ironstrack, and Daryl Baldwin, offer a retrospective analysis of the linguistic and cultural journeys of Miami citizens enrolled at Miami University.

In part 3, “Community Engagement beyond the US Settler Academy,” we turn our attention to libraries, laboratories, living history museums, and courtrooms. It must be acknowledged that innovative, community-engaged scholarship has flourished in spaces outside of academic departments. Tenure and promotion standards often ignore CES methodologies or, in some cases, cast it off as service rather than scholarship. Moreover, because academic departments prioritize single-authored scholarship, innovative, collaborative research often takes place outside of university settings.

In chapter 8, “Historians as Expert Witnesses for Tribal Governments,” historian John P. Bowes describes his work in the world of litigation, using ethnohistorical work on behalf of the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan and the Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians. In chapter 9, “Looking Inward from 60 West Walton Street: Reflections on Community-Engaged Scholarship from the Perspective of the Newberry Library,” historian Brian Hosmer offers a retrospective on his time as director of the D’Arcy McNickle Center, where he worked to procure grants and created infrastructure that allowed for institutional collaborations with

Indigenous communities. In chapter 10, “The Return of Indian Nations to the Colonial Capital: Civic Engagement and the Production of Native Public History,” anthropologist and public historian Buck Woodard gave Native Americans a stage and a platform at Colonial Williamsburg, where they narrated their own histories with colonial America. In chapter 11, “Repatriation as a Catalyst for Building Community-Engaged Curriculum,” anthropologists April Sievert and Jessie Ryker-Crawford describe how institutions that hold human remains and associated funerary objects can improve their working relationships with Native nations. Sievert and Ryker-Crawford show how consultations, when done properly and ethically, should recognize Native nations’ free, prior, and informed consent under the guidelines of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990). In chapter 12, “The Collaboration Spectrum: Legendary Stories as Windows into Gendered Change in Stó:lō Understandings of Territoriality,” Keith Thor Carlson, Naxaxalhts’i (Albert “Sonny” McHalsie; Stó:lō First Nation), Colin Murray Osmond, and Tsandlia Van Ry (Stó:lō First Nation) take community-engaged scholarship north of the Medicine Line. In Canada, the adage “nothing about us without us” guides the important work of the Stó:lō Research and Resource Management Centre (SRRMC) in Chilliwack, British Columbia.

In the afterword, “Where Do We Go from Here?,” historian Jacki Thompson Rand (Choctaw citizen) offers a retrospective on her training in the fields of history and museum studies. Her experience of the disconnect between scholarly methodologies and Indigenous communities underscores the need for community-engaged scholarship. Land acknowledgment statements and overused words such as decolonization require that we take a more thoughtful approach.

Replanting Cultures: Community-Engaged Scholarship in Indian Country offers many different examples of both triangulated and single-authored research. Some chapters chronicle our individual journeys toward community engagement, but the majority offer retrospective analyses of projects designed by and for Indigenous communities in the United States and Canada. Both the Myaamia Center and the Stó:lō Research and Resource Management Centre offer remarkable examples of innovation and Indigenous sovereignty. However, in contrast to the United States, the Canadian government has taken steps to acknowledge and correct its role in funding research that has disadvantaged First Nations. In 2001 the Canadian government created a Panel on Research Ethics, which

established rigorous protocols for researchers. Importantly, this panel acknowledged Canada's long history of exploitative research. To chart a new course, national funding agencies require that scholars demonstrate "that research involving aboriginal peoples" is "premised on respectful relationships." These and other guidelines have made community-engaged research the preferred model of the Canadian government. Scholars who fail to embrace research methodologies based on respect and reciprocity are not eligible for national funding.¹³

In the decades before the panel's creation, Julie Cruikshank, Laura Peers, and Alison Brown modeled the kind of research that resulted in this paradigm shift in Canadian scholarship. In *Life Lived Like a Story*, anthropologist Julie Cruikshank describes coming of age as an anthropologist in the late 1960s. She explains that the "ethical dilemmas of anthropological research" convinced her that she had to "do research outside a university framework." Positivism, which in anthropology turns on the "methodological goals of observation and participation," informed her decision to work outside of an academic institution. The Native women in the Yukon with whom Cruikshank worked challenged her to move beyond conventional approaches to anthropological fieldwork. Together, they settled on what we might now describe as "collaborative ethnography." Cruikshank developed a model of "life history investigation" in which the Indigenous women owned the final product. Jointly reviewing and correcting the life histories became intrinsic to the process. Cruikshank suggests that before the establishment of the Panel on Research Ethics Canadian research institutions might have limited her capacity to conduct this kind of ethical, reciprocal research.¹⁴

To the south, scholars in the United States have made halting progress toward engagement. The reasons for this are complex, owing in part to the decentralized and diverse nature of higher education in the United States, as well as the limited commitment of federal and private funding agencies to engaged scholarship. As in Canada, scholars of community engagement such as John Saltmarsh and Edward Zlotkowski argue that colleges and universities in the United States are largely to blame. From their perspective, academic institutions founded between the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries "have remained remarkably stable—or inert." As evidence, they point to antiquated tenure and promotion standards; standards of professionalism that focus on individual achievement rather than inclusive, community-based research that builds capacity in underserved populations. Perhaps because of these conventional standards, the

foremost champions of community-engaged scholarship with Indigenous populations typically come from museums, nonprofit organizations, and public-private partnerships beyond university settings. Research centers featured in this volume such as the Myaamia Institute in Oxford, Ohio, the Glenn Black Laboratory of Archaeology at Indiana University, the Newberry Library in Chicago, and the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation cultivate the scholarship of engagement because it is an intrinsic measurement of their success. These institutions recognize that their success depends on outreach with federally recognized Native nations. Some of the best community-engaged scholarship in the United States comes out of the governments of Native nations, or research centers that work closely with Indigenous communities.¹⁵

However innovative community engagement seems, it is important to recognize that this methodology grows out of an older form of ethno-historical practice based on team- or “triangulated” research. Today’s community-engaged scholars embrace inclusive scholarly practices and honor Indigenous perspectives. “Sharing authority,” according to the Anishnaabe archaeologist Sonya Atalay, “builds capacity” in Native communities. The essayists included in this volume model interdisciplinary scholarship that furthers the sovereignty of Indigenous communities.¹⁶

Collaborative research in Native American and Indigenous studies is a unique strand of the larger movement toward community engagement. Their scholarly products do not always resemble the peer-reviewed publications that many academics have come to expect. Museum exhibits, oral histories, recovered pottery traditions, and Myaamia ribbonwork reflect the diverse outputs that result from engaged scholarship. Unlike mainstream examples of community engagement, allied scholars in Indigenous communities are more circumspect regarding wider publics and the ways in which their work benefits the civic cultures of the United States and Canada. Saltmarsh and Zlotkowski suggest that conventional academic “departments can remain, but only if civic engagement is intrinsic to the curriculum.” They call for integrative scholarship whose ultimate end is the creation of life-long learners driven by civic engagement. According to the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, the notion of the common good, including “community engagement pedagogies . . . combine[s] learning goals and community service in ways that can enhance both student growth and the common good.”¹⁷

Native American and Indigenous communities are justifiably wary of scholars who approach them on universal quests for knowledge and

democracy. Concerned with cultural recovery after centuries of genocide, Native peoples search for allies interested in placing the needs of Indigenous communities above those of the American nation-state. Quite literally, institutions such as Indiana University built their reputations on the land of Native peoples, and then compounded their tyranny by exhuming and desecrating the bones of Native peoples' ancestors. At the same time, ethnologists collected the languages and music of the Shawnee and their Midwestern relatives, only to lock them away from the very people who provided their culture, their sound, and their history to non-Natives. These treasures have remained hidden from Native peoples until quite recently. Blocked by paywalls and exorbitant out-of-state tuitions, these colleges and universities have excluded Native peoples from ever enjoying the benefits of the knowledge they possess. Because of this history, it is not surprising that citizens of Native nations often determine that their need for cultural privacy outweighs the scholars' need for publication and other means of disseminating knowledge. Alternatively, Native nations pursue the repatriation of artifacts of culture collected by people such as Harrington. Across the United States, 574 federally recognized Native nations work to return knowledge to their communities; knowledge taken by museums and universities. These goals supersede the needs of the non-Native students and their teachers for whom civic engagement and public service remain their foremost aims. Each in their own way, the authors in this volume argue that Indigenous communities have the right to know, and to respond to, interpretations of their culture and history.¹⁸

In the essays that follow, we contend that community-engaged scholarship, often written by teams of scholars, yields exciting new discoveries in history, anthropology, and related disciplines. We show how the questions posed by Indigenous communities leads to new discoveries in these disciplines. In our view, new questions, when combined with the expertise of Native scholar-activists and their allies, yields better outcomes than single-authored manuscripts written largely in isolation from the Indigenous community that is the subject of their research.

Community-engaged scholars and teachers frequently work among the most vulnerable populations. Perhaps because of this, leading scholars are now questioning universalist claims for the "common good" that have dominated academic scholarship since John Dewey published *Education and Democracy*. Dwight Giles, a leading scholar on teaching and learning, makes the case for "a practice element to broaden the scholarship

to include practitioner voices as co-generators of knowledge.” Channeling Giles, the educational theorist Gregory Jay believes that we need to explain both “who we mean when we say ‘the public,’ and to whom our work is accountable.”¹⁹

Most scholars approach teaching from a problem-solving perspective. We design classes to improve our students’ ability to function successfully in the twenty-first century. Alternatively, we worry that our students lack a basic understanding of American democracy. These problem-based approaches to learning, when applied to Indigenous communities, often reflect poorly on academics. We come across as condescending saviors, convinced that we alone can solve a community’s problems. When treated this way, Indigenous communities avoid the newcomers, waiting for their departure to return to their normal patterns of life. Engaged teaching and research can avoid these problems. When communities identify the problems they wish to solve, everyone benefits.

Non-Native academics are often the last to challenge the “presumptive universalism of the academic humanities curricula.” The Enlightenment quest for truth, for universal understandings of the common good, are baked into these institutional identities. Native Americans know firsthand how these same institutions have stored their ancestors in boxes, conducted tests on their ancestors’ remains, patented their seeds, and published their histories of creation, all in pursuit of the common good. These abuses of power give the lie to positivism, to the false idea that “facts exist independently of values and assumptions.” Native people know that objective science was never truly objective; that the settler-colonial states that are now sovereign over their lands often use objective science to justify the dispossession of Native people. As evidence, look to the Indian Claims Commission. Settler-colonial benefactors have always played a critical role in our interpretation of human societies, past and present. Federal officials in search of termination got scholars to work for the Indian Claims Commission.²⁰

Despite these long histories of working with colonial powers, many scholars continue to subscribe to the false notion that their research, conducted under a smokescreen of positivism, is free of bias. Witness the recent *American Historical Review* AHR Exchange “Historians and Native Americans and Indigenous Studies.” In this forum, historian David Silverman worries about the weakening of historical methods, and he suggests that collaborative methodologies undermine the discipline. He accuses community-engaged scholars of both presentism and an unwillingness to

tackle difficult histories. CES practitioners, particularly those aligned with the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association, are, in his view, obsessed with “identity politics” to such an extent that our work does not permit “the honest study” of past worlds. Well before the publication of this forum, the authors included in *Replanting Cultures* anticipated Silverman’s criticism and explained why scholarly rigor has been so essential to our work. We were heartened by the thoughtful replies of the AHR Exchange respondents, who zeroed in on Silverman’s misrepresentation of their, and our, work. For example, historian Christine DeLucia described how her Pequot and Wampanoag interlocutors offered “probing, insightful” comments on her work that improved the quality of her research. Broad-stroke accusations of shallow, presentist research bear little resemblance to our own experience of community-engaged scholarship.²¹

One legacy of settler-colonialism is that non-Native scholars have unparalleled access to, and sometimes control over, a given community’s archival record. Historians and archivists in positions of power now seek out collaborative opportunities that democratize their collections. They can bring tribal citizen-scholars into contact with larger networks of scholars and archivists who know the history of the documents in their possession; documents that are often vital to the defense and expansion of tribal sovereignty. For Harry Williams, a citizen of the Owens Valley Paiute, the records of his people housed at the University of California, Berkeley’s Bancroft Library “represent an astonishing collection of traditional materials and knowledge now largely lost to the tribe.” Archivists, working in tandem with teachers and students, have brought the stories contained in “faded notebooks” back to life, restoring the “lost patrimony of the Paiute people.”²²

Like the Owens Valley Paiute, the Miami and Shawnee communities featured in this volume cultivate scholarly partnerships based in values of reciprocity. They value partnerships with scholars and universities that feature collaboration and repatriation. In the case of the Miami, they have fostered the intellectual growth of their own citizens, people such as the language activist, scholar, and MacArthur fellow Daryl Baldwin. The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma’s disciplined focus on linguistic and cultural analysis culminated in the creation of the Myaamia Center, a place where collaboration with tribal partners lives and thrives for students and faculty. For the Shawnee Tribe (one of three Shawnee nations), collaboration was born out of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). Before final disposition of ancestral remains can occur,

the Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, the Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, and the Shawnee Tribe need to have discussions to achieve a concurrence. Out of these NAGPRA conversations, relationships have arisen between the tribes and public institutions in the old Shawnee homelands. Unlike the Miami, the Shawnee have a vast area of historical and cultural interest. Shawnee villages and trading posts seem to appear out from under every rock in the historical narrative ranging from Florida up the Atlantic coast into Maryland and New York to as far west and south as Mexico and Texas. Edmond Atkin, the Southern Superintendent for Indian Affairs, described the Shawnees and their travels in his 1755 *Report* as “the greatest Travellers in America.” Their historical archive is vast, as their people occupied a prodigious region across more than twenty American states. Borne from consultations in their former homelands, relationships between individuals and institutions have bloomed. The Shawnee Tribe has developed a wide network of collaborative, academic partnerships with community-defined research goals at the American Philosophical Society, the Glenn Black Laboratory of Archaeology at Indiana University, the Kentucky Archaeological Survey, and the Ohio History Connection, as well as other Native nations, universities, and public institution. For both the Miami and the Shawnee, the desire is the same. Language and cultural loss occurs within communities, so it stands to reason that those same communities must be the primary force in restoration. Myaamia citizen-scholar Daryl Baldwin eloquently explains that his people must be the authors of their own destiny:

Although it is easy to point to the many forces, some deliberate, that served as the impetus for the decline of Myaamia language and cultural knowledge, it is clear that the recovery process rests largely on the shoulders of the Miami nation and its citizens. If Myaamia language and culture survives into another century, in whatever form, it will be because the people want it to.²³

Both the Miami and the Shawnee have their national headquarters in Ottawa County, Oklahoma, located in the northeastern-most corner of the state. It is perhaps no accident that nine Native nations are headquartered there. In the aftermath of the Civil War, as non-Native settlement in Kansas accelerated, the Miami, Shawnee, and their Native neighbors were removed yet again, mainly to the northeastern corner of Indian Territory,

what is now Oklahoma. It is here in Ottawa County, a peculiar context of multiple removed tribes, that the Shawnee, Eastern Shawnee, Miami, Peoria, Ottawa, Wyandotte, Seneca-Cayuga, Quapaw, and Modoc have learned to value cooperation in this patchwork quilt of allotted lands and jurisdictional areas. Eight of the nine of these nations have connections to eastern states along the Great Lakes, and the Ohio and Mississippi River valleys. The Modoc are the sole exception, being removed by railcar from California, shackled in chains as they arrived in Oklahoma.

For both the Shawnee and Miami nations, dispossession of land deprived them and their neighbors of their living history. The restoration of their archival history is critically important to language revitalization and other aspects of cultural patrimony. Two facts of their respective histories make the repatriation of knowledge critical to their efforts. First, the United States forcibly removed them from their homelands in what is now Ohio and Indiana. Second, even before removal, the chaos of colonialism spread Miami and Shawnee communities over most of the eastern half of North America. Because of this vast diaspora, Miami and Shawnee records are scattered across the United States as well as repositories in Canada, the United Kingdom, France, and Spain.²⁴

Repatriating this knowledge through interlinked archives offers a promising means of connecting tribal citizens to what the digital scholar and curator, Kimberly Christen calls “digital heritage.” The world’s Indigenous people are now working to develop “local cultural protocols” that reflect the unique “intellectual property needs” of their communities. Repatriating knowledge to specific Native nations immediately benefits Indigenous communities seeking to defend their ancestors through the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. Others value the ability to access information previously hidden behind paywalls and other institutional barriers. Native nations committed to “building the capacity” of their citizens now work to create online content systems that make that possible.²⁵

Before the advent of community-engaged scholarship, as the ethnographer Luke Eric Lassiter explains, scholars assumed a “hierarchy of understanding” in which their knowledge superseded that of tribal citizens. In 1993, anthropologist Elaine Lawless called for a new chapter in these quests for cultural information, what she termed “reciprocal ethnography.” In *Holy Women, Wholly Women*, Lawless defined a method in which both the interlocutor and the author share authority for the interpretation of culture housed within scholarly books and articles. Lassiter has subsequently

taken Lawless's call for "reciprocal ethnography" a step further, toward the collaborative production of ethnographic texts; a process that treats American Indians as co-intellectuals. This new "process of textual production" no longer places the scholar above the needs of the informant or the community they represent.²⁶

Native Americans and First Nations' peoples are understandably wary of non-Native scholars and the institutions they represent. It is a mistrust built on generations of exploitative research. Gaudry explains that the "reluctance of communities to engage academic researchers is not, I think, an inherent issue of scholarly research, but rather *the normalization of exploitative and extractive research* as standard scholarly practice." Gaudry makes an important distinction, in that he refers to Indigenous communities in expansive and inclusive ways. Indigenous governments and their elected officials are not the only representatives of Indigeneity. It is with this definition of "community" that the authors in the following pages describe to varying degrees their work. Collectively, we hope that the essays offer useful case studies of engaged, ethical research. Successes and failures are an inherent part of these endeavors. There is really no greater trust that can be shown than by the sharing of sacred seeds of Indigenous knowledge, culture, religion, and traditions. It is our hope that these examples of community-engaged scholarship will help to seed future generations of scholarship predicated on ethical engagement with Native communities.²⁷

Notes

1. M. R. Harrington to US Indian agent, December 17, 1909, "Indian History" folder, Sac and Fox Agency Records, Box 189, Oklahoma Historical Society, Oklahoma City, OK; W. Vernon Kintz and Erminie Wheeler-Voegelin, eds., *Shawnee Traditions: C. C. Trowbridge's Account* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1939); Jacob Piatt Dunn, *Indiana and Indianans: A History of Aboriginal and Territorial Indiana and the Century of Statehood* (Chicago: American Historical Society, 1919).

2. For a recent treatment of the genocidal intentions and actions of the United States in the eastern half of North America, see Jeffrey Ostler, *Surviving Genocide: Native Nations and the United States from the American Revolution to Bleeding Kansas* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2019).

3. Ann McMullen, "Reinventing George Heye: Nationalizing the Museum of the American Indian and Its Collections," in *Contesting Knowledge: Museums and Indigenous Perspectives*, ed. Susan Sleeper-Smith (Lincoln: University of

Nebraska Press, 2009), 65–105; John Haworth, “100 Years and Counting: Reflections about a Collection, a Collector, and the Museum of the American Indian (before There Was an NMAI),” *American Indian* 17, no. 1 (2016), <https://www.americanindianmagazine.org/story/100-years-and-counting-reflections-about-collection-collector-and-museum-american-indian>; Jacob Piatt Dunn, “Shall Indian Languages Be Preserved?” *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* 10, no. 1 (1917): 96, 95. See also Lana Ruegamer, “History, Politics, and the Active Life: Jacob Piatt Dunn, Progressive Historian,” *Indiana Magazine of History* 81, no. 3 (1985): 265–83; Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 2nd ed. (New York: Zed Books, 2012), 1.

4. Adam J. P. Gaudry, “Insurgent Research,” *Wicazo Sa Review* 26, no. 1 (2011): 123; Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 81.

5. Stephen Warren and Ben Barnes, “Salvaging the Salvage Anthropologists: Erminie Wheeler-Voegelin, Carl Voegelin, and the Future of Ethnohistory,” *Ethnohistory* 65, no. 2 (2018): 189–214; Keith Thor Carlson, John Sutton Lutz, David M. Schaepe, “Decolonizing Ethnohistory,” in *Towards a New Ethnohistory: Community-Engaged Scholarship among the People of the River*, ed. Keith Thor Carlson, John Sutton Lutz, David M. Schaepe, and Naxaxalhts’i (Albert “Sonny” McHalsie) (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2018), 7–11; Michael Harkin, “Ethnohistory’s Ethnohistory: Creating a Discipline from the Ground Up,” *Social Science History* 34, no. 2 (2010): 113–28; Arthur J. Ray, *Aboriginal Rights Claims and the Making and Remaking of History* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2016); Kenneth R. Philp, *Termination Revisited: American Indians on the Trail to Self Determination* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999); Daniel M. Cobb, *Native Activism in Cold War America: The Struggle for Sovereignty* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2008); Paul C. Rosier, *Serving Their Country: American Indian Politics and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).

6. This phrase is drawn from the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which established the modern states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. For more on the Indian Claims Commission and the larger context of the Cold War, see Rosier, *Serving Their Country*; Shannon Speed, “Forged in Dialogue,” in *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship*, ed. Charles R. Hale (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 213; Stuart Hall, “The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power,” in *Identity and Diaspora*, vol. 2 of *Essential Essays*, ed. David Morley (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2019), 225. See also Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 2003).

7. Sol Tax, “Action Anthropology,” *Current Anthropology*, 16, no. 4 (1975): 515. See also Judith M. Daubenmier, *The Meskwaki and Anthropologists: Action Anthropology Reconsidered* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008).

8. Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 166; Douglas E. Foley, “The Fox Project: A Reappraisal,” *Current Anthropology* 40, no. 2 (1999): 172. For more on

Tax's view of action anthropology, see Solomon H. Katz, "Action Anthropology: Its Past, Present, and Future," in *Action Anthropology and Sol Tax in 2012: The Final Word?*, ed. Darcy C. Stapp, JONA memoir 8 (Richland, WA: Journal of Northwest Anthropology, 2012), 198–99; Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 45.

9. Foley, "The Fox Project," 177.

10. Shirley A. Leckie, *Angie Debo: Pioneering Historian* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000), 145.

11. David H. Price, *Cold War Anthropology: the CIA, the Pentagon, and the Growth of Dual Use Anthropology* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016). See also David H. Price, *Threatening Anthropology: McCarthyism and the FBI's Surveillance of Activist Anthropologists* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004); Landon R. Y. Storrs, *The Second Red Scare and the Unmaking of the New Deal Left* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2013); Charles R. Hale, ed., *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 4; Carl Rhodes and Peter Bloom, "The Trouble with Charitable Billionaires," *Guardian*, May 24, 2018; Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie, *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

12. Ruth Behar, *The Vulnerable Observer: Anthropology That Breaks Your Heart* (Boston: Beacon, 1996).

13. Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, home page, accessed March 26, 2022, <https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/societe-societe/community-communite/index-eng.aspx>.

14. Julie Cruikshank, *Life Lived like a Story: Life Histories of Three Yukon Native Elders* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990), 1, 13. For collaborative ethnography, see Luke Eric Lassiter, "From 'Reading over the Shoulders of Natives' to 'Reading Alongside Natives,' Literally: Toward a Collaborative and Reciprocal Ethnography," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 57, no. 2 (2001): 145.

15. Exceptions to the rule include the Whiting Foundation, <https://www.whiting.org/>; and the American Philosophical Society, which has created the Andrew W. Mellon Native American Scholars Initiative Fellowships, <https://www.amphilsoc.org/grants/andrew-w-mellon-foundation-native-american-scholars-initiative-nasi-fellowships>. For recent scholarship promoting engaged research, see Amy Koritz and George J. Sanchez, introduction to *Civic Engagement in the Wake of Katrina*, ed. Amy Koritz and George J. Sanchez (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2009), 8. See also John Saltmarsh and Edward Zlotkowski, eds., *Higher Education and Democracy: Essays on Service-Learning and Civic Engagement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011), 81. To date, the best examples of integration between academic departments and Indigenous research centers are in Canada. See, for example, Keith Carlson, from the University of Saskatchewan, who holds the Research Chair in Indigenous and Community-Engaged History; the University of Carleton's Great Lakes Research Alliance Aboriginal Arts and Cultures,