

An introduction to native north america, 4 e

Countries, United States



An Introduction to Native North America, 4/e Sutton ©2012 / ISBN:

9780205121564 Chapter begins on next page > PLEASE NOTE: This sample chapter was prepared in advance of book publication. Additional changes may appear in the published book. To request an examination copy or for additional information, please visit us at www.pearsonhighered.com or contact your Pearson representative at www.pearsonhighered.com.

1 Introduction In 1492, Christopher Columbus sailed west from Spain, looking for a shorter and more direct route to the Indies. Instead, he landed on a small island in the Caribbean and encountered a New World occupied by many millions of people belonging to many hundreds, perhaps as many as a thousand, different cultures. These cultures were incredibly diverse, ranging from very small groups of hunters and gatherers to large groups of farmers living in cities, and having social and political institutions of varying complexities comparable to any in the world. Europeans wanted to believe that they had “discovered” a new land, untouched and pristine, a land occupied by wandering, primitive savages who did not “properly” possess the land. They believed it their duty to drag these native peoples from their state of savagery into the light of civilization. These beliefs served to justify the conquest of the New World and are still widely held today. But despite the onslaught of Europeans, native peoples have survived. Why are we interested in learning about Native North America? In the abstract, Native American culture is part of the larger human experience. Each culture is unique and the more we know about different cultures, the more we know collectively about all people. Anthropology holds the view that all cultures are valid, that they have the right to exist, and no one has the right to

suppress them. Following this, the more that is known about a group, the better it is protected. Another tenet of anthropology is that no culture is better or worse than any other (with some exceptions such as Nazi Germany) and that cultures should not be judged. We all live in a multicultural world and it is important that everyone comprehend and appreciate cultural diversity so that bias, ethnocentrism, and racism can be conquered. As all cultures are unique, each has lessons to teach others and there is much (good and bad) that Native Americans can offer, such as their environmental practices, philosophy, literature, and the like. Their knowledge is useful to everyone and we can all learn from their successes and failures. A bit closer to home, American culture has been shaped, in part, by contact and interaction with native peoples over hundreds of years and an appreciation of that history can help to better understand where we all are now and how we got here. It is important for everyone to grasp the issues that surround minorities within a larger dominant culture, and to look for solutions to problems inherent in that situation. Many native peoples have gotten a "raw deal" and everyone should understand how that happened and what can be done about it. In some cases, the culture and practices of some native peoples were, at least in part, preserved for later generations by anthropologists. Lastly, Native American cultures are not "vanished races" consigned to natural history museums but modern, active, and vibrant groups. Everyone should celebrate the survival and revival of those cultures.

The Geography of North America Prior to 1492, Europeans thought they knew the geography of the world and the location and extent of the various major landmasses and bodies of water. The landmasses known at that time

consisted of Europe, Africa, Asia, and many of the islands of the western Pacific. However, when they encountered a huge new landmass full of unfamiliar people, it was seen as a " New World, " a name that continues to be used today (Fig. 1. 1). The world known to the Europeans prior to 1492 was subsequently referred to as the Old World, a term also still used. Today, the New World is also known as the western hemisphere and the Old World is the eastern hemisphere. FIGURE 1. 1 Simplified map of the world, showing both New and Old Worlds Greenland Europe North America NTIC EAN Asia Africa South America Australia N 0 1000 2000 Miles New World Old World Kilometers 0 1000 2000 2 Chapter 1 Introduction Greenland North America South America N 0 0 Kilometers 1000 2000 FIGURE 1. 2 New World Major cultural divisions of the The New World is often described as comprising two continents: (1) North America, which extends from the Arctic to Panama, and (2) South America, which runs from Colombia to the southern tip of Chile. However, it is now common for the New World to be thought of as three regions: North, Central, and South America. Many people consider North America to consist of the United States and Canada, Central America to include Mexico and all the countries south through Panama, and South America to extend from Colombia to the southern tip of Chile. A third way to conceptualize the New World is based on broad cultural distinctions, leading to the specification of three somewhat different regions: North America, Mesoamerica (meso meaning " middle"), and South America (Fig. 1. 2). According to this frame of reference, the southern boundary of North America is located in northern Mexico; this definition is used in this book. The modern border between the United States and Mexico is not relevant to a

definition of past cultures. After defining the southern boundary of North America, the question arises as to whether to include Greenland to the north. Some researchers consider Greenland a part of Europe, others a part of North America, while most simply ignore the problem. In this book, Greenland is considered a part of North America, primarily because the Inuit that inhabited much of Arctic North America also lived in Greenland. The geography of North America is complex, and many regions can be defined within it, based on a number of criteria. For the purposes of this book, seven general natural areas are defined (Fig. 1. 3); these overlap with the culture areas defined later. In the far north lies the Arctic, a largely treeless region covered with snow and ice for most of the year, roughly corresponding to the Arctic culture area. To the south of the Arctic lies a region containing mountains and a vast, cold, coniferous forest with thousands of lakes that generally coincides with the Subarctic culture area. Farther south, and east of the Mississippi River, lies an extensive temperate forest, much of which has been destroyed over the past 150 years, and this region is divided into the Northeast and Southeast culture areas. West of the Mississippi River, an immense region of grasslands called the Plains (both the geographic region and the culture area) extends west to the Rocky Mountains, which run north to south along much of North America. The Plains is now mostly covered by fields of corn and wheat. A large desert occupies much of western North America and includes both the

Great Basin and Southwest culture areas. Lastly, the Pacific coast lies along the western boundary of North America and encompasses the Northwest Coast, California, and Plateau culture areas. Culture Areas Researchers recognized early on that cultures in similar environments tend to be similar to one another, sharing some aspects of economy, politics, and even language. Large-scale geographic regions where environment and culture were similar were defined in the late 1890s and called culture areas, first in North and South America (Mason 1894), then in other areas of the world. The definition of a culture area is never precise, and there is considerable argument over how many there are, where their boundaries are, which groups should be included in each, and even

4 Chapter 1 Introduction Asia
Russia ARCTIC OCEAN Greenland Arctic Subarctic North America Northwest Coast Great Basin Plateau Northeast Plains California Southeast the ATLANTIC OCEAN N PACIFIC OCEAN est Gulf of Mexico Mesoamerica 0 0 1000 Miles Kilometers 500 1000 500 CARIBBEAN SEA

FIGURE 1. 4 Culture areas of North America Adapted from Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 4, History of Indian-White Relations, W. E. Washburn, ed., p. ix; copyright © 1988 by the Smithsonian Institution. Used by permission of the publisher.

whether culture areas should be defined at all. Ten culture areas are defined herein, following the Handbook of North American Indians (see Fig. 1. 4). Using the culture area concept gives anthropologists the opportunity to compare societies within broadly similar environments and to determine the extent of influence from groups outside a particular culture area (diffusion, migrations, etc.). In spite of many weaknesses—such as defining a single area that contains considerable cultural and/or environmental diversity, the use of

somewhat arbitrary criteria, the assumption that a static cultural situation exists, and the tendency to equate environment with cause—the culture area concept continues to be useful as a point of comparison and reference. Most anthropologists use this concept, even if informally, to refer to geographic regions and general culture. Most laypeople also inherently recognize culture areas, having, for example, at least some idea that the native peoples of the Plains are different from those of the Arctic. Native North Americans Prior to the arrival of Columbus, all of the people living in North America were native. After 1492, however, immigrants of many ethnicities and cultures flooded the continent, mixing both among themselves and with native peoples. While many “ full-blooded” native people still exist, the majority have a mixed biological and cultural heritage (some have even formed new groups, such as the Métis of Canada Native North Americans 5 and the Great Lakes area, the Choctaw-Apaches of Louisiana, and the Lumbee of North Carolina), complicating their classification (see Snipp 1989) and group memberships (see Basson 2008). Recently, many more people have claimed Indian ancestry, based on a desire to be Indian, newfound pride in their previously unclaimed ancestry, or changing definitions of what an Indian is. Today, a good definition of Native American is elusive. At least three general defining categories apply: biological, administrative, and mystical (see Snipp 1989). Biological definitions are usually based on some percentage of “ Indian blood, ” commonly called “ blood quantum” (e. g., one-quarter, one-eighth). Many tribes require a certain percentage of blood quantum to classify a person as a tribal member. Administrative definitions, often based on mystical and biological definitions, are also used to serve whatever agency

formulated them, such as a government definition of natives for benefit and/or settlement purposes or a tribal definition of members for benefit and/or voting purposes. Mystical definitions may consist of romantic, spiritual, and even fictional views of a people descended from an ancient past. A person can claim to be an Indian if he or she somehow feels like one (such as in the census). All of these definitions are used, sometimes interchangeably. Today, more than 4.4 million Americans identify themselves as (at least part) Native American. The People It seems impossible to find an objective, universally accepted term for the indigenous inhabitants of the Americas (see discussions in Churchill [1999]; and Yellow Bird [1999]). Some use Native American, but others have argued that such a category includes Native Hawaiians (although Hawai'i is not in North America and Native Hawaiians are technically Polynesian) or even anyone born in North America regardless of his or her ancestry. The widely used term Indian is sometimes considered inappropriate since it is not even a native term, as it was misapplied by Columbus, who thought he was in the East Indies. It is also possible to confuse Indians of the New World with the people of India. The term American Indian would bypass those issues but the people of the Arctic (e. g., the Inuit) are not biologically or culturally Indian although they are still Native Americans. The terms Native Peoples and Native Nations suffer from similar problems. Some prefer the term First People to refer to indigenous people in general, a term that could include Native Americans. In Canada, the term First Nations is commonly used. The term aboriginal is also used in that same manner. Many Native Americans, such as Hopi, want their specific group name to be used. In this book, the very general terms Native

American, native peoples, and Indian will be used and will apply to those people who were indigenous to North America prior to the European invasion. Where possible, specific group names will be used. In the United States and Canada, native people are viewed as distinct from the majority, non-Indian population. However, the situation is quite different in Mexico, where Indians comprise the vast majority of the population. Some 75 percent of Mexicans are of mixed Indian and non-Indian heritage (called mestizo), about 20 percent are full-blooded Indian, and some 5 percent are white, mostly of Spanish heritage (West and Augelli 1989: 291). In Mexico, most people identify themselves as Mexican and only those who speak native languages are considered "Indios." Over time, many non-Indians intermarried and had children with Indians. Escaped black slaves sometimes found refuge with native peoples (most Indians were not concerned about skin color). Soon, people of mixed native—black heritage, the Black Indians, came into existence (not limited to North America; see Katz [1997]). In North America, Black Indians formed an important part of a number of native groups in the American Southeast, including the Seminole (see Chapter 12). Political Entities As with the people themselves, it is difficult to find an accurate term for their political units. Perhaps the smallest political unit is the band, typically a small group of families living by hunting and gathering. The term tribe is often employed, but it carries a certain anthropological meaning that does not apply to all groups (discussed later). Nation could be (and often is) used, but that term could imply an organization and political autonomy that is not true of all groups. In this book the generic term group will be used, and wherever

possible, the appropriate political term (e. g., tribe). In the United States, about 900 groups claim native status. As of 2010, 564 tribes, including some 229 groups in Alaska, have been formally recognized as having a special "government-to-government" relationship with the United States (for a listing of federally recognized groups, log on to [www. bia. gov/idc/groups/xofa/documents/ document/idc012038. pdf](http://www.bia.gov/idc/groups/xofa/documents/document/idc012038.pdf)).

As of 2008, approximately 250 additional native groups (about 50 of them in California) have applied for federal recognition (the number changes frequently as applications are accepted, denied, submitted, or withdrawn). Many other North American groups exist in Canada and northern Mexico. Population The native population of North America prior to 1492 has not yet been accurately determined. It was first thought that there were about 500, 000 native people before the arrival of Columbus. This low estimate was made partly to minimize native occupation of the land, further justifying European intrusion. In the early 1900s, however, this view began to change as a result of detailed work on population by researchers from the Bureau of American Ethnology, who estimated that perhaps as many as three million Indians existed in North America before 1492. Today, after much more work, estimates of the native population of North America just prior to the time of Columbus range from about eight million to eighteen million (see Thornton 1987, 1997; Stannard 1992; Ubelaker 1992; Reddy 1995; Ogunwole 2006). However, a recent analysis of archaeological data (Milner and Chapin 2010) suggested that the population of North America at about A. D. 1500 was between 1. 2 and 6. 1 million, well below the other estimates. After 1492, it has been argued (e. g., Stannard 1992: 268), there was a population decline

on the order of about 95 percent before the trend was reversed and populations began to recover (see Table 1. 1). Today, the number of people who identified Native American as their " race" in the United States census has increased to more than 2. 4 million people, plus another two million more who identified Native American as one of their races (Ogunwole 2006: Table 1). The criteria for classifying a person as an Indian or a member of a specific group can vary, depending on the group, the census, the political climate, or other factors (see Weaver 2001). Also, people who are Indian but have only recently listed themselves as Indian on the census create an illusion of population increase. Nevertheless, it is clear that native populations are increasing rapidly.

Native North Americans 7 TABLE 1. 1
Native American Population of the United States Percent Change N/A 294
222 218 218 211 212 27 110 112 213 136 14 14 147 151 173 139 Language
Native North Americans spoke a bewildering array of languages—more than 400, belonging to some 62 language families (see Goddard 1996a, 1996b: Table 3, 1996c) (Fig. 1. 5). Of those languages, only 209 were still spoken as of 1995, and only 46 were spoken by children (Goddard 1996b: Table 2). It seems that the others will become extinct very soon. The loss of native languages carries a high price, including the loss of knowledge, philosophy, worldview, and many other aspects of native culture. Understanding the distribution of languages across North America is important for interpreting relationships between cultures, the transmission of culture and traits, and the interactions between cultures. It is also critical to the reconstruction of group movements over time and has helped cast light on the past of much of North America (see Foster 1996). Year 1500 1800 1820 1847 1857 1870

Year	Population
1880	10,000,000 ^{1a}
1890	600,000
1900	471,000
1910	383,000
1920	313,000
1930	278,000
1940	244,000
1950	228,000
1960	250,000
1970	279,000
1980	244,000
1990	332,000
2000	345,000
2010	357,000
2050	4,405,000 ^{projected}

Source: estimate census census census census census census census census census census census census Territories and Boundaries In Europe, nations maintained strict territorial boundaries. The borders defining each country were set and defended by force of arms. 2011 Americans still hold this general view regarding territory; thus, we have imposed territorial boundaries on many native groups, even though modern estimates ranging from eight million to eighteen million (see Thornton 1987, 1997; Snipp 1989; Stannard 1992; Reddy 1995) although this may lead to false impressions of how native peoples viewed the land. A glance at the maps in b. 2000 U. S. census data (Ogunwole 2006: Table 1). this book will illustrate this point. Each group's territory is bounded by lines, and there are no unassigned areas. In reality, however, many groups did not have a set territory with well-defined and defended borders. In many cases, a group would have a core area and a peripheral area that may have overlapped with the peripheral areas of other groups. Thus it is impossible to draw a single, accurate line between the lands occupied by any two groups, but this is typically done for the sake of convenience. In addition, groups have moved about the landscape throughout time, and their territories have changed, just as those of

European countries have. When explorers or anthropologists recorded the territory of a group, they defined it as it existed at that point in time (known as the ethnographic present) but may not have reflected past territories.

These recorded territories now seem to be set in "stone," though they reflect only part of a group's historical relationship with the land. However, some groups did claim specific territories and boundaries, which they frequently defended. In some Northwest Coast groups, clans owned specific areas; some Plains groups had defined hunting territories; and many groups "owned" particular places, such as springs and sacred sites, and others could access these localities only by permission. Even if rigid territories were not as important to native

8 Chapter 1 Introduction 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Eskimo-Aleut Athapaskan Algonquian Salishan Penutian Hokan Uto-Aztecan Siouan Caddoan 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 Muskogean Timucuan Tanoan Keresan Zuni Chumashan Unclassified region (too little information) 1 1 1 2 1 Athapaskan Greenland 1 5 1 4 3 Algonquian 3 5 6 5 7 N 13 7 16 14 2 12 7 2 3 9 12 9

UtoAztecan 9 8 3 16 3 10 3 8 3 FIGURE 1. 5 General distribution of major language groups in North America Adapted from Handbook of North

American Indians, Vol. 17, Languages, Ives Goddard, ed., map in rear pocket; copyright © 1996 by the Smithsonian Institution. Reprinted by permission of

the publisher. peoples as they were to Europeans, native groups certainly had an understanding of geography, as illustrated by Warhus's (1997) book

on Native American geography and maps. Group Names Each Native American group has always had a name for itself, a name that often

translates to something like "The People." However, groups have often been known to the outside world by other names, often applied to them by

someone else only to officially become their name, regardless of the wishes of the groups, assuming they even knew about it. As time passed, many of these names stuck and now even the Indians themselves often use them. In many cases, the new name applied to a group was derogatory. For example, the group known as the Sioux (a Plains group; see Chapter 10) actually encompasses a number of related groups with other names, Native North Americans 9 such as Oglala, Hunkpapa, and Yankton. The word Sioux comes from a French translation of a term applied to the general group by their enemies, the Blackfoot, and has something to do with snakes. Although derogatory in origin, this name has been so commonly used that it is now generally recognized, although the individual groups want to use their own original names (e. g., Oglala). Another group, the Creek (in the Southeast; see Chapter 12), got their name from English settlers when describing the locations of their villages, next to creeks. As part of their increasing pride and power, many native groups are trying to revive their original names and asking that these be used instead of other names. For example, the Nez Perce want to be called Nimiipuu, " The People. " Archaeologists, not knowing what people in ancient cultures called themselves, have also given various names to Native American groups. For example, the cultures that lived along the Mississippi River prior to Columbus no doubt had names for themselves but since those names are unknown, archaeologists generally call them " Mississippian. " Sometimes the names assigned by archaeologists can cause problems. For example, for more than 100 years, archaeologists have used the term Anasazi to refer to the prehistoric Puebloan people who lived in the American Southwest (see Chapter 9). The term Anasazi

originated from a Navajo word that generally refers to ancestor enemies, friends, or relatives (Warburton and Begay 2005: 537). However, the current Pueblo groups do not like a Navajo word being used to describe their ancestors and prefer the term Ancestral Puebloans instead. Most archaeologists now use that term. The Role of Women Native North American women, like women in many cultures, are underrepresented in the ethnographic database; thus, their roles, power bases, or lives are poorly understood. Part of the problem is that most early anthropologists were men. They were interested only in male activities and talked mostly to men. Some notable exceptions to this general tendency include the work of Anna Gayton in California and Elsie Parsons in the Southwest. Recently, however, there has been a considerable increase in the study of women in native cultures (see P. G. Allen 1986; Boyer and Gayton 1992; Green 1992; Klein and Ackerman 1995; Maltz and Archambault 1995; Perdue 1997, 2001; G. Riley 1997; Sonneborn 1998; Bataille and Lisa 2001; Kugel and Murphy 2007; B. A. Mann 2008; Valaskakis et al. 2009). Western people tend to view the women of many traditional cultures around the world as silent and powerless within their own cultures, as little more than mothers and domestic laborers. This probably reflects the Western view of women up until very recent times. The terms squaw, used to refer to average Native American women, and Indian Princess, used to refer to royal (a European concept) women, are characteristic of this view. It is probably true that women provided much of the food in most traditional societies, but it is not true that women had no power. We just do not yet fully understand what that power was or how it manifested itself. It has also been argued (P. G. Allen 1986) that the male-

centric colonial powers suppressed knowledge of the important role of women in native societies. For example, males held overt political power in Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) society (in the Northeast; see Chapter 11) but in reality the women controlled the men and so the political process, exercising much more power than apparent at first glance. In some North American Indian societies, women were the landowners and exerted considerable power; in many others, women led the primary social units and controlled many aspects of their cultures.

10 Chapter 1 Introduction Sex and Gender

Most Americans generally view gender as biological anatomy and sex as an activity. However, in anthropology, sex refers to anatomy, with individuals being either male or female. True hermaphrodites (having both male and female anatomy) do exist but are rare in humans and most of us are sexually either male or female. Gender, on the other hand, is an anthropological description of the culturally defined role an individual plays in his or her society. Most males are raised to behave as males (following how a culture defines that role) and most females assume female roles. In Western society, a male who behaves in a female role is viewed as " abnormal" and much effort is expended to suppress that desire and to get that male to behave as a " male. " This is, at least partly, why Westerners do not make the clear distinction between sex and gender; we want them to be the same because it is simple and neat and so we can all be " normal. " Westerners do not like things that are in between set categories and are uncomfortable with things that do not neatly fit our preconceived notions. Nevertheless, Western culture is full of " in between" people, including transvestites, transsexuals, gay and lesbian people, tomboys, and the like. Acceptance of these

individuals is a major issue in today's society. There can be many gender categories within the two sex categories, depending on the society. Native American people have traditionally recognized the biological duality of male and female. However, in many native cultures, the "in between" people were not classified as abnormal but were instead accepted as regular folk doing different things. Generally, no stigma was attached, and as a result, that individual had a much healthier psyche. For a detailed treatment of sexual diversity in native North America, see W. L. Williams (1986), Maltz and Archambault (1995), L. B. Brown (1997), Jacobs et al. (1997), Lang (1998), Roscoe (1998), and Rifkin (2008). Males who take on a female role were called "berdaches" (a term applied by early French explorers) by anthropologists, who now use the term two-spirits. Twospirits would wear women's clothing, participate in women's activities, associate with women, and could even have a husband. Some might even simulate a menstrual flow by cutting themselves and/or simulate pregnancy by stuffing something in their clothing. Two-spirits would often function in important ceremonial and economic roles. The other males (in men's roles) would usually treat a two-spirit as a female (even to the point of marrying one) rather than as a "weird" male. In general, no automatic stigma was attached. Females sometimes assumed male roles and the terms "cross-gender female" (Blackwood 1984), "Amazon" (Williams 1986), and "Men-women" (Lang 1998: 261) have been applied. Females would dress and act as males, perform male activities such as hunting, and even marry women. In some Plains groups, females could participate in combat and even gain leadership status. Females might also become spiritual and medical practitioners

(shamans), a profession usually associated with males. Cross-gender females appear to have been more prevalent in native groups in western North America (see Lang 1998: Map 6 and Table 7). Contemporary Adoptions of Native American Culture Despite the negative views many people have held about native New World cultures, they have been quick to adopt many skills and products from those cultures (see Weatherford 1988, 1991), especially foodstuffs. Corn (or maize) was first domesticated in Mesoamerica, whereupon it spread to many North American groups and Native North Americans. It was then adopted by European settlers along the East Coast. The world is now surprisingly dependent on this single plant, it being grown and consumed all over the world. Corn currently accounts for about one-third of all of the calories consumed in the United States (in the form of corn kernels, corn on the cob, hominy, grits, tortillas, corn bread, cornstarch, corn syrup, corn-fed pork and beef, etc.). Other important native foods adopted by others are beans, squash, peanuts, sunflowers, vanilla, tomatoes, potatoes, and chocolate. In addition to foodstuffs, New World cotton is considered to be of better quality than Old World cotton (Weatherford 1988: 43). Native agricultural technology was crucial to the survival of the early colonists, and the Indians taught them how to grow corn. Understanding these ancient agricultural systems may someday be critical to developing sustained agriculture in environments such as rainforests. A number of other elements from native cultures have also been adopted, including some drugs (e. g., aspirin, cocaine), tobacco (see the Sidelight at the end of Chapter 2), building techniques such as the very efficient pueblo-style architecture of the American Southwest, art (native art is now very popular), various

philosophies regarding the supernatural and the environment (e. g., New Age ideas), sports (e. g., lacrosse), and the incorporation of many native terms into the English language (see Cutler 1994). On the other hand, it has been argued that the native peoples have been exploited for commercial purposes and that elements of native cultures have been appropriated and distorted to suit the needs of the dominant culture, irrespective of the harm done to native peoples (see Meyer and Royer 2001). This is a form of " cultural imperialism, " a problem confronted by indigenous people all over the world.

A Brief History of Research on Native North Americans After Columbus, Europeans took an immediate and considerable interest in the native peoples of North America. Purposely or not, a great deal of information on native cultures was preserved in the records of the various colonial administrations, mission records, the diaries of explorers and travelers, military registers, census data, various pictorial accounts (drawings, paintings, and photographs), land records, newspaper stories, and many other sources. By the early nineteenth century, considerable effort was being made to record and classify Indian languages, led by the American Philosophical Society and the American Ethnological Society. Archaeological work in the Mississippi River Valley in the 1830s explored the great complexes of earthen mounds. Many thought that the constructions were too sophisticated to be Indian in origin and so the mounds were thought to be the remains of a pre-Indian (and so non-Indian) culture, the so-called Moundbuilders. After several decades of work, it was determined that the mounds had indeed been built by the Indians; thus, they could not be the primitive savages that most people believed at the time. By the 1840s, a

number of biographies and histories of Indians were being written. The formal anthropological study of North American Indians was initiated during the mid-nineteenth century by Lewis H. Morgan, an American social scientist. Morgan began a comprehensive study of the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) in the Northeast (see Chapter 11), publishing the first actual ethnography written about a native group in North America, *League of the Iroquois* (Morgan 1851). This work had a huge impact, both on anthropology (it set a standard for future work) and on the Haudenosaunee, who became quite famous as a result. Morgan went on to greater accomplishments in anthropology, developing a classification of kinship systems, many of which were named after North American Indian groups. His classifications are still used today. At about the same time, science grew in importance in Western culture, and many of the scientific disciplines familiar to us today were established, including anthropology. Evolutionary theory was formalized, and a significant anthropological theory, known as Unilinear Cultural Evolution, was advanced by Morgan and other anthropologists. This idea proposed that cultures progressively evolve from "savagery" (hunting and gathering), up through "barbarism" (herding and agriculture), and then finally up to "civilization" (conveniently European, the primary criterion being the use of a phonetic alphabet). Thus, by definition, all native North Americans were either savages or barbarians. It is unfortunate that these offensive words were used as classificatory terms (they still are), as they were subsequently used to justify the harsh treatment of native peoples. Beginning in the mid-nineteenth century, a number of museums became involved in the study of Indians. The

Smithsonian Institution was established in 1846, and the associated Bureau of Ethnology (later the Bureau of American Ethnology, or BAE) was founded in 1879. The task of the BAE was to record as much information, as soon as possible, about the native peoples of the United States, as it was believed at that time that all Indians would soon become extinct. Much of the work of the BAE was concentrated in western North America where the Indian cultures at that time were still fairly intact. Many other museums were also established, including the United States National Museum in Washington, D. C., the American Museum of Natural History in New York, the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology in Cambridge, Massachusetts, the Heye Foundation in New York, and the Canadian National Museum. In their early days, many such museums dispatched teams of people simply to collect objects for display, either through legitimate collection, purchase, or even theft. Too little attention was given to the objects' importance in the context of native cultures (see Cole 1985). In 2004, the National Museum of the American Indian opened in Washington, D. C., with materials and displays designed by Native Americans, rather than anthropologists (although this has also had its problems and issues, see Chapter 13). Anthropological work continued, fueled by the belief that the unspoiled, "primitive" native culture was rapidly disintegrating and that the Indians were becoming extinct. By the late nineteenth century, considerable effort was being expended in conducting "salvage ethnography" before the native peoples disappeared. A leader in this effort was Franz Boas, who is known as "the father of American anthropology." He, his students (Alfred Kroeber in California being an outstanding example), and later their students amassed

huge quantities of information, a great deal of which still remains to be analyzed. Much of this effort focused on western North America, as native groups in the West had survived intact longer than those in the East, where many had been long extinct before any anthropological work could be done. By the early twentieth century, this information was being gathered, summarized, and published in works such as the 2-volume Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico (Hodge 1907–1910), the 20-volume work The North American Indian (Curtis 1907–1930), and The Indian Tribes of North America (Swanton 1953). In addition to his books on Indians, Edward S. Curtis photographed many Indians A Brief History of Research on Native North Americans 13 across North America and many of his wonderful pictures have been published in a series of “ coffee table” books. Many Curtis photographs can be viewed online at <http://curtis.library.northwestern.edu>. In 1978, the Smithsonian Institution began publishing a comprehensive 20-volume work, Handbook of North American Indians. Of the 20 planned volumes, 13 were published while the others were cancelled due to cost. Also, many general texts on Native Americans have been produced (e. g., Boxberger 1990; Garbarino and Sasso 1994; Trigger and Washburn 1996; J. C. H. King 1999; Nichols 1999; Bonvillain 2001; Kehoe 2005; Oswalt 2008), as well as a number of encyclopedic treatments (e. g., M. B. Davis 1994; Hoxie 1996; Malinowski and Sheets 1998; Green and Fernandez 1999; Barrett and Markowitz 2004; Johansen and Pritzker 2008; B. T. Klein 2009; Waldman 2009). Today, a huge literature exists concerning native North America, some of it written from a scholarly viewpoint and some from a popular perspective. New knowledge of native groups continues to emerge

and helps to enlighten us all. Recently, more research is being conducted by native peoples themselves, providing a most welcome addition to the literature. Much of this work conveys a distinctly different view of native cultures.

The Impact of Anthropology on Native Cultures

The stated goal of anthropology is to gain understanding of other cultures and ultimately of all cultures. In addition, anthropology is motivated by a real desire to record information in order to learn from and "preserve" cultures, not only for the general benefit of everyone but more specifically for the descendants of specific cultures. Most anthropologists share these goals and are sensitive to the interests of native groups. For example, anthropologists mostly support Indian land claims, and some groups have won significant legal victories with the help of anthropologists. However, anthropologists have impacted native groups in some negative ways. Early anthropological theory formalized the categories of savage, barbarian, and civilized people. Using these classifications, much of the mistreatment of the Indians was justified as necessary to drag the native peoples up to the level of civilization. The boundaries of the territories of most groups were defined by anthropologists, often with relatively little knowledge of the groups; these boundaries are now entrenched in the literature and are thus very difficult to change. Further, many Indians object to anthropological research as exploitative of Indians, as they feel they have little or no control over the dissemination of the information. They also feel that it is of little practical value to them; after all, many ask, why should Indians participate without some benefit? Some even believe that such research is "imperialistic" in that it fosters white views of Indians (e. g., V. Deloria 1988). Others have claimed that through

their work, anthropologists construct a "reality" of Indian culture that may or may not fit the view of the Indians, and this is sometimes seen as a threat. These issues have become important to anthropologists as they struggle to make anthropology relevant to the Indians and to recognize and rectify any problems their studies may have caused (see Biolsi and Zimmerman 1997; Swidler et al. 1997; also see V. Deloria 1997). These criticisms have resulted in a number of changes in the techniques, ethics, and conduct of anthropologists who study Indians. Today, Indian views of themselves and of their past are far more important to anthropologists than ever before (see Richter 2001). New laws have been passed to protect native religions Chapter 1 Introduction and cemeteries, and to require that Indians be consulted concerning projects and activities that affect them. However, while these changes progress, many problems still remain to be resolved. Popular Views of Native Americans Soon after Columbus landed in the New World, Europeans formed two basic images of Indians: the good and noble savage and the evil and bloodthirsty savage (see Bordewich 1996; Ellingson 2001; LeBlanc and Register 2003). The image of the noble savage reflects the European idea that humans once enjoyed an existence of innocence, naiveté, simplicity, harmony, and contentment. Following this general view, the conservation movement in the United States included Indians among those things to be conserved, and their images were used to convey a sense of loss of the wilderness and closeness to nature. This image is still very popular. Sidelight THE DOMESTICATED "WILDERNESS" Most Americans erroneously believe that much of North America was a wild and unsettled land prior to the arrival of Europeans. All people impact their environment,

irrespective of their technological complexity, and it is simply not true that hunter-gatherers made no impact on the land. While a person with a digging stick may cause less damage than a person with a bulldozer, the digging stick nevertheless affects the environment. In fact, all people impact and manage their environment at a minimum of three different levels.

Environmental manipulation is active management conducted on a large scale and includes practices such as plowing and water diversion (things agriculturalists do) and burning (things both agriculturalists and hunter-gatherers do). Active resource management takes place on a smaller scale and involves active management of specific plants and animals (things both agriculturalists and hunter-gatherers do). Passive resource management includes practices such as rituals dedicated to the supernatural for weather control (which may be conducted by both agriculturalists and hunter-gatherers). The environment is thus modified and “domesticated”- controlled for the benefit of the people-by all groups, past and present. This is a far cry from an untamed wilderness (see Dolittle 2000; C. C. Mann 2005; Sutton and Anderson 2010). Many non-Indian management practices often conflict with Native American practices, as they are performed by different groups with different goals. Burning is an excellent example of this. Indians often employed burning to encourage growth of specific plants, to attract game, and to manage fuel (duff) to prevent a catastrophic fire. Government policy has generally prevented burning, thus allowing fuel to build up and set the stage for very hot and catastrophic fires that destroy entire forests. Recently, however, some government agencies have begun to adopt more flexible policies regarding wildfire suppression and prescribed burns. There is

much to learn about land and resource management from Native Americans. Intimate knowledge of an area, as many native groups had of their territories, can contribute to management and control. Europeans also misunderstood the native system of farming in the eastern United States (see Kehoe 2005). When planting their crops, the Indians would not totally clear the land but planted various crops around trees, stumps, and rocks. By contrast, Europeans would typically completely clear the land so it could be plowed. Since it was not fully cleared, Europeans saw Indian farmland as "unimproved," weakening any claim the Indians may have had on it. Europeans also failed to recognize the similarities between their methods and the Indians' way of procuring mammals and fish. The Europeans managed their animals in captivity and harvested them at will, and the Indians managed their animals in the wild but still harvested them at will. The Europeans intensively fished some areas during certain times of the year, just as the Indians did. In spite of the similarities in economy and management of the land and resources, the Europeans saw the Indians' land as wild and untamed, and this view served as justification for European conquest. A Brief History of Research on Native North Americans 15 As part of this perspective, today many people see Indians as the first ecologists, living a virtuous life in harmony with the earth (see Grinde and Johansen 1995; Bol 1998). This view is based on a number of assumptions regarding Indians of the past that may or may not be true (see R. White 1997; Harkin and Lewis 2007; also see Krech 1999). There is no question that some Indian groups lived in some balance with nature while others made bad ecological decisions, such as overhunting, overfishing, and overgrazing. However, due

to their small populations and less complex technology (as compared to contemporary technology), even poor decisions did not cause the catastrophic changes in the environment that we see today, such as the destruction of the rainforests, global air pollution, and nuclear accidents. The second view of Indians, that of warlike, aggressive, and primitive savages, developed from the competition between colonists and Indians for critical resources, primarily land. Native practices such as warfare, torture, scalping, head-hunting, and slave raiding added to their violent image, in spite of the fact that Europeans of the time were doing exactly the same things. The Indians were viewed as impeding the path of civilization, and when they defended themselves and their lands, they were judged to be primitive and bloodthirsty savages. As savages, Indians were to be feared and either converted to civilization or exterminated. This view flourished as long as conflict between Indians and whites persisted (see Trigger 1985). Later, the notion of the warrior Indian was perpetuated by the press and by phenomena like the "wild west shows" (the most famous being that of William "Buffalo Bill" Cody, see Warren [2005]); traveling pageants that depicted Indians in stereotypic activities, including staged attacks on wagon trains. In both cases, Indians are viewed as being different, a people apart from the other Americans, still expected to live and behave as they did in the past. In that sense, nonIndians are surprised when they see Indians doing things not associated with their past, such as singing opera, playing a violin, and the like (see P. J. Deloria 2004). Misconceptions and stereotypes of Indians continue to persist (e. g., Mihesuah 2009; P. C. Smith 2009) and that is a concern to us all. Once defeated by Euroamericans, Indians were

regarded as pitiful and forgotten children. No longer a threat to a still expanding America, Indians were romanticized and stereotyped by the media in a number of ways, such as gallant warriors, Sidelight THE PRACTICE OF SCALPING Scalping, the removal of skin and attached hair from the head, is a trait commonly associated with many native groups. While scalping does appear to date prior to Columbus, the introduction of steel knives by Europeans and the European practice of paying a bounty on Indian scalps greatly increased the practice. Scalping probably developed from the practice of taking heads as trophies, proof of personal bravery in battle. Scalps would be preserved by drying and/or smoking and displayed, sometimes used to decorate various items such as shields, poles, and spears. Scalping was not practiced by Arctic peoples and was not particularly important on the Plains, where scalps were considered a second-class trophy, often taken by women after a battle. A history and early accounts of scalping was provided by Friederici (1906) and a discussion of techniques was provided by Nadeau (1941). 16 Chapter 1 Introduction ignorant menial workers, or parasitic poverty-stricken beggars. Each image embodied the false notion that native peoples somehow existed in a historical past—living fossils that had not changed (see Porter 1990: 7—11). Today, native cultures have undergone a resurgence and Indians are now admired and emulated by the mainstream public. Nevertheless, past images of Indians persist in the form of sports mascots, names of cars and weapons, and characters in movies and television shows (see Bataille and Silet 1980; Marsden and Nachbar 1988; Marubbio 2006), as well as in the press (see Weston 1996). Perhaps the best images of Indians reveal them simply as people; like any

other people, they have strengths and weaknesses as well as valuable contributions to make. A General Prehistory of North America The prehistory of North America began with the entry of humans into the New World sometime during the late Pleistocene, a geologic period from about two million to ten thousand years ago, roughly equivalent to the Ice Age. Exactly how and when this entry occurred is hotly debated. We know relatively little about the early prehistory of North America, but what we do know is briefly considered later. The latest treatment of the prehistory of North America was provided by Sutton (2010). The Origin of Native Peoples in the New World Any discussion of the origin of Native Americans must take into consideration their views of their origins (cosmology). This view is often "we have always been here," generally encoded in oral tradition and ceremony, although the specific details vary from group to group. This in situ model does not require a migration of people, which is the basis of all of the non-Indian theories concerning the origins of Native Americans (see V. Deloria 1995). Many native people continue to believe in the in situ model, and anthropologists must take that perspective into account. Summaries of various native cosmologies are included in the various case studies discussed later. Early European explanations of the origin of the Indians centered around the origin of humanity as chronicled in the Bible. The Indians of the New World thus presented a problem to Christians: who were they, where did they come from, and where in the Bible might answers to these questions be found? However, it was first necessary to determine whether the Indians were actually people; if not, their origin did not require explanation or consideration. As ridiculous as this sounds now, it was a real issue then, one

that could only be resolved by the Pope. The question was submitted to the Pope, who in 1512 ruled that the native people of the New World were people and had souls. Thus began the attempts by Europeans to explain their origin. Most Christian Europeans of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (and even today) would not accept the idea that native peoples had been created by non-Christian native deities, so some other explanation had to be found. One early popular idea was that New World native peoples were descendants of one of the Lost Tribes of Israel, appealing because it fit with existing Christian belief. Other early ideas, again meshing with existing beliefs, posited that the people had come from the "lost continents" of Atlantis, or Mu, or had somehow crossed the Atlantic Ocean from Egypt. This latter idea seemed logical because pyramids existed in Mexico (they just had to be Egyptian), and this hypothesis still has some followers.

A General Prehistory of North America 17 At this point, it is important to understand something about science. Very simply, the goal of any science is to generate new knowledge and to learn new things and this can be done in a variety of ways. One approach is to use a nonempirical science, relying on information that is not physical or objective and cannot be reproduced. Generally, nonempirical information is gained by specific individuals under "special" circumstances, such as in visions or visitations by spirits, and that information is passed from generation to generation. Nonempirical science is the basis of most religious beliefs, generally called faith. A second approach is empirical, the use of data that are as objective as possible, observable, measurable, and reproducible (see Kuhn 1962; Kitcher 1993). However, Western empirical science follows a very specific set of rules on data and

inquiry, called the "scientific method." Studies not meeting standards of objectivity, measurability, and reproducibility are often rejected out of hand or (at best) considered tentative. As such, faith-based knowledge is generally rejected by Western science. In the Western scientific method, empirical data are first observed and then recorded. Ideas about the relationships between data are then used to form hypotheses and if the hypothesis is not testable, it is immediately dismissed (most faith-based hypotheses fall into this category). Hypotheses are then tested and either accepted or rejected. Accepted hypotheses are tested again and again. A set of interrelated hypotheses is called a theory, which is then subjected to yet more testing. Even accepted hypotheses and theories get tested over and over. If a theory survives considerable and repeated testing, it may then be called a law. However, scientists are people and people make mistakes, have their own personal agendas, and are biased. This is where constant testing, especially by scientists of other theoretical persuasions, is valuable and makes Western science self-correcting (Kitcher 1993). All cultures employ both nonempirical and empirical science in their knowledge systems and all recognize objective realities. Empirical science in non-Western cultures is often called traditional science. Although few other cultures use the strict formal method of Western science, considerable experimentation does occur, although written records are generally lacking. If one were to deemphasize methods and concentrate on results, the contribution of native cultures to our overall knowledge would be rightly viewed as staggering. Shamans might not be able to explain the specific chemical properties of the substances they use, but they clearly understand the results. An example of traditional science may be found with

the Navajo (see Grady 1993; Schwarz 1995). In 1991, healthy Navajo people in the Southwestern United States were dying from a mysterious disease. After a considerable effort by Western scientists, it was discovered that a Hantavirus carried by deer mice (*Peromyscus maniculatus*) was the killer, spread to humans through exposure to mouse urine and saliva. Traditional Navajo beliefs had identified mice as disease carriers and special precautions were taken to protect people from mouse urine and saliva. This knowledge appears to be centuries old, indicating that traditional Navajo science had identified the vector (mice) and had developed precautions to avoid getting the disease. Navajo elders blamed the recent outbreak on the movement away from traditional beliefs. Thus, a complete understanding of native groups, past and present, relies on the combined approach of traditional belief, traditional science, and Western empirical science, although the latter approach is not embraced by some native people. One must remember that the goal of any science is to learn.

18 Chapter 1 Introduction Western Scientific Views on the Origin of Native Americans It seems clear that people must have first migrated to North America by foot or small boats along an existing coastline. Several possibilities were suggested, including a land bridge between northeastern North America and northwestern Europe (across Greenland and Iceland), a land bridge from South America to some unknown location, and a land bridge between Alaska and northeastern Asia, across what is now the Bering Strait. This latter route was first proposed in 1637 (Wauchope 1962: 85) and currently forms the basis for most of the current theories on Native American origins. The Bering Land Bridge It had been recognized early on that many native peoples looked physically similar

to certain Asian populations and that some connection might exist. Later, archaeological data, including artifacts and skeletal morphology, linked North America and northeastern Asia. More recently, linguistic, blood group, and DNA studies have all supported this link. There is little doubt now that native peoples first came into the western hemisphere from northeast Asia. However, the questions of when, how, and why are still debated (see the discussion in Sutton [2010: 24—50] for more information). Asia and North America are separated by a rather narrow body of water called the Bering Strait. On a clear day, from the easternmost tip of Asia, an island can be seen in the Bering Strait; and looking east from that island one can see the westernmost tip of Alaska. Thus, traveling from Asia to North America by boat is relatively simple and could have been done many thousands of years ago. However, although this is one method that people could have employed to enter into the western hemisphere early on, direct evidence of early boats is lacking. Both the Bering Strait and the Bering Sea are rather shallow, between 150 and 180 feet deep in many places. There is now evidence that, as a result of the vast amount of water that was locked up in glacial ice toward the end of the Pleistocene era, there was a worldwide drop in sea level of as much as 400 feet (Hopkins 1967). This drop would have eliminated the Bering Sea and exposed a very substantial land bridge, called Beringia (see West 1996), which created a land link between northeast Asia and western Alaska (see Fig. 1. 6). As the glaciers expanded, sea levels dropped and exposed Beringia; as the glaciers melted and retreated, sea levels rose again, flooding the land bridge. The glaciers advanced and retreated a number of times in the last 100, 000 years, and there appears to

have been a small land bridge between about 75, 000 and 60, 000 B. P. (B. P. stands for before present, essentially “ years ago”), although there is currently no solid evidence that people crossed into the New World during this time. The last major drop in sea level commenced about 25, 000 B. P., exposing most of Beringia until about 11, 000 B. P. (Elias 2002: 11, 13). This decline in sea level would also have exposed the coastal plains of North America (and coastlines all over the world for that matter), suggesting the possibility that people migrated south along the coast. As sea levels dropped, the dry land of Beringia would have been colonized by plants and animals. At that time (ca. 20, 000 B. P.) the region would have been colder and drier than it is today, and there is reason to believe that no trees existed in Beringia until after about 14, 000 B. P.; if so, a lack of firewood could have slowed human colonization (Elias 2002: 20). In any case, people crossing Beringia must have been technologically adapted to cold climates, and there is evidence that such

A General Prehistory of North America 19 Ice Cap N

FIGURE 1. 6 Northern North America showing the extent of the glaciers and of Beringia ca. 18, 000 B. P. From Prehistory of North America, Third Edition by Jesse D. Jennings. Copyright © 1989 by Mayfield Publishing Company.

Reprinted by permission of the publisher. cultures were present in northeastern Asia by about 15, 000 B. P. Hunter-gatherer groups probably would have crossed Beringia by following game animals or moving along the southern coast to exploit ocean resources. Over hundreds of years, people would have moved further into the interior of North America. At the height of the last Ice Age (ca. 14, 000 B. P.), northeastern Asia, Beringia, and most of Alaska would have been cold but not glaciated, allowing movement of people

across the region. At that time, glaciers were present in eastern Alaska and prevented the movement of people into the rest of the western hemisphere. Once the ice began to melt, people could have moved south, following game animals presumably as they did from Asia to Alaska. It is difficult to determine the exact routes and times of the migrations since most of Beringia and the coastal plain, where most of the evidence should be, are now under water. The Paleoindian Period Archaeologists are coming to believe that at least three, and possibly four, migrations of native people into the New World took place. For the past few decades, it was thought that people, called Paleoindians, first migrated into the New World about 12, 000 years ago. However, increasing evidence points to an earlier date and the first migration may have occurred prior to 14, 000 B. P. Several archaeological sites in North America have been dated to between 20, 000 and 13, 000 B. P., including a site in Oregon where 14, 000-year-old human feces (paleo-poop) have been discovered (Gilbert et al. 2008). Several sites in South America also appear to date from earlier than 12, 000 B. P. For example, the Monte Verde site in Chile has been dated to 13, 500 B. P. and contains a structure foundation, wooden and bone tools, and food residues.

20 Chapter 1 Introduction Assuming that people walked to South America from North America and that they were living in South America by 13, 500 B. P., it seems logical to conclude that people had arrived in North America by at least 14, 000 B. P. In addition, some evidence suggests that these very early people may not have been the ancestors of the current Indians but rather died out or were replaced or absorbed by a subsequent wave of immigrants. The sequences of and relationships between the early

migrations into the New World have yet to be worked out. The most recent synthesis of the evidence (Goebel et al. 2008) argued that the initial migration into the Americas was (1) a single population from Siberia moved into Beringia no earlier than 30, 000 B. P. and probably after 22, 000 B. P., (2) that people moved from Beringia into the Americas no earlier than 16, 500 B. P., and (3) the colonists likely migrated south along the coast. It has recently been proposed that people first came to North America not from Asia but from Europe about 18, 500 B. P., crossing the North Atlantic Ocean during the height of the Ice Age (see Bradley and Stanford 2004). This trip would have been extraordinarily difficult, if not impossible, and there is currently no empirical evidence to support the idea (Straus et al. 2005). Even the Norse, with a maritime tradition, a much more sophisticated maritime technology, and better climatic conditions, had a very difficult time crossing the North Atlantic. The best documented—and for many years believed to be the earliest—Paleoindian culture in the New World is called Clovis, named after the town near the archaeological site in New Mexico where it was first identified. Clovis is also the name of the diagnostic artifact, the Clovis point, found at a number of sites. It was seemingly designed for use on a thrusting spear. These points exhibit a unique and sophisticated “fluting” technology found only in North America. Clovis sites date to between about 12, 900 and 13, 500 B. P., are found all across North America, and are frequently associated with mammoth and mastodon remains (see Haynes 2002). A slightly later culture, called Folsom, also named after an archaeological site in New Mexico containing fluted points, associated with giant bison remains. These associations gave rise to the notion that Paleoindians were primarily

big-game hunters, a notion that is still widely held. However, it seems more likely that Paleoindians consumed a wide variety of foods that included many
o