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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Thomas D. Thiessen

INTRODUCTION

This document is a cultural anthropological overview and assessment of the Niobrara/Missouri National Scenic Riverways (NIMI). It represents the first formal planning step taken by the National Park Service (NPS) to identify the different ethnic and religious groups of people that have historical and/or contemporary ties to the NIMI region. It primarily focuses on American Indian groups that used the NIMI region for various purposes in past historical times. The discussion of American Indian peoples emphasizes the three Federally-recognized tribes that reside in the NIMI region today, the Poncas, Santee Sioux, and Yankton Sioux. Other groups that used the NIMI region for various purposes in the past, such as hunting, residence, or warfare, are also discussed, but to a lesser extent because they no longer are present in the NIMI region as organized tribal groups. The three tribes resident in the region today are, in a very real sense, neighbors to NIMI and for that reason receive more in-depth discussion.

The overview and assessment also summarizes information about non-native peoples who resided in and near NIMI in the recent past, some of whom continue to live in the area today as organized social or ethnic groups, such as the Hutterites at the Bon Homme Bruderhof. Consequently, this document surveys Hutterites, Mormons, African Americans, Germans from Russia, Czechs, Scandinavians, and other immigrants who settled in the region during the latter part of the nineteenth century.

This overview and assessment summarizes the present state of knowledge about each of these groups, including their history, lifestyle, and religious beliefs, and recommends further studies that may be desirable to complement and fill important gaps in this knowledge. Most of the information presented in this volume is drawn from published sources, though some of it comes from unpublished records and interviews with members of these groups, particularly the three Native American tribes that reside in the region today.

The purpose of this overview and assessment is to provide the NPS with knowledge of the special circumstances and concerns of these various groups, so that informed and culturally-sensitive decisions can be made when NPS affairs affect their existing or potential interests. The objective of the NPS is to be a good neighbor to all of these people, by managing its
responsibilities for NIMI in a way that takes into consideration
how its operations may affect, positively or negatively, these
groups, along with other members of the public at large.
Consequently, information presented in this overview and
assessment should help NPS establish and maintain a long term
positive relationship with American Indian and other organized
ethnic/religious groups in and near NIMI, with the result that
the interests of these groups will be fully considered in the NPS
decision-making process.

This study complements two other cultural resource studies
conducted by the NPS for NIMI: 1) the compilation of
archaeological resource data for the region by the Midwest
Archaeological Center (in progress; Vawser and Osborn n.d.), and
2) the review of the region's historical themes and cultural
landscapes completed by the Midwest Regional Office in 1994
(Franklin et al. 1994). The cultural anthropological overview
and assessment, of course, deals less with historical events and
physical remains of past life than it does with the description
of ethnic lifestyles and religious beliefs that persist in the
NIMI region today.

NIORARA/MISSOURI NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS

The Niobrara/Missouri National Scenic Riverways is one of
the newest additions to the National Park System units
administered by the Midwest Region of the National Park Service.

In 1968, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (82 Stat. 906; 16
U.S.C. 1274 et seq.) established a national policy of preserving
and protecting rivers which possess important scenic,
recreational, and other values. The act designated certain
rivers as wild, scenic, or recreational rivers, and also
identified other rivers as potential future additions to the wild
and scenic river system. By subsequent amendments, additional
rivers not identified in the 1968 act were also designated as
components of the system or as subjects of study to determine
their eligibility for the system.

In 1978, an amendment of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (92
Stat. 3467; Public Law 95-625) designated the Missouri River
reach from Gavins Point Dam to Ponca State Park as a recreational
river, later named the Missouri National Recreation River.

In 1991, the Niobrara Scenic River Designation Act (105
Stat. 254; Public Law 102-50) further designated portions of the
Missouri and Niobrara rivers, and part of Verdigrre Creek as well,
as existing or potential scenic or recreational rivers. The act
also directed study of certain lands along the Niobrara and
Missouri rivers as a potential national park and a potential
national recreation area.
Consequently, the following river segments and areas are presently being studied by the NPS under the 1978 and 1991 legislation (see Figure 1-1):

1. **The Missouri and Niobrara National Recreational Rivers.** The former includes both the reach of river designated in 1978 from Gavins Point Dam to Ponca State Park (59 miles) and that designated in 1991 between Fort Randall Dam and the headwaters of Lewis and Clark Lake (39 miles). The latter also includes the 25-mile segment of the Niobrara from the western edge of Knox County eastward to its confluence with the Missouri, including Verdigrre Creek from its confluence with the Niobrara to the northern edge of the town of Verdigrre. The 1991 designation is contiguous with the Missouri River boundary of the Yankton Sioux reservation.

2. **The Missouri national recreation area study** (designated 1991), comprises a feasibility study of lands in Knox and Boyd counties, Nebraska, adjacent to the Missouri National Recreational River (no. 1 above), as well as lands adjacent to Lewis and Clark Lake, as a potential national recreation area. In addition to the Missouri River from Fort Randall Dam to Gavins Point Dam, this study also includes the Niobrara River reaching from the western boundary of Knox County east to the Niobrara/Missouri confluence (25 miles) and Verdigrre Creek from the Niobrara/Verdigrre confluence to the north edge of the town of Verdigrre (8 miles). The authorizing legislation stipulates that this study will be conducted in consultation with the Santee Sioux Tribe, part of whose reservation lies within the study area, among other state and local political entities. The study area also includes part of the Yankton Sioux reservation.

3. **The Niobrara National Scenic River** (designated 1991), reaching from Borman Bridge east to the mouth of Chimney Creek (40 miles) and from the mouth of Rock Creek east to the Highway 137 bridge (30 miles). Separating these two reaches of the Niobrara River is no. 4 below.

4. **The Niobrara 6-mile segment scenic or recreational river study area** (designated 1991), consisting of the Niobrara River from the mouth of Chimney Creek east to the mouth of Rock Creek 6 miles). The 1991 act stipulated that if this river segment, which was studied several years ago by the Bureau of Reclamation as a potential site for the Norden Dam, is not selected or funded for a water resources project (i.e., the construction of the Norden Dam) within five years of the date of the 1991 law (i.e., by May 24, 1996), it would automatically be designated as part of the Niobrara component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

5. **The Niobrara national park study area** (designated 1991), encompassing a block of land straddling the Niobrara River from
the eastern boundary of Ft. Niobrara National Wildlife Refuge
eastward to near the mouth of Rock Creek, north of the river, and
to the mouth of Plum Creek on the south.

Collectively, the several designated river reaches,
potential national recreation area, and potential national park
are administered by the National Park Service as the
Niobrara/Missouri National Scenic Riverways (NIMI). Immediate
management of NIMI is provided by a National Park Service
superintendent and staff headquartered in O'Neill, Nebraska,
under the direction of the Regional Director of the Midwest
Region, Omaha, Nebraska.

The NPS is charged with administering NIMI and performing
several kinds of planning studies on the individual components of
NIMI as described above, including the formulation of General
Management Plans (GMP) to direct future development and
management of the national national recreational or scenic
rivers, as well as Special Resource Studies (SRS) to determine
the eligibility of the several areas studied for national scenic
or recreational river status, national recreation area status, or
national park status. Each of the GMP planning studies is to be
accompanied by development of an Environmental Impact Statement
(EIS), and the SRS planning studies by an Environmental
Assessment (EA). These several planning studies, and the lead
offices responsible for them (DSC=Denver Service Center;
NIMI=park staff), are outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>GMP/EIS</th>
<th>SRS/EA</th>
<th>Lead office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mo. Nat'l. Recreational River (1978 designation)</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>DSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo. R. natl. recreation area study</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>DSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nio. Nat'l. Scenic River</td>
<td>GMP</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>NIMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nio. 6-mile scenic or rec. river study</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>NIMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nio. natl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the present time, no land has been acquired by the Federal government as part of any component of NIMI. Nor have boundaries been drawn to guide future land acquisition or other aspects of NIMI administration. The studies listed above, which are underway at present, may result in recommendations for boundaries and may identify alternatives for managing the various components of NIMI.

The overview and assessment has collected and documented information on the historical occupation of NIMI by American Indians and other ethnic and religious groups. For the purposes of this study, an ethnographic resource is defined as any natural or cultural resource, landscape, or natural feature which is linked by a subject community to the traditional practices, values, beliefs, history, and/or ethnic identity of that community. It has been the purpose of this research to identify American Indian and other ethnic/religious groups who live or once lived in the NIMI region as well as known ethnographic resources within the above defined study area. The information resulting from this research effort will in the future form the basis for beginning to develop an ethnographic data base which will be used to fully consider impacts to Indian tribes and other peoples and ethnographic resources, which may result from proposed actions at NIMI. Information resulting from this research is available to NPS planners and management officials as well as Indian tribes and other peoples studied as part of this effort, with appropriate restriction of sensitive or confidential information concerning religious beliefs, sacred areas, and the identities of persons who contribute information to the research. Section 4020 of the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1992 directs denial of public access to information about the location, character, or ownership of historic resources if such disclosure may 1) cause a significant invasion of privacy; 2) risk harm to the resources; or 3) impede the use of a traditional religious site by practitioners of the relevant religion.

CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL OVERVIEW AND ASSESSMENT

Typically, a cultural anthropological overview and assessment is one of the first anthropological studies programmed during early stages of planning to review and analyze accessible archival and documentary information about people and resources that are traditionally associated with parks (National Park Service 1994:25, 174). The overview and assessment study constitutes a comprehensive synthesis of available information concerning American Indian and other ethnic/religious groups and associated ethnographic resources in the study area, and evaluates previous historical and cultural anthropological research relative to them. The study also serves as the baseline
for determining the need for additional studies. Information is
derived primarily from published and unpublished literature, and
to a lesser extent from unpublished archival materials and
personal interviews.

This research was performed in accordance with the authority
and requirements of the Historic Sites Act of 1935 (P.L. 74-292),
the Native American Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-342),
the Archeological Resource Protection Act of 1979, as amended
(P.L. 96-95), the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as
amended in 1980 (P.L. 96-515), the National Historic Preservation
Act Amendments of 1992, and the National Park Service Cultural
Resources Management Guideline (NPS-28).

Management of cultural and natural resources in an
efficient, culturally informed manner, requires the gathering and
analysis of cultural anthropological data focusing on
contemporary American Indians and others with traditional ties to
the land in the study area. The information will help managers
evaluate requests for access to resources as well as to identify
division features of sacred or cultural importance that may
require special treatment or protection. Cultural
anthropological information also allows an informed assessment of
the potential impacts to culturally-important natural resources
arising from planning and development activities, as well as the
effect of specific cultural uses of natural resources by
contemporary cultural groups. These data will also eventually
contribute to the development of an Ethnographic Resource
Inventory (ERI) of the sites, structures, objects, and natural
features valued by peoples traditionally associated with park
lands.

The cultural anthropological overview and assessment is
based primarily on review and analysis of information in
published and unpublished literature, and to a more limited
extent on consultation with organized American Indian and other
cultural groups. Emphasis is placed on specific cultural groups
with both long-term and presently active associations with lands
within the study area, particularly those peoples who reside in
the NIMI region as organized cultural or religious groups, and
the cultural and natural resources to which these groups have
ascribed cultural value (i.e., religious, legendary, subsistence
values, etc.). American Indian tribes that have an historic or
contemporary association with the study area have been the
primary emphasis of the study due to limitations of time and
funding, but NIMI-associated religious or ethnic groups of
ultimate Euroamerican origin have also been identified and
studied to a lesser extent. Contemporary residents of the study
area with socio-economic ties to the region, such as ranchers,
farmers, and merchants, were not subjects of the study except
insofar as they may also belong to one or more traditional ethnic
or religious groups with historical ties to the study area, for
example, the Hutterites in the Bon Homme Colony who are both farmers and members of a highly organized religious sect. The focus of the study has been on NIMI-associated peoples or groups that practice aspects of traditional cultures and religions, and not those with primarily economic or familial ties to the region.

STUDY OBJECTIVES AND METHODS

The overview study was initiated in the spring of 1993. A scope-of-work to guide the study was drafted and sent to the park, Denver Service Center, and the Midwest Regional Office in early March for review. Review comments were also requested from the tribal governments of the three American Indian tribes resident in the NIMI region. No replies were received from the tribes, but comments were received from the Denver Service Center and the scope-of-work was finalized in May.

The overall objective of this study is the gathering of cultural anthropological information about the NIMI study area to aid in the development of planning documents which can be used by NPS managers. This information will be used as future input into planning and environmental assessment work, as well as in making other management decisions that affect, or potentially affect cultural and natural resources.

The initial objectives of this study were to:

1) document the relationships of protohistoric, early historic, and present-day American Indians and other contemporary cultural groups to NIMI;

2) identify and document the past and present uses of the NIMI study area by NIMI-associated cultural groups;

3) identify and document, on the basis of available published and unpublished literature and written records, known ethnographic resources in and near NIMI;

4) where feasible, document the physical boundaries of NIMI ethnographic resources on topographic base maps for inclusion in the Geographic Information System (GIS) data set;

5) identify and review historic, current, or anticipated treaties, agreements, legislation, or special use permits relating to any specific American Indian and other ethnic groups with strong historical and/or contemporary ties to the NIMI area;

6) identify, by means of an annotated bibliography, selected sources that will provide management with cultural anthropological information on peoples historically or contemporaneously associated with NIMI; and
7) recommend further studies about NIMI-associated peoples and ethnographic resources, including suggestions from traditional cultures for resource management and definition of access needs for traditional, ceremonial, or subsistence use of study area resources.

Four products were planned at the outset of this study: 1) the cultural anthropological overview and assessment report; 2) a non-technical summary of the overview and assessment; 3) an annotated bibliography of selected sources of information on NIMI-related groups; and 4) basemaps documenting the locations of ethnographic resources.

Ultimately, it did not prove possible to meet all of the above goals, for several reasons. The scope of the undertaking was ambitious and was not possible to achieve with the limited available funding. Project funds were exhausted shortly after completion of the consultation phase of the work (in early 1994). Despite augmentation by limited other funds supplied by the Midwest Archeological Center, the appointments of two key researchers (Ritter and Hitchcock--see "Project Personnel" section below) were terminated in the summer of 1994 because of the ultimate lack of funds. On July 27, 1993, Thomas Thiessen was designated the Acting Regional Ethnographer for the Midwest Region, and duties relating to ethnography program responsibilities and compliance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) took up most of his time from that date. Consequently, the project's three key research and coordination personnel made only slight progress with the project in the latter half of 1994 and early 1995. In the Spring of 1995, a small amount of funding was provided to complete the overview and assessment report. The non-technical summary, the annotated bibliography, and the basemaps were not developed for lack of funding and time.

Despite the fact that the project was curtailed for fiscal reasons, considerable progress was made toward accomplishing several of the initial objectives of the study. The relationships of American Indian tribes and European immigrant groups with the NIMI region are explained in the several ethnographic summaries that appear in this volume, as well as the general uses that such groups made of the NIMI area. Information about known ethnographic resources was gathered from written documents and is summarized in Chapter 28, though much useful information about ethnographic places remains to be gathered through future field studies. It has not been feasible to document the physical boundaries of ethnographic resources in the NIMI study area because little usable information about this is available at present. The review of treaties, legislation, and the like is accomplished in Chapter 2 (the legislative background) and Chapter 29 (the overview of American Indian policy of the U.S. government), and Appendix II contains copies
of relevant treaties and agreements. It has not been possible to
develop an annotated bibliography of sources; however, each
chapter contains a "References Cited" section and the chapter
texts often provide some commentary about particular important
sources. And lastly, recommendations for further studies and
other actions are offered in Chapter 31.

With respect to ethnographic places in and near the study
area, much information—particularly precise locations—is often
not available in written documents. In such cases, information
on the general location of important regions or areas has been
presented to the extent possible in the tables included in
Chapter 28.

The study involved limited consultations with Indian tribes
and individuals to elicit oral information about tribal concerns
with respect to land and other resources. NIMI staff were
advised in advance of all meetings with tribal governments and
governmental officials, though the confidentiality of interviews
was preserved when appropriate. This was for the purpose of
having an official representative of NIMI on hand to answer
questions that interviewees may have about the status of NPS
planning for the study area, as well as to keep NIMI personnel
informed of contacts that project personnel had with NIMI­
associated groups.

These consultations were carried out by Beth R. Ritter
between August, 1993, and February, 1994. She met with the
tribal government representatives of the Poncas on August 2,
September 3 (1993), and January 31-February 1 (1994); the Santees
on August 2 and 20, September 2-3 and 22 and 24 (1993), January
31-February 1, and February 14 (1994); and the Yanktons on
of the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska gave written permission on Auigust
10, 1993, for NIMI overview research to proceed among tribal
members, and the Santee Sioux Tribal Council granted written
permission on August 9, 1993, for tribal members to be
interviewed on a voluntary basis. The first formal contact with
the full Yankton Sioux Business and Claims Council did not take
place until February 4, 1994, as council elections had taken
place the preceding Fall and many of the council members were
unseated; Ms. Ritter was advised to wait until the new council
members had had time to become acquainted with tribal issues
before approaching them about the NIMI overview project.

In addition to Ms. Ritter’s visits to the three American Indian
tribes resident in the NIMI region, research assistant Michelle
L. Watson visited Verdigre, Niobrara, and vicinity on August 12-
13, 1993, to familiarize herself with the locality and historic
architecture associated with immigrant ethnic and religious
groups who settled in the area, principally Czechs. She was
accompanied by Dr. Mila Saskova-Pierce of the Department of
THE STUDY AREA

Although the major focus of this overview and assessment study is on the total NIMI area, it has been necessary in some instances to present information relating to areas outside NIMI in order to provide a broader cultural context for understanding traditional cultural peoples and properties that are within or very close to NIMI. After all, the cultural and religious groups that have a strong historical or contemporary association with NIMI proper also are a part of the cultural history of a much larger region surrounding NIMI. It is possible that ethnographically significant locales and physiographic features exist near but outside any eventual NIMI boundaries which may affect, or be affected by, proposed management actions and decisions identified in NPS plans for NIMI.

The 1978 and 1991 legislative authorizations do not specify boundaries for NIMI, but leave such boundaries to be recommended as a result of the planning studies to be carried out by NPS. However, for the purposes of the several NPS planning studies that are underway for NIMI, an interim boundary of one-quarter mile back from the high water mark of the Missouri and Niobrara rivers has been adopted until the studies are completed.

For purposes of this cultural anthropological overview and assessment, the boundaries (which may differ from the final boundaries for various components of NIMI recommended at the conclusion of planning studies now underway) of the study area include: 1) 15 miles on either side of the Niobrara National Scenic River segments; 2) 5 miles on either side of the Niobrara/Missouri/Verdigre recreational segments; and 3) the boundary as legislatively proposed for the Niobrara national park study area. Counties partially within this study area include: Boyd, Brown, Cedar, Cherry, Dixon, Holt, Keya Paha, Knox, and Rock in Nebraska; and Bon Homme, Charles Mix, Clay, Gregory, Union, and Yankton in South Dakota.

PREVIOUS ANTHROPOLOGICAL STUDIES

Three anthropological and archeological overviews relating the NIMI area were completed in the early 1980s and have proven to be useful starting points for this study. These broad-scope studies, which were conducted primarily for archeological resource management purposes, are reported in the following documents:

Blakeslee, Donald J., and John O’Shea
1983 The Gorge of the Missouri: An Archeological Study of Lewis and Clark Lake, Nebraska and South Dakota. Archaeology Laboratory, Wichita State University. Submitted to the U.S. Army
Corps of Engineers, Omaha District.

Hartley, Ralph J.

1983 Ethnohistorical Background for the Proposed Norden Reservoir Area, North Central Nebraska. Section 1 in "Ethnohistorical and Historical Background Studies: Norden Reservoir Area, Nebraska," by Ralph J. Hartley and John S. Smith, pp. i-iii to 1-238. University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Department of Anthropology, Division of Archeological Research, Technical Report 82-07.

Ludwickson, John, Donald Blakeslee, and John O’Shea


Although these reports deal primarily with the identification and evaluation of archeological resources, they are useful studies that offer a beginning point for further assessing the cultural anthropological background of NIMI. All three contain historical or ethnographic summaries of the various American Indian groups that are historically or contemporaneously associated with the NIMI region. In addition, the report by Blakeslee and O’Shea also provides a detailed description of the Bon Homme Hutterite Colony. However, their geographic scope does not cover all of the NIMI region, each focuses primarily on a different area of NIMI, and they do not all review the same native peoples (see Table 1-1). Together they do not constitute a comprehensive or current ethnographic overview of NIMI, for the following reasons:

1. Each study focuses on different geographical portions of NIMI as currently designated, and ignores other portions of the NIMI study area;

2. The studies are now a decade or more old, and do not reflect more recent research; and

3. The studies review the histories of American Indian groups only to circa 1865 (prior to the establishment of reservations), and do not describe the post-reservation histories of those peoples.

NIMI-ASSOCIATED AMERICAN INDIAN AND OTHER GROUPS

Three Federally-recognized American Indian tribes--the Northern of "Cold" Poncas, the Yankton Sioux, and the Santee Sioux--still reside as organized cultural groups within the study area, and are the primary focus of the study. Other American Indian groups that utilized the NIMI area for various non-residential purposes in the past will be studied to a lesser extent.
Review of the studies cited above suggests that the following American Indian peoples had a significant historical presence in and/or strong traditional tie to areas within NIMI: Northern and Southern Poncas; Omahas; Ioways; Pawnees; Arikaras; Santee Sioux (Dakota speakers); Brule and Oglala Sioux (Lakota speakers); Yankton Sioux (Nakota speakers); Plains Apaches (Pawdahs; Gattackas or Catakas; Palomas; Kiowa Apaches).

Groups also reviewed in previous studies relating to the study area, but which are not judged in the present study to have significant historical or contemporary ties to NIMI, include the Mandans, Cheyennes, Arapahoes, and Comanches.

Indian trust lands, administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs on behalf of the NIMI "resident" tribes, exist on the Santee and Yankton Indian reservations, and the Northern Poncas, who do not have an established reservation, tribally own a small amount of land which is administered as trust lands (see Chapters 3, 29, and 30).

The reservation of the Winnebagos of Nebraska exists near, but wholly outside, NIMI. The Winnebagos arrived at this location in 1865 as refugees from the Crow Creek Reservation in South Dakota, and they lack significant historical or contemporary ties to NIMI.

In separate chapters that follow, the cultural anthropological overview and assessment presents information about each of the American Indian groups identified above. Particular emphasis is placed on tribes having a current "residential" tie to the study area (such as the Poncas, Yanktons, and Santees).

Ethnic and/or religious groups of Euroamerican derivation (such as Scandinavians, Czechs, Germans from Russia, Hutterites, Mormons, etc.), which have an historical association with NIMI, are also the subjects of this study, but less attention is devoted to them than to the numerous American Indian peoples associated with the area.

PROJECT PERSONNEL

The study was conducted by the Midwest Archeological Center of the National Park Service, based in Lincoln, Nebraska, in cooperation with cultural anthropologists at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln who were hired by the Center for this purpose. The study team consisted of the individuals identified below.

Dr. F. A. Calabrese, Chief of the Midwest Archeological Center, provided overall managerial oversight of the project.

Dr. Robert K. Hitchcock (Associate Professor of Anthropology
at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln) served as co-Project Director and assisted with writing of certain sections and assembly of the report. Dr. Hitchcock is an applied anthropologist with 15 years of consulting and research experience in that field.

Ms. Beth R. Ritter (Adjunct Assistant Professor of Anthropology at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln) served as co-Project Director; conducted the consultations with American Indian groups and individuals and wrote the consultation chapter; prepared the post-reservation histories of the Poncas and Yanktons (the former in collaboration with Mr. Oliver Froehling), as well as the analysis of changes in Federal Indian policy and the resulting effects on the Native American groups resident in the NIMI region; and prepared, in collaboration with Mr. Oliver Froehling, a doctoral student in geography at the University of Nebraska, the ethnographic summary of the Poncas. Ms. Ritter has performed extensive research on the Northern Poncas, completing her M.A. thesis on the restoration of Federal recognition of that tribe. She presented a paper on the NIMI cultural anthropological overview project at the November 17-23, 1993, meeting of the American Anthropological Association. The paper was entitled "Collaborative Research and Applied Anthropology in the National Parks: The Niobrara/Missouri Scenic Riverways Project." She also served as an ethnographic consultant on NIMI to the National Park Service in August, 1992.

The several ethnographic summaries on various ethnic and religious groups associated with NIMI were prepared by various individuals. As mentioned above, Ms. Ritter and Mr. Froehling wrote the summary on the Poncas. Dr. Leonard R. Bruguier, Director of the Institute of American Indian Studies at the University of South Dakota and a Yankton tribal member, prepared the summary concerning the Yankton Sioux. Ms. Michele Moray, a graduate student in anthropology at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, wrote the summaries on the Santee Sioux and the Pawnees. Ms. Rebecca Hautzinger, an anthropology student at the University of Nebraska-Omaha, prepared the summary on the Omahas. Ms. Hautzinger also contributed a chapter dealing with the Winnebagos in Nebraska during the period 1863-1879. Mss. Gloria Rial and Judith Campbell Miller, both graduate students in anthropology at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, furnished the summary on the Lakota Sioux groups historically associated with NIMI, while Ms. Michelle Watson, also an anthropology graduate student at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, prepared the summaries relating to non-American Indian cultural groups associated with NIMI, specifically those concerning the Hutterites, Mormons, African Americans, Czechs, Germans and Germans from Russia, and Scandinavians. Ms. Watson also prepared ethnographic summaries on the Winnebagos, Cheyennes, Commanches, and Plains Apaches. Ms. Michele Voeltz, an undergraduate anthropology student at Bates College, prepared ethnographic summaries on the Arikaras,
Mr. Thomas D. Thiessen, Archeologist at the Midwest Archeological Center, coordinated the project activities and assembled and edited the overview and assessment report. He also prepared the introductory chapter and chapters dealing with the legislative background; Sioux ethnonymy; ethnographic places; and co-authored with Dr. Hitchcock and Ms. Ritter the recommendations chapter.

Mrs. Anne Wolley Vawser, Archeologist at the Midwest Archeological Center, while not a contributor to the present volume, simultaneously compiled information on the NIMI archeological database, and shared information with the overview research team.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS REPORT

This overview is organized into five parts. Part I contains Chapters 1 and 2, the introduction and legislative background information, respectively. Part II consists of Chapters 3 through 7, which are separate ethnographic sketches of each of the three "resident" NIMI Native American tribes (Poncas, Yanktons, Santees), as well as a chapter dealing with the histories of the residential tribes following establishment of their reservations and a brief chapter that reviews the ethnonymy of the linguistic and cultural divisions of the Sioux. Part III contains brief ethnographic sketches of other Native American tribal groups historically associated with NIMI, such as the Omahas, Lakotas, Iowas, Winnebagos, Pawnees, Arikaras, Mandans, Cheyennes, Arapahos, Commanches, and Plains Apaches (Chapters 8-19). Part IV deals with immigrant cultural or religious groups from Europe that historically were present in the NIMI region and whose descendants reside there today. This part contains Chapters 20 through 27, focusing on the Germans, Hutterites, Czechs, French-Canadians, Mormons, Scandinavians, African Americans, and Irish. Part V contains Chapters 28-31, which respectively concern ethnographic places; an overview of American Indian governmental policy as it relates to the three residential NIMI tribes; consultation with the NIMI resident tribes; and concluding recommendations. Following Part V are two appendices, one containing the tribal government constitutions, charters, etc. for the three residnetial tribes, and the other presenting selected treaties, executive orders, etc. that have played an important role with respect to the three residential tribes.
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Table 1-1. Comparison of geographic coverage and ethnographic/historical treatment of ethnic/religious groups by Ludwickson et al. (1981), Blakeslee and O'Shea (1983), and Hartley (1983).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Study Area</th>
<th>Groups Described</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ludwickson et al. 1981</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin’s Point Dam to Ponca, Nebraska (= 1978 designated Mo. Natl. Rec. River)</td>
<td>Omaha/Ponca*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sioux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pawnee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arikara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ioway*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blakeslee and O’Shea 1983</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis and Clark Lake (= part of the 1991 designated Mo. River nat. rec. area study)</td>
<td>Ponca*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yankton*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santee*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omaha*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pawnee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hutterites of the Bon Homme Colony*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hartley 1983</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Niobrara River (conducted for the Norden Dam proposal) (= 1991 designated Niobrara Natl. Scenic River &amp; Niobrara 6-mile segment)</td>
<td>Ponca*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yankton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teton Sioux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pawnee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arikara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plains Apache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheyenne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arapaho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes extended discussion of these groups in the cited study.
CHAPTER 2
RELEVANT LEGISLATION
Thomas D. Thiessen

INTRODUCTION
Over the course of nearly the past century, the Federal government has enacted laws that define the responsibility of its officials toward the cultural resources of the United States. The following discussion will identify cultural resource legislation pertinent to NIMI, together with Executive Orders, regulations, and policy statements that bear on the management of cultural resources within and near the NIMI study area. Particular emphasis will be given to laws, regulations, and policies that define the government's relationship to American Indian people and traditional cultural properties relating to American Indian tribes. Legislation that mandates protection of native religions and ethnographic resources is relatively new, having come into existence within the last 20 years.

LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND DIRECTIVES
Table 2-1 lists the laws, Executive Order, and other federal directives that are discussed below, together with regulations, policy statements, and other pertinent formal guidance pertaining to their implementation. These laws, regulations, and directives are important not only for the management of cultural resources (including traditional cultural properties) in federal stewardship, but only for defining the relationship of federal agencies and bureaus to federally recognized American Indian tribes.

Antiquities Act of 1906
The Antiquities Act of 1906 established a criminal penalty for the appropriation, excavation, injury to, or destruction of any Federally-owned historic or prehistoric ruin or monument, or any object of antiquity, without the permission of the Secretary of the Department having jurisdiction over such property. It also established a system of permits for legitimate archeological research on Federal lands, and authorized the President to declare historic and prehistoric properties as national monuments. Late in 1906, uniform rules and regulations were promulgated by the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, and War to govern the administration of the Act. Although never repealed, the Antiquities Act was largely superseded in 1979 by the passage of the Archeological Resources Protection Act, which provides more stringent standards and penalties for the protection and investigation of archeological resources on
Federal and Indian land.

**Historic Sites Act of 1935**

The Historic Sites Act of 1935 provides the Secretary of the Interior, through the National Park Service, with broad authority to conduct research on historical and archeological sites, buildings, and objects; acquire land containing such properties; enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with non-Federal parties for the protection, preservation, maintenance, or operation of such properties; restore, reconstruct, rehabilitate, preserve, and maintain such properties of national significance, and operate museums in conjunction therewith; operate and manage such properties for the benefit of the public; commemorate historical or archeological places and events of national significance; develop an educational program to make historical and archeological information available to the public; and other powers. It also established the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments to advise the Secretary in matters relating to the National Park System. This Act has long been the basis for many of the historic preservation activities of the National Park Service.

**National Historic Preservation Act of 1966**

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 is the keystone of the National Register of Historic Places program and the Section 106 responsibilities of all Federal agencies. Title 1 of the Act established the National Register as "a national register of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture." According to regulations subsequently issued, individual properties may qualify for the National Register on the basis of their significance on the national, state, or local level. The Act also established an independent agency, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, to advise the President and Congress on historic preservation matters and to work with other Federal agencies on meeting their Section 106 responsibilities. This Act has had far-reaching consequences for all Federal agencies, inasmuch as Section 106 of the Act requires them to consider the impact of their programs and actions on properties that are listed on, or are eligible for, the National Register. In complying with Section 106, agencies are encouraged to follow the Advisory Council's regulations entitled "Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties," codified as Title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 800 (36 CFR 800), which sets forth criteria for measuring the significance of individual properties and the effects that agency activities will have upon properties. These regulations spell out in detail the procedure for documenting compliance with Section 106, as well as for consulting with the Advisory Council on Section 106 findings.
The Act was strengthened in 1980 by amendments which, among other things, added Section 110 which clearly places responsibility on Federal agency heads for preservation of historic properties under the jurisdiction or control of their agency. Toward this end, Section 110 directs Federal agencies to "locate, inventory, and nominate" to the National Register all historical and archeological properties under their jurisdiction or control, much as Executive Order 11593, signed by the President in 1971, also requires (see below). The 1980 amendments also contain many other provisions relating to historic preservation matters, but it is important to note that Section 304 authorizes Federal agencies to withhold from the public information about the location or nature of historical and archeological resources when the release of such information "may create a substantial risk of harm, theft, or destruction to such resources."

The Act was further amended in 1992. Like the 1980 amendments, the 1992 amendments contain many diverse provisions, but Section 101(d) specifically relates to American Indian tribes. That section encourages the establishment of tribal historic preservation programs, gives tribes parallel responsibilities to State Historic Preservation Officers in administering some aspects of tribal historic preservation programs, and authorizes grants to tribes for the purpose of preserving their historic heritage. Section 101(d)(6)(A) provides that American Indian traditional religious and cultural properties may be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, and the following subsection directs Federal agencies, in the course of meeting their responsibilities under Section 106, to consult with tribes on the effects of agency programs and activities on traditional religious and cultural properties. The 1992 amendments also add to Section 304 a provision that allows withholding of information about historic properties if disclosure may 1) "cause a significant invasion of privacy" or 2) "impede the use of a traditional religious site by practitioners."

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requires Federal agencies to disclose, by means of environmental impact statements prepared for the public, the effects of proposed or planned projects on the environment. Cultural resources are regarded as part of the environment for this purpose. It is generally held that environmental impact statements must disclose impacts to National Register or National Register-eligible historical or archeological properties. Consequently, if the historical or archeological properties within the direct (and often the indirect) impact area of proposed or planned undertakings are not fully known, survey investigations must be conducted to locate and assess their National Register
significance so that appropriate impact information can be disclosed.

Executive Order 11593, Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment

Executive Order 11593, signed by President Nixon on May 13, 1971, is not law but as an Executive Order it carries the force of law. Among its provisions are the requirement that Federal agencies "locate, inventory, and nominate" to the National Register all historical and archeological properties under their jurisdiction or control. Although the Order set a deadline of July 1, 1973, for these activities, it has been ruled that passage of that date does not relieve agencies of responsibility to meet the requirements of the Executive Order. The Executive Order's provisions and language regarding the identification and inventory of historical and archeological properties were embodied, virtually verbatim but without any completion deadline, in a 1980 amendment that created Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (see above).

American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978

In 1978, Congress passed the American Indian Religious Freedom Act to:

- protect and preserve for Americans Indians their inherent right of freedom to believe, express, and exercise the traditional religions of the American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut, and native Hawaiians, including but not limited to access to sites, use and possession of sacred objects, and the freedom to worship through ceremonials and traditional rites. (American Indian Religious Freedom Act, Section 1)

Section 2 of the Act directed Federal agencies "to evaluate their policies and procedures in consultation with native traditional religious leaders in order to determine appropriate changes necessary to protect and preserve Native American religious cultural rights and practices." This is a key piece of legislation on which is based much of the current relationship between the National Park Service and American Indian people (see the discussion of the Service's Native American Relationships Management Policy below).

Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979

The Archeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) augments the protective intent of the earlier Antiquities Act by 1) prohibiting the excavation, removal, damage to, alteration, or defacement of archeological resources on Federal or Indian lands; 2) providing stringent penalties for persons who violate any prohibition of the Act; and 3) establishing a permit system to
regulate legitimate archeological research on Federal and Indian lands. In addition, the statute prohibits trafficking in archeological artifacts obtained in violation of this Act or any other Federal law, and it protects the confidentiality of information on the nature and location of archeological resources on Federal and Indian lands. A 1988 amendment to ARPA (Public Law 100-555, 102 Stat. 2778, 16 USC 470mm) directed the Secretary of the Interior, among other agency heads, to develop plans and schedules for archeological surveys of lands under their control. Final uniform regulations for ARPA were published in the Federal Register on January 6, 1984, and are codified in Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 7 (43 CFR 7).

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation

On September 29, 1983, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation were published in the Federal Register. This document sets forth a wide range of standards and guidelines for historic preservation activities in several disciplines, including archeology. Included is guidance on: 1) identifying and evaluating historical properties; 2) registering historical properties in the National Register of Historic Properties; 3) documentation of various kinds of historical properties; 4) standards for various treatments of historical properties, such as protection, stabilization, preservation, acquisition, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction; and 5) minimum professional qualifications for personnel who direct historic preservation projects. Ethnographic resources are not specifically addressed in the document.

NPS-28: The National Park Service Cultural Resources Management Guideline

The National Park Service developed a guideline which comprehensively explains policies and procedures relating to the full range of cultural resources administered by the Service. The current version is Release No. 4, issued in September, 1994. Chapter 10 of NPS-28 discusses the management of ethnographic resources and activities, including a brief description of the kinds of studies that should be conducted and differing levels of investigation. It describes the ethnographic overview and assessment as a study that:

...reviews and summarizes existing ethnographic data for people and resources associated with parks; the assessment evaluates them and identifies data gaps. Information is derived primarily from existing archival and published materials and is supplemented with ethnographic interviewing of knowledgeable community consultants (NPS-28, Chapter 10, page 174)
The kinds of information contained in an ethnographic overview and assessment typically include:

* a statement of the basis for the group's access to the resources, e.g. treaties, park enabling legislation, cooperative agreements, special use permits, other legislation;

* a list of the peoples (tribe, community, ethnic group) covered by the legislation, agreements, and the park resources they use;

* previous descriptions of ethnographic occupation, cultural significance of natural resources and physical environmental features (e.g. plants, caves, rock shelters, springs, shrines, and other sacred locations);

* use of each type of resource, including frequency of use, nature of use (religious or subsistence), size of harvest (if appropriate), which forms part of the data base for the ethnographic program;

* an annotated and current bibliography that meets management needs for ethnographic information on the associated peoples;

* a record of consultations with Native Americans and other ethnic groups whose lifeways and cultural resources may be affected by park management plans and actions;

* a list of ethnographic resources to be considered for inclusion in the CSI; and

* recommendations for further study needs regarding park-associated ethnic groups.

NPS Guidelines for Consultation with Native Americans About Archeological Projects and the Disposition of Human Remains

On November 25, 1986, the Acting Director of the NPS issued a memorandum reminding NPS managers of the requirements for issuance of ARPA permits for archeological investigations, and especially for consultation with appropriate Native American tribes when archeological investigations are expected to result in harm to, or destruction of, "any Indian tribal religious or cultural site on public lands." Such notification is to take place at least 30 days prior to the issuance of any ARPA permit for the investigation. In essence, these guidelines specify that cultural and religious values regarding human remains "must be considered and reconciled" when human remains are to be disturbed or removed as a result of NPS archeological investigations or construction/development work. They also stipulate that Indian
tribes or other groups (such as Hutterites and the Amish) should be consulted in such situations as well, and they establish that costs "accruing as a result of consultation with ethnic groups and treatment or curation of human remains are to be borne by the Service."

**NPS Native American Relationships Management Policy**

On September 22, 1987, the final version of the NPS Native American Relationships Management Policy was published in the Federal Register. This is a comprehensive policy statement that governs the broad relationship between the Service and American Indian tribes. The policy's preamble summarizes the general philosophy underlying this relationship:

The National Park Service, to the extent consistent with each park's legislated purpose, shall develop and execute its programs in a manner that reflects knowledge of and respect for the cultures, including religious and subsistence traditions, of Native American tribes or groups with demonstrable ancestral ties to particular resources in or within the National Park system. Such ties shall be established through evidence from systematic archeological or ethnographic studies, including ethnographic oral history and ethnohistory studies, or a combination of these sources.

The policy provides more specific direction on Service-Native American interrelationships in the area of park resource management, planning and operations, research, and interpretation, generally requiring prior consultation with Native American groups when actions in these areas will affect the religious or traditional cultural values held by these groups. Some specific directions of the policy are:

* Guaranteeing to Native Americans access to and use of locations within parks that have been historically used for traditional religious activities. Such use may be governed by a permit issued in accordance with 36 CFR 2.50, "Special Events," or 2.51, "Public Assemblies, Meetings."

* Gathering of fish and wildlife will be allowed for the pursuit of traditional religious or subsistence activities when authorized by law or existing treaty rights.

* Hand gathering of vegetable materials such as fruit, nuts, and berries for personal use or consumption will be allowed upon a "written determination that the gathering or consumption will not adversely affect park wildlife, the reproductive potential of a plant species, or otherwise affect park resources."

* The Service will protect sacred sites, places, and objects
under its stewardship "to the extent consistent with legislation and Service capabilities."

* Burial areas, whether marked or unmarked, will be protected from disturbance unless there are no feasible and prudent alternatives, in which case appropriate Native American groups will be consulted concerning the proper treatment and disposition of human remains that must be disturbed. The preferences of these groups will be considered by the Service "to the maximum extent feasible under current law."

* The Service shall consult appropriate Native American groups at the earliest practicable time during the planning process and shall seek the views of such groups throughout the decision-making process. To this end, each Superintendent shall maintain a "current roster" of potential and appropriate contacts within such groups.

* Service sponsored or executed research "shall reflect sensitivity to the privacy of community consultants regarding their practices, beliefs, and identities."

* The Service will consult with appropriate Native Americans in acquiring, maintaining, using, and disposing of museum objects associated with Native American groups. To this end, the Service will acquire only objects "having a legal and ethical pedigree in accord with existing laws," policy, and guidelines. Repatriation of objects will be made 1) when the requesting groups can show that the requested material is their inalienable communal property; and 2) requests are made by representatives empowered to act on behalf of the group. "Interested persons" will be given access to inspect or study Service museum collections and records, "consistent with standards for the use and preservation of collections."

* The Service shall consult and cooperate with Native Americans in planning interpretive programs. Interpretive programs about Native American subjects will employ ethnographic information and concepts, and will present factual, value-neutral information about Native American and non-Native American cultures, heritage, and history.

The Native American Relationships Management Policy explicitly supersedes an earlier NPS policy statement, Special Directive 78-1, "Policy Guideline for Native American Cultural Resources Management," which provided policy guidance that has been outmode by subsequent laws and directives.

NPS Management Policies

The latest version of the National Park Service's Management
Policies (1988), a formal collection of policy statements governing virtually every aspect of NPS operation, contains numerous references to how the Service is to incorporate consideration of Native American concerns and consultation with tribes into its planning and operational activities. Most of this discussion is contained in Chapter 5, "Cultural Resource Management," but many pertinent references are scattered throughout other chapters of the document. Statements are found related to:

"New Area Studies and Criteria" (Chapter 2, pages 1 and 4);
"Park Planning Process and Products" (Chapter 2, pages 5-6);
"Park Planning in a Regional Context" (Chapter 2, pages 9-10);
"Natural Resource Management" (Chapter 4, pages 1, 5, 7);
"Wilderness Management" (Chapter 6, page 7);
"Interpretation by Others" (i.e., by non-NPS persons) (Chapter 7, page 4);
"Interpretation and Native Americans" (Chapter 7, page 5);
"Native American Use" (of parks) (Chapter 8, page 8-10);
"Special Park Uses" (Chapter 8, page 15); and
"Concession Administration" (Chapter 10, pages 8-9).

The collective gist of these policy statements is that NPS will conduct its business in consultation and cooperation with Native Americans, and with consideration of the concerns of Native Americans for their religious and traditional beliefs and practices.

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990

On November 16, 1990, the President signed into law the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), which has far-reaching consequences for NPS museum collections and treatment of human remains and associated objects discovered on NPS lands in the future. NAGPRA has several purposes. Simply stated, these are 1) to restore to Native American groups certain kinds of museum objects that have religious or cultural significance to those groups; 2) to repatriate skeletal and other human remains, together with associated funerary objects, to lineal descendants or culturally affiliated Native American groups; and 3) to protect Native American graves from disturbance and govern the disposition of Native American human remains and certain kinds of cultural objects that are discovered--either inadvertently or intentionally--on Federal and tribal lands in the future. It also prohibits trafficking in Native American human remains and certain kinds of cultural objects.

NAGPRA imposes several obligations on museums and Federal agencies that own or control human remains and certain kinds of Native American objects in their museum collections. These kinds of objects include both archeological and ethnographic materials,
irrespective of where the collections are housed. Inasmuch as NIMI does not have any museum collection at present, the procedures spelled out in NAGPRA for identifying certain kinds of museum objects (unassociated funerary objects, sacred objects and objects of cultural patrimony must be summarized, while human remains and associated funerary objects are to be inventoried by certain dates specified in the law) generally do not pertain to NIMI.

However, NAGPRA also spells out some procedures to be followed when human remains and NAGPRA-relevant objects are discovered or excavated on Federal and tribal lands, either accidentally during maintenance, construction, or other work activities, or intentionally during archeological research, whether done by Service researchers or by archeologists working under ARPA permits. NAGPRA establishes a priority ordering of ownership for human remains and cultural objects excavated or discovered on Federal or tribal lands after the date of enactment of the Act. This is, briefly stated, lineal descendants first, followed by the Indian tribe on whose reservation lands such materials are found; the Indian tribe with the closest cultural affiliation with the materials; the Indian tribe on whose aboriginal territory the materials were found (aboriginal territory means the land established as a group's historic homeland by a final decision of the Indian Claims Commission or the United States Court of Claims); and finally, by a claiming tribe that can show a closer cultural relationship with the materials than the tribe that aboriginally occupied the land where they were found.

NAGPRA also stipulates that intentional excavation and removal of human remains and cultural objects from Federal or tribal land must take place pursuant to ARPA; must be accomplished after consultation with appropriate Indian tribes; will be governed by the ownership priorities outlined above; and must be conducted only after proof of consultation or consent is documented.

In the case of accidental discovery of human remains and cultural objects on Federal or tribal lands, NAGPRA requires that any activity—such as construction, mining, agriculture, and so forth—that revealed such materials be stopped and notification be provided to the appropriate Native American tribe. Following such notification and after certification that notification has been received, the activity may resume after 30 days. In such a case, disposition and control of such materials proceeds as in the case of intentional excavation.

The National Park Service developed proposed regulations for the implementation of NAGPRA, which were published in the Federal Register on May 28, 1993. Comments were solicited from the public and were due to be received in Washington on July 27,
As of this writing (June 1995), final regulations have not been issued and the proposed regulations of May 28, 1993, stand only as unofficial guidance for matters involving compliance with NAGPRA. The May 28 proposed regulations dealt in large part with procedures for preparing summaries of, consultations about, and repatriation of unassociated funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony. Many of the sections concerning guidance for the inventory and disposition of human remains and associated funerary objects and future discoveries of human remains were reserved for drafting in the future.

Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993

The Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993, enacted on November 16, 1993, recognizes that actions and policies of the Federal government often unintentionally interfere with, or "burden," the free exercise of religion as guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution. Consequently, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act protects the free exercise of religion by directing that "the Government shall not substantially burden a person's exercise of religion" unless two conditions are met: 1) the government's action "is in furtherance of a compelling governmental interest;" and 2) the action "is the least restrictive means of furthering that compelling governmental interest." While applying to all religious beliefs in general, the Act has especially potential implications for the relationship between NIMI and the practice of religion by the three Native American tribes resident in the NIMI region. Native religions often require the use of certain natural resources or access to certain places of sacred significance, both kinds of which may be expected to lie within the eventual NIMI boundaries.

In 1993 and 1994, Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt and President Bill Clinton issued directives to Interior bureaus and agencies of the Executive Branch that require all federal interactions with recognized American Indian tribes be conducted on a government-to-government basis. These directives are intended to ensure that the rights of Indian tribes as sovereign dependent nations are recognized and honored by all federal agencies and bureaus (see Chapter 29 for further discussion of tribal sovereignty).

The emphasis of each directive is slightly different. Secretary Babbitt's Order No. 3175 (November 8, 1993) deals with the subject, "Departmental Responsibilities for Indian Trust Resources." It requires Interior bureaus to "operate within a government to government relationship with federally recognized Indian tribes" for the purpose of identifying, protecting, and
conserving tribal trust resources. Consequently, bureau heads
are directed to be aware of the impact that programs and
activities in their charge may have on Indian trust resources,
disclose such information to tribes, and consult with tribal
governments about such impacts.

Generally stated, the President's memorandum, signed on
April 29, 1994, and published in the May 4, 1994, issue of the
Federal Register, directs all Executive Branch departments and
agencies to assess and take into consideration the impact of
their programs and activities on tribal trust resources, to
consult with tribal governments about all actions that affect
federally recognized tribes, and to cooperate with tribal
governments and other federal departments and agencies on matters
that affect tribal trust property and the governmental rights of
Indian tribes.

Presidential Memorandum Regarding the Distribution of Eagle
Feathers for Native American Religious Purposes

Also published in the May 4, 1994, issue of the Federal
Register was another Presidential memorandum. This memorandum
directs federal agencies and bureaus to "improve their collection
and transfer" of eagle fathers and body parts to Native Americans
for use in traditional religious practices. "Salvageable" eagle
carcasses found on federal lands are to be shipped to the
National Eagle Repository for subsequent distribution to Native
Americans.

American Indian Religious Freedom Act Amendments of 1994

On August 6, 1994, the American Indian Religious freedom Act
Amendments of 1994 were enacted to guarantee to American Indians
the right to use, possess, and transport peyote "for bona fide
traditional ceremonal purposes in connection with the practice
of a traditional Indian religion." No Indian can be penalized
or discriminated against by federal or state authorities for
possessing peyote used for such purposes. This is an important
consideration for practitioners of the pan-tribal Native American
Church, which has long used peyote as one of its sacraments.

Tribal Self-Governance Act of 1994

The Tribal Self-Governance Act of 1994 comprises Title IV of
the Indian Self-Determination Act Amendments of 1994 (P.L. 103-
413, 108 Stat. 4250), which became law on October 25, 1994. The
Indian Self-Determination Act Amendments of 1994 supplement P.L.
93-638, the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance
Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.), a law that established a
Federal policy of allowing American Indian tribes to take a
greater hand in administering educational and other Federal
services to Indian people. The law authorizes the Federal
government to enter into contracts with tribes to enable the
latter to control funding and decision-making for programs
previously administered by Federal agencies and bureaus, principally the BIA and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At its heart, the law, and subsequent amendments thereto, are rooted in the legal concept of Indian tribes as dependent sovereign nations that enjoy, on the basis of the U.S. Constitution, treaties, and precedent law, a special relationship with the United States government. In 1988, amendments to P.L. 93-638 established the Tribal Self-Governance Demonstration Project to demonstrate, on an experimental basis, that participating tribes possessed the administrative and fiscal capability to assume management of programs run by the BIA.

The 1994 amendments to P.L. 93-638 enlarged the scope of the Self-Governance program to include the programs of all Department of the Interior (DOI) bureaus, including the NPS. Tribes certified to participate in the tribal Self-Governance program are eligible to enter into annual funding agreements with any of the DOI bureaus for the purpose of tribal administration of "programs, services, functions, and activities" run by those bureaus. Presently, 36 tribes (none of them in the NIMI region) are eligible for Self-Governance. The law allows up to 20 more tribes to be declared eligible for participation in the Self-Governance program each year, provided they have completed certain planning and fiscal requirements, and have formally applied for the program. In addition to giving American Indian tribes decision-making and funding control of certain programs, etc., the Act also has an additional objective of providing for "a planned and measurable parallel reduction in the Federal bureaucracy" as a result of the shift of program responsibilities to tribes (Section 203).

The Tribal Self-Governance Act of 1994 authorizes DOI bureaus to enter into annual funding agreements with eligible tribes, by which decision-making responsibility and funding for specific "programs, services, functions, and activities" of those bureaus will be turned over to the tribes. The law authorizes the tribes to "plan, conduct, consolidate, and administer" such programs, etc., and also provides for "advance payments" to be made to the tribes in annual or semi-annual installments, at the discretion of the participating tribes. In order to give the tribes as much latitude as possible in the decision-making process, the law (Section 403[1][2]) allows tribes to request the Secretary of the Interior to waive regulations pertaining to programs, etc., administered by the tribes under the Self-Governance program. DOI bureaus will continue to have the responsibility to identify funding needs for Self-Governance activities in their annual budget requests to Congress.

At present (June 1995), the Tribal Self-Governance program does not affect the planning for NIMI. In the future, however, Self-Governance may become relevant to NIMI as additional tribes are certified to participate in the program.
In addition to the above-described enacted laws and regulations, an Executive Order is presently under consideration by the Clinton Administration, which would have as its purpose the protection of Native American sacred sites. It is an outgrowth of unsuccessful bills introduced in both houses of Congress in 1993 and 1994, which died with the end of Congress in 1994. The draft text of the order has not been released, so its ramifications for planning and future management of NIMI are unknown at present.

CONCLUSION

Together, the laws, Executive Order, regulations, and other guidance summarized above clearly direct that Federal agencies conduct their affairs in ways that show sensitivity and consideration for American Indian political sovereignty, religious beliefs, sacred places and objects, graves, traditional cultural resources, and locations that have continuing traditional importance to native peoples. A common theme emphasized among them is that agencies, to the maximum extent possible and practical under existing law, consult with appropriate Native American groups in all agency actions—proposed, planned, or underway—that have the potential to affect such groups. Consultation should be made on a government-to-government basis, meaning that contacts with tribes should be formally made with the duly-consituted tribal governments.

Many of the chapters that follow will be largely concerned with identifying and briefly describing Native American groups that have historical and/or contemporary associations with the NIMI study area, and recommendations will be offered for conducting consultations with them. Information about other, non-native peoples and groups will also be similarly summarized to provide a perspective on the historical reasons for their presence in the area as well as an evaluation of their continuing ties to the region.
Table 2-1. Major federal laws, Executive Order, regulations, policies, directives, and guidance relating to management of cultural resources at NIMI and federal-Native American relationships in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date Passed/Signed</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antiquities Act</td>
<td>8 Jun 1906</td>
<td>PL 59-209, 34 Stat. 225, 16 USC 431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Rules and Regulations for the Antiquities Act</td>
<td>28 Dec 1906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Order 11593, Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment</td>
<td>13 May 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archeological Resources Protection</td>
<td>31 Oct 1979</td>
<td>PL 96-95, 93 Stat. 721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act (ARPA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Archeology and Historic Preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uniform Regulations for ARPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NPS-28, Cultural Resources Management Guideline, Release No. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NPS Guidelines for Consultation with Native Americans About Archeological Projects and the Disposition of Human Remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NPS Native American Relationships Management Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NPS Management Policies (especially Chapter 5, Cultural Resource Management)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NHPA Amendments of 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Regulations for NAGPRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of the Interior’s Order No. 3175 concerning Departmental responsibilities for Indian trust resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 Sep 1983</td>
<td>FR 29 Sep 1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Feb 1984</td>
<td>FR 6 Feb 1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 Sep 1987</td>
<td>FR 22 Sep 1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 May 1993</td>
<td>FR 28 May 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Nov 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 April 1994</td>
<td>Presidential memorandum concerning government-to-government relations with tribal governments</td>
<td>Federal Register, Vol. 59, No. 85, pp. 22951-22952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 April 1994</td>
<td>Presidential memorandum concerning the distribution of eagle feathers for Native American religious purposes</td>
<td>Federal Register, Vol. 59, No. 85, pp. 22953-22954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PL = Public Law
Stat. = Statutes
USC = United States Code
FR = Federal Register
CFR = Code of Federal Regulations
CHAPTER 3

PONCA ETHNOGRAPHIC AND GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY

Beth R. Ritter and Oliver Froehling

INTRODUCTION

The Poncas were the smallest of the Dhegiha-speaking cognate tribes, which include the Omahas, Kansas, Quapaws, and Osages. The Poncas are long-term residents throughout the NIMI study area; however, their core territory has consistently emanated from the Niobrara/Missouri confluence for centuries. Ponca geography has contributed greatly to their history, as well as their cultural inventory. The Poncas' geopolitical juxtaposition between several large, powerful plains tribes (e.g., Teton Sioux, Pawnees, and Omahas) has had a profound impact on the Poncas' relationship (and overall well-being) with the federal government throughout the historic era. Their cultural adaptations were also highly characteristic of eastern periphery prairie-plains tribes who pursued a mixed strategy of bison hunting and semi-sedentary horticulture along the fertile floodplains. As a result of forced relocation to present-day Oklahoma in 1877, the Poncas split into two groups, the Northern Poncas who returned to the tribal homeland in Nebraska and the Southern Poncas who remained in Oklahoma. The following chapter will sketch a brief overview of Ponca traditions and culture in general, with emphasis on the Northern Poncas.

HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH

The definitive ethnography detailing Ponca culture and history, The Ponca Tribe, was written by the late James H. Howard (1965). Howard also made important contributions with articles documenting ceremonial life (1959; 1961; 1971) and the description and location of known village sites (1970). James Owen Dorsey, a missionary, was one of the earliest and most prolific ethnographers to document Ponca religion (1894; 1883), mythology (1884; 1885; 1888a; 1888b; 1889), language (1883; 1894) and social structure (1891; 1881-1882; 1886; Dorsey and Thomas 1910). George Amos Dorsey contributed an important work on one of the last Ponca Sun Dances held in Oklahoma (1905). Fletcher and LaFlesche (1992, originally published 1911) drew from Dorsey's work with the Omahas and Poncas and added appreciable ethnographic detail from informants from both tribes to produce The Omaha Tribe. Other early ethnographic work by notable anthropologists would include Skinner's (1915) comparative study of social aspects of the Iowa, Kansa, and Ponca tribes and
documentation of Ponca language by Boas (1906) and Boas and Swanton (1911).

Based on Indian Claims Commission research, Jablow's Ethnohistory of the Ponca (1974) remains one of the most solid contributions to the Ponca literature. Wood's (1959) "Notes on Ponca Ethnohistory" provides an excellent overview of the Ponca protohistoric period, based on Wood's extensive archaeological work on Ponca archeological sites (1960; 1965; 1978; 1993). Cash and Wolff (1975) are frequently cited for their history, The Ponca People; however, it lacks scholarly documentation and is written primarily from the Southern Ponca perspective. Three biographies of prominent Poncas have been produced: "Xube, A Ponca Biography" (Whitman 1939); "Peter Le Claire--Northern Ponca" (Le Claire 1961); and White Eagle (Zimmerman 1941).

The now-famous 1879 trial of Chief Standing Bear, a Northern Ponca, has resulted in numerous publications and legal treatments. Helen Hunt Jackson (1888) was among the most articulate of the Ponca supporters. Her book, A Century of Dishonor: A Sketch of the United States' Dealings with Some of the Indian Tribes, mobilized the Indian reform movement and resulted in restitution for the Poncas (Mathes 1987, 1990; Prucha 1984; Mardock 1979; Olson & Wilson 1984). Thomas Henry Tibbles, a local journalist involved with the Standing Bear case, published a dramatic account of the trial (1972, originally published 1880), and toured the East Coast with Chief Standing Bear and "Bright Eyes", an Omaha Indian (Susette LaFlesche), to publicize the plight of the Poncas. Perhaps the best account of the trial of Standing Bear and the concomitant impact of the Standing Bear case on U.S. case law is Lake's "Standing Bear! Who?" (1981).

Recent contributions to the Northern Ponca literature include articles by Grobsmith and Ritter (1992) and Ritter (1994) outlining termination policy and the recent restoration of the Northern Poncas' federally-recognized status. In addition, an excellent overview of nineteenth-century Ponca ethnohistory, demography, and dispossession is provided in Wishart's An Unspeakable Sadness: The Dispossession of the Nebraska Indians (1994).

ETHNONYMY

According to Howard (1965:5-6), the name the Poncas use to refer to themselves is Ponka. The meaning of this term is no longer known, however; it is used as a clan or subclan name among the Dhegiha-speaking Osages, Kansas, and Quapaws (Fletcher and LaFlesche 1992; Howard 1965:5). The only Dhegiha speakers lacking a Ponka clan are the Omahas, lending support to the often-cited likelihood that the Poncas were once a clan of the Omaha tribe (Howard 1965; Dorsey 1884:218-222; Champe, cited in
Wood 1959:10; Grobsmith and Ritter 1992:4). After the 1877 removal of the Ponca tribe to Indian Territory and their subsequent split, the Northern Ponca band came to be known as Osni-Ponka meaning "Cold Poncas" and the Southern Poncas came to be known as Maste-Ponka, which means "Warm Poncas" (Howard 1965). Reportedly, the Poncas also frequently referred to themselves, collectively, as Dhegiha, meaning "The people of this group" (Howard 1965:5-6).

Beyond tribal and linguistic designations, the Poncas identified themselves by clan names. In the historic period, Howard (1965:6) reports that the Poncas often identified themselves with one of two bands associated with the two village locations: Waixude, "The Gray Blanket Village Group" or Hubdo, the "Fish-smell Village Group."

CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC AFFILIATION

The Poncas speak a dialect of the Dhegiha group of Siouan languages. Close linguistic and cultural relatives of the Poncas would include the Omahas, Kansas, Quapaws, and Osages. The dialects of the Omahas and Poncas are mutually-intelligible, with the exception of a few modern words (Grobsmith and Ritter 1992; Dorsey 1885). Perhaps predictably, the Omahas and Poncas, therefore, share a high degree of cultural similarity in terms of social, ceremonial, and political structure (Fletcher and "LaFlesche 1992).

ORIGIN AND MIGRATION TRADITIONS: FIRST AMERICAN CONTACTS

The Poncas are one of the five tribes in the Dhegiha language group, together with the Omahas, Quapaws, Kansas, and Osages. The origin of this group can be traced with some certainty to the Ohio River Basin (Howard 1965:4; Cash and Wolff 1975:2). Some traditions place earlier origins of the tribes "near a great body of water" (Fletcher and La Flesche 1992, 1:70), which has been interpreted variously as the Great Lakes, the Gulf of Mexico, or the Atlantic.

Dorsey (1884) prepared a map showing the migration of the five tribes and the significant events that occurred along the route (Fig. 3-1). This information is supported by other researchers, in particular Howard (1965) and Fletcher and La Flesche (1992). The five tribes, traveling together but already divided into the five tribal groups, followed the Ohio River to the Mississippi. At the mouth of the Ohio, the Quapaws followed the Mississippi downstream whereas the rest of the group migrated upstream. They spent some time at the confluence of the Missouri, in the area of today's St. Louis. After further migration westward, the Osages separated, following the Osage River into the area of today's southern Kansas, and the Kansas continued along the Missouri into what is today northeastern
Kansas. The Omahas and Poncas were joined by the Iowas and migrated gradually through the present-day states of Missouri and Iowa into the area of Pipestone, Minnesota. From there they proceeded to the Big Sioux River, and built a fortified village. Because of continued raids by the Dakotas, the three tribes were obliged to migrate further west to Lake Andes, South Dakota. There they cut the Sacred Pole and assigned particular customs and duties to each clan. After continuing further along the Missouri River to the mouth of the White River, they crossed to the west bank of the Missouri. There the Omahas and Iowas remained, while the Poncas went on to the Black Hills. After a short stay in the Black Hills, the Poncas returned eastward and reunited with the Omahas and Iowas. Together, they migrated downstream along the Missouri to the mouth of the Niobrara. Here the Poncas remained while the Omahas and Iowas continued further downstream.

Fletcher and La Flesche (1992) do not give an indication of the time period when this migration took place. According to Dorsey (in Howard 1965:15), the separation of the Quapaws had occurred before 1540, and the Poncas arrived at the Niobrara around 1670. Howard (1965:15-16) presents archeological evidence that would date the Ponca, Omaha, and Iowa village on the Big Sioux River to 1700, their stay at the White River to around 1715, and the final split between the Omahas and Poncas to 1735, which is also supported by Jablov's research (1974:28). On a map dated from 1718 there is an indication of the "Wandering Omahas" far above the Omahas and Iowas who are situated on the Big Sioux River (Howard 1965:24). It seems certain that the Poncas as a distinct tribe were living on the Niobrara by the 1730s. The first confirmed historical mention of the Poncas is in 1785, when they are reported to occupy a village at Bazile Creek (Jablov 1974:18; 331).

DEMOGRAPHY

The population figures of the Poncas prior to removal in 1877, as detailed in early reports of traders and explorers and later in censuses of Indian agents, present the picture of a population that is wildly fluctuating (see Fig. 3-2 and Table 3-1) (Jablov 1974:147; Howard 1965:17). While part of this fluctuation is certainly due to the difficulties in assessing an often-nomadic population, other sources also suggest a high flux due to epidemic diseases, especially smallpox, which struck the Poncas in 1801 (Fletcher and La Flesche 1992, 2:620; Howard 1965:26). The numbers, however, also demonstrate that the population had the ability to rebound to a general average of about 900 until the 1860s. This would indicate that the Poncas still had access to enough resources to offset the losses due to epidemics through increased birth rates.

After the land cession of 1858, population estimates become
more reliable due to increased government involvement in tribal affairs and the need for accurate population estimates in order to assess the need for rations. The agents' reports in the Annual Reports of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs (ARCIA) are a major source of information on the Poncas in this time period. By 1860 the bison had disappeared from the eastern Great Plains, which meant that the Poncas had to travel farther and farther west on their summer hunt. The increased travel time also meant more exposure to the Dakotas and a higher chance of missing the bison herds altogether. Howard (1965:30) reports that the last successful bison hunt took place in 1855. The increase in unsuccessful outcomes is demonstrated by the continued decline in Ponca population after 1860, and also supported by reports from agents (ARCIA 1860-1876; Welsh 1872). Dakota raids further intensified after the Ponca reservation was included in the Great Sioux Reservation in the 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty.

When the Poncas were removed in 1877, about 30 tribal members stayed behind with tribes in the area, such as the Omahas, Santees, and Yanktons (ARCIA 1877:102). Many mixed blood Poncas were also allowed to stay in the Niobrara region. After Standing Bear returned in 1879 (because his trial gained him permission to stay in the aboriginal Ponca territory) a steady stream of tribal members from the south increased the membership of the Northern Poncas (or cold Poncas) to a maximum of 230 in 1888 (Fig.3-3). When the reservation was parcelled up during the course of allotment in severalty, several members left the reservation and stayed permanently in the south. After this period, the Northern Ponca tribe increased steadily in numbers, a fact that also increased the problems associated with the limited amount of land available. At the time of termination in 1965, the Northern Ponca tribal membership was 442, about 70 of whom resided in the area of the reservation (U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary 1965).

TRIBAL TERRITORY AND GEOGRAPHY

The question of establishing a tribal territory is not an easy one, since Native American land tenure is quite different from Euroamerican concepts of land ownership and territory. In general, traditional Native American territories demonstrate a high degree of overlap and seasonality of use. One way of looking at Ponca geography is considering their "action space," i.e., the extent of the area utilized for all major activities. Clues to this territorial range appear in works by Jablow (1974) and Howard (1965). Howard (1970) also gives an account of the village sites of the Poncas, combining archeological and oral-history evidence.

The traditional subsistence base of the Poncas consisted of hunting, plant collection, and horticulture, which involved planting a variety of corn and beans in fields that were located
around the mouth of the Niobrara. They utilized a large area in
the central Great Plains for various activities, including
trading at the Missouri river, salt gathering at Salt Creek,
military and horse-raiding parties against the Pawnee and the
Sioux, visits to friendly tribes like the Omahas and Otoe-Missourias, and hunting all the way from the Missouri River to
the Rocky Mountains (Fig. 3-4). After the acquisition of the
horse in the early eighteenth century and the onset of the fur
trade, hunting increased even more in importance and resulted in
a westward expansion of the region utilized by the Poncas (Jablow
1974:29). The core of the Ponca territory was the area along the
Missouri River, between the mouth of the Niobrara Ponca Creek,
and Bazile Creek. This area was exclusively occupied by the
Poncas. Part of this core aboriginal territory was included
within the 1865 reservation boundaries; however, the area around
Bazile Creek was not included in any Ponca reservation and later
(1866) became part of the Santee reservation.

The Poncas claimed that their traditional hunting territory
extended from the Missouri River on the east to the Black Hills
and foothills of the Rocky Mountains in the west, and from the
White River in the north to the Platte in the south (Fig. 3-5).
The Poncas shared and disputed it with other tribes, notably the
Omahas to the east, the Pawnees to the south, and the Dakotas (or
Sioux) to the north and west. There are indications that the
area between the Niobrara and the Keya Paha rivers was respected
as Ponca territory, even though they could not prevent the much
stronger Dakotas from passing through it on their way to the
Platte (Jablow 1974:288).

The Ponca seasonal activities started with the preparation
of the fields in early spring. After spring planting, the tribe
would depart on the summer hunt into the western part of the
country, leaving the old and infirm at the villages. They would
return in the fall for harvesting, then leave again for their
winter hunt in October. They would stay out on the winter hunt
until, once again, it was time for spring planting. This
seasonal round is of course idealized, there is evidence that the
Poncas totally abandoned horticulture in some years, especially
in the 1830s and 1840s (Jablow 1974:329-330). In other years,
they were prevented from going on the hunt by the hostile
Dakotas.

During the late 1700s and early 1800s the Poncas had
benefitted from the fur trade, which provided an incentive to
increase hunting in the winter. The guns received from the trade
could tip the balance of power in the region in their favor and
other goods were traded with tribes further upstream. To protect
their preferential access to trade goods and their position as
middlemen, the Poncas also tried to prevent traders from
continuing upstream on the Missouri (Howard 1965:25-26). By
1830, however, the number of fur bearing animals in the area was
substantially reduced and the power of the Ponca position had declined. At this time the Poncas took up a fully nomadic lifestyle in order to follow the buffalo to the west (Wishart 1992:66-67).

In the first half of the nineteenth century, the Poncas made several treaties with the U.S. government, starting in 1817 with a friendship treaty, which was renewed in 1826. Being remote from the resettled eastern Indians and the Oregon Trail, they were not (unlike other Nebraska Indians) pressured to sell land in the 1830s and 1840s. Indeed that was the time when they discontinued their village life and took up a nomadic lifestyle, following the decreasing buffalo herds to the west. To this end they had to ally themselves with the Dakota and participate in raids against their close relatives, the Omahas. After the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, however, and the decline of the bison herds, they were obliged to consider selling lands for basic support. Their last successful summer bison hunt took place in 1855; after this date their fragile alliance with the Teton Dakotas was over. This made it impossible for the Poncas to venture west to the bison herds and return with their bounty (Ritter-Knoche 1990). In 1858 they ceded the vast part of their land and retained a reservation between the Niobrara and Ponca Creek. The extent of this cession was disputed, because the Poncas claimed a much larger territory than was finally accepted in the treaty. The Omahas and Pawnees had ceded their lands in 1854 and 1857, and as a result of these overlapping claims, no description of the ceded lands entered into the final treaty with the Poncas. It was, in essence, defined by default.

The traditional territory claimed by the Poncas, as described in original sources, is confusing in its description and is contradictory when actually mapped. They claimed that their territory was bounded by lines

Beginning at the mouth of the river Aoway, thence up Elk Creek to the old Omaha Village on the river Elk Horn, thence westwardly to the Black Hills, thence along the Black Hills to the source of the White River, thence down said river to where it empties into the Missouri, thence down the Missouri to the beginning. (Jablow 1974:414)

The problem is that the source of the White River is to the southwest of the Black Hills. This error is probably a result of poor translation and the unfamiliarity of the translator with the area. In all likelihood, the area that was supposed to be delineated is the one shown as hunting territory on Fig. 3-5.

When, in the middle of the twentieth century, these disputed Indian claims to land were adjudicated, the Indian Claims Commission ruled that the Poncas only held aboriginal title to territory that was exclusive of the cessions made by other tribes.
According to the Commission, the Ponca territory was bounded by the Omaha cession of 1854 to the east, the Pawnee cession of 1857 to the south, and the Fort Laramie Treaty line of 1851 to the west (Fig. 3-6). This line ran directly from the mouth of the White river to the forks of the Platte. The boundary between the Pawnee and the Ponca cessions was set as the deciding line between the watersheds of the Elkhorn and the Niobrara. The western boundary of the Omaha cession was the west line of Range 5 West of Principal Meridian, Nebraska (Jablow 1974:298). The compensation received for this 2,334,000-acre cession was $455,000, which amounts to 19.5 cents per acre. In its decision, the Indian Claims Commission accepted one dollar per acre as fair market value, the price a hypothetical informed purchaser would have made at the time of taking (Wishart 1990).

The original description of the reservation created in 1858 is also ambiguous and led to confusion. It was first described as Beginning at a point on the Neobrara River and running due north so as to intersect the Ponca River twenty-five miles from its mouth; thence from said point of intersection, up and along the Ponca River, twenty--miles; thence due south to the Neobrara River; and thence down along said river to the place of the beginning. (Royce 1899:818-819)

It was found, however, that this description did not conform to the tract actually intended for the Poncas, so in 1860 the eastern boundary was set by the Commissioner of the General land office to be the line between Ranges 8 and 9 West, and the western boundary to be the line between Ranges 12 and 13 West of Principal Meridian, Nebraska (Royce 1899:818-819).

Unfortunately, this reservation was poor farming land and had very little timber. In addition, their reservation was removed from their traditional fields and burial grounds. The promised protection of person and property made by the federal government in the 1858 treaty turned out to be considerably less than expected, and the Dakotas, especially the Brule Dakotas, raided frequently. Far removed from the next Euroamerican settlement, the small Ponca nation was easy prey for the Dakota raiding parties who were punishing them for making treaties with the United States government. Frequent pleas by the Poncas and their agent for guns and ammunition were ignored. No wonder that the agency was located on the far eastern side of the reservation, as close as possible to the nearest Euroamerican settlement in Niobrara (Fig. 3-7).

In 1865, the federal government, supposedly rewarding the Poncas for their "constant fidelity to the government and citizens thereof," exchanged the western part of their reservation for the area between the Niobrara and the Missouri, thereby returning their traditional burial grounds and fields (Royce 1899:836) (Fig. 3-7). The area received by the Poncas coincides with the part of the
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reservation located in Knox County, Nebraska. The agency was at once relocated to the Missouri River, which provided both protection from the Dakotas and easier access for supplies brought up the Missouri River.

In 1868, the Ponca reservation was included in the Fort Laramie treaty as part of the Great Sioux reservation. Since the Ponca title to the land was older, however, it should not have changed the status of the Ponca reservation as Ponca land. The federal government, however, did nothing to correct this error, and also neglected to protect the Poncas from the intensified Dakota raiding parties. All this time the reservation was part of Dakota Territory; not until allotment in 1891 did the area become part of Nebraska when her northern boundary was shifted from the Niobrara to the 43rd parallel.

In 1877, the Ponca tribe was removed to Indian Territory. The removal is described in the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for 1877 and shown on Fig. 3-8. After crossing the Niobrara, they proceeded through Milford, Nebraska, along Shell Creek and the Big Blue River to Manhattan, Kansas. They continued along the Neosho River to the Quapaw reservation in Indian Territory, south of Baxter Springs, Kansas. It was a story of disasters and large loss of life, indicated by the gravesites left along the way. Because of the poor conditions found on the new reservation in Indian Territory, several Poncas returned to the aboriginal homeland in Nebraska, among them Standing Bear and Smoke Maker, a hereditary chief. After the trial of Standing Bear in which the Poncas also gained the right to choose their residence, more Poncas returned from Indian Territory, finally forming the Northern Ponca Tribe. They settled on the old reservation grounds. Since it was also, at least officially, part of the Great Sioux reservation, no non-Indian settlements existed north of the Niobrara until 1890, when the reservation was allotted.

**SUBSISTENCE**

While the ethnographic record lacks documentation of Ponca subsistence prior to the 1780s, most contemporary scholars agree that the Poncas pursued a mixed subsistence strategy which included hunting, fishing, gathering of wild plant resources, and horticulture. Interestingly, many of the early ethnohistoric accounts tend to emphasize the nomadic bison hunting lifestyle (Jablow 1974; Lewis 1806), while others emphasize the sedentary, horticultural nature of Ponca subsistence (Tabeau in Jablow 1974; DeSmet 1905). Blakeslee and O'Shea (1983) suggest that the conflicting characterizations may represent the failure of Euroamericans to grasp the seasonal shifts in subsistence strategies practiced by the Poncas. The Poncas practiced a seasonal cycle which featured two communal bison hunts (in the spring and fall) interspersed with periodic semisedentary village life to pursue horticultural activities.
Arguably, hunting (particularly of bison) was one of the most important subsistence activities of the Poncas and therefore occupied the majority of their time. Factors which would have contributed to the documented shifts toward greater reliance on bison hunting would include: access to the horse and gun; economic incentives provided by the fur trade; the need to maintain mobility to escape the ravages of epidemic disease; and predation of the more-sedentary Plains tribes by the Teton Dakotas.

According to Howard (1965:39) and Dorsey (1884:283), the Poncas distinguished between two types of hunting, abaye, "hunting by small groups of men without their families," and gax an, or "tribal hunts when the entire group, with its belongings, moved in pursuit of the bison." Communal bison hunts typically occurred twice yearly, one in late spring or early summer (after the corn fields were planted and hoed), the other in the fall (after the harvest). The length of the fall/winter hunt depended on the success of the hunt, the Poncas would not return until they had procured enough dried bison meat to overwinter. Consequently, the tribe sometimes did not return to the village until early spring.

'The buffalo hunt was sacred to the Ponca because they depended upon the buffalo for their winter store of dried meat'. Some idea of the tremendous importance of the bison to the people may be gained from Ponca ceremonies, nearly all of which have some bison symbolism. (Peter Le Claire quoted in Howard 1965:39)

The tribal hunts were led by an appointed hunt leader, assisted by the Buffalo-police. The hunt procession was led by the "sacred tribal pipe in its bundle..., tended by its priest or keeper..." (Howard 1965:40). Each night, the group camped in the Huduga or camp circle, which organized the camp by clan. Howard (1965) reports that the surround was one of the preferred methods of hunting on the communal hunt, and that cows and young buffalo were the preferred prey. Other game animals important in the Ponca economy included elk, deer, pronghorn antelope, and various species of small game (Howard 1965).

Wild plant foods and herbs, gathered primarily by Ponca women, included wildrice, wild onions, Indian-potatoes, wild sweetpeas, water chinquapin, ground beans, and tipsina or prairie turnips. Important cultigens included maize, beans, squash, gourds, pumpkins, and tobacco. Hartley (1983:105) suggests that the type of maize planted by the Poncas was likely the eight-rowed variety, similar to samples recovered at the Ponca Fort site (25KX1) (Galinat and Gunnerson 1963).

TECHNOLOGY
Howard (1965:51) characterizes Ponca material culture as reflecting both a "Woodland heritage" and "later a Prairie-Plains orientation." He goes on to state that

Thus the artifact inventory of the 19th-century Ponca includes not only most of the items common to the "classic" High Plains groups but also most of those common to the Central Algonquians as well. (Howard 1965:51)

Ponca material culture included woodworking, rope-making, basketry, weaving, leather-tanning and dyeing, lithic manufacture, and ceramic manufacture. For the Poncas, the bow and arrow was the most important weapon in the prehistoric and protohistoric periods (Howard 1965:54).

The Poncas utilized four types of dwellings at the time of European contact (Howard 1965:56). The most common dwelling at the time of contact was the round earthlodge or *maithi*. The Poncas credit the Arikaras, or "Sand Pawnee," with teaching them to construct earthlodges (Howard 1965). A large earthlodge might be occupied by an extended family, often consisting of two or three brothers and their families. Bushnell (1922:84; also cited in Howard 1965:56) relates that earthlodges were not arranged in the traditional camp circle, or *huduga*, but were instead arranged to accommodate individual family needs. Earthlodges were traditionally constructed by women and generally featured an east-facing entryway, "in order to catch the morning sun" (Howard 1965).

Reflecting their possible Algonquin associations, the Poncas also reportedly constructed "wigwam" dwellings, although hides were frequently substituted for the more traditional bark covering. The two types reportedly utilized by the Poncas were the *diudipu* or hemispherical wigwam and the elongated wigwam or *diudipu-snide*.

The fourth type of dwelling described as traditional for the Poncas was the tipi or *thiudidj*. The tipi was used during the communal hunts and for temporary shelter. Typically, the tipi was of the three-pole foundation variety, and featured twelve to twenty lodgepole construction. Tipis were covered with hides, frequently decorated with individual or clan markings.

**SETTLEMENT**

Early village sites are indicated by Howard (1970) who collected this information from oral-history and archaeological evidence (Fig. 3-4). Some of these village sites were permanent, especially in the core area around the Niobrara and Bazile Creek, and consisted of earth lodges. Others are older sites, occupied during their migration with the Omahas, or village sites to be occupied with tipis on the bison hunt. Of special note are the
sites near Pipestone, Minnesota, and on the Upper Missouri, dating back to the early migration. Temporary sites were in southeastern Nebraska, at the mouth of the Platte and on Salt Creek. The site in the Black Hills is Wind Cave, also dating to the early Ponca migrations.

Before removal the Poncas were located in three villages, with the majority of individuals (377) residing in the agency village, 248 residing in Point Village (or Gray Blanket Village), and 114 residing in Hubdon Village (Fletcher and LaFlesche 1992, 1:51). There was no particular relationship between band affiliation and the village of residence, except for the mixed-blood band, which almost exclusively resided in the agency village (ARCIA 1874). Point Village was located on the west bank of the Niobrara, while Hubdon (or Fishsmell) village was on the Missouri, near the mouth of Ponca Creek. The Ponca fields indicated by a surveyor in 1858 also give an indication of the traditional Ponca settlement area (U.S. Department of the Interior, General Land Office n.d.) (Fig. 3-9). The village sites are indicated, and so are some of the traditional fields, located in the flood plains of the Missouri and the Niobrara. These were chosen because of the soils in the floodplains were much easier worked and more fertile than the prairie soils on the bluffs and highlands. These areas were preferred when allotments were taken out in 1890. The map also shows the different roads leading from the town of Niobrara to Fort Randall and to the different agencies. The site of the agency from 1859 to 1865 and the associated village site and fields were apparently not utilized after the agency had been shifted further east. Some of the traditional burial sites located on the bluffs overlooking the Missouri are also indicated.

After removal and return of part of the tribe, the settlement on the reservation was dispersed, with most Poncas living in their own wood-frame houses, furnished by the government and located near their particular fields. Since they did not have their own agent, but were part of the Santee agency, there was little supervision (ARCIA 1880-1890). It is around these locations that allotments were taken out in 1890. The location of the allotment of the head of family should therefore give a good indication of the residence of any particular family in the 1880s. When the sale of allotments began in 1902, more and more Poncas left the reservation.

TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION

Before acquiring the horse, sometime in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century, the Poncas relied on domesticated dogs as beasts of burden. The Poncas reportedly had different breeds of dogs for various purposes, for example, large dogs (similar to Great Danes) (Howard 1965:48) were used to pull travois and were especially valuable on the hunt. Other breeds
of dogs were raised specifically for hunting or meat and hair.

While the ethnographic record lacks a clear consensus regarding the source of the first Ponca horses, the most likely channels were through the Padoucas or perhaps the Teton Dakotas (Fletcher and LaFlesche 1992; Howard 1965). Regardless of the origin, the horse rapidly became an integral part of the Ponca subsistence economy, raiding complex, and status system. Horses were used to pull travois on the hunt and for military and raiding purposes. Horse stealing or raiding was an important avenue for young men to enhance their status by demonstrating bravery. Horses also represented wealth and were thus frequently given away as bridewealth to the family of a Ponca bride.

SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Ponca social life was organized around the huđuga, or camp circle, which represented seven patrilineal exogamous clans (Skinner 1915; Fletcher and LaFlesche 1911; Howard 1965). While some evidence exists for the division of clans into subclans, there is little evidence of phratries or moieties. In historic times, an eighth clan was added to accommodate the children of non-Indian unions. Individual clans strictly possessed "ceremonies and traditional prerogatives," utilizing clan markings on arrows and property, clan haircuts, clan bundles, and specialized ritual knowledge (Howard 1965:97). Beginning with the first clan and proceeding clockwise around the camp circle, the Ponca clans were: 1) Wazaze, 2) Nikapsna, 3) Dixida, 4) Wasabe, 5) Maka, 6) Nuxe, 7) Hisada, and 8) Wageziga. In addition, each clan had its own hereditary chief who exercised authority over his clan.

Individual status within the tribe was determined by one's position in the family, the family's position within the clan, and the clan's position within the tribe (Dorsey 1897:213). Social prestige could also be gained through war honors or shamanism (Blakeslee and O'Shea 1983). As is true with many American Indian societies, generosity was a highly regarded virtue among the Poncas and was a requisite among leaders.

In addition to tribal clan affiliation, Nikie kinship, or kinship based on a common mythical ancestor is reported by Dorsey (1884a:252-253). This category of kinship often cross-cut tribal or clan affiliation and aligned members of the Ponca and Omaha tribes possessing similar Nikie kin together. The existence of this practice perhaps lends further weight to the contention that the Poncas and Omahas were once a single tribe and thus acknowledged their common ancestry (Ritter-Knoche 1990:28). The Poncas also had numerous dancing societies which cross-cut clan affiliations (Skinner 1915; Howard 1965; Blakeslee and O'Shea 1983).
Marriage, in Ponca society, was usually accompanied by a substantial gift of property to the family of the bride (bridewealth), e.g., horses. Generally speaking, marriages were arranged, either by the groom or his family, with the bride's family. Postmarital residence was frequently patrilocal, but in the historic period newlyweds were allowed to choose whether to live with or near either spouse's kin or to set up housekeeping independent of either set of kin. Typically, a girl would marry between the ages of fourteen and sixteen, men were generally older at the time of marriage. Traditionally, the Poncas practiced polygyny and favored sororal polygyny (the marrying of sisters). Howard's (1965:148) informants reported that a woman never had more than two husbands at a time. Howard (1965) reports that husbands practiced a strict mother-in-law avoidance. Divorce was easily obtained, usually informally. A man could "give away" his wife at the Heduska ceremony to a younger man, thereby ending his marital obligation and simultaneously gaining prestige (Howard 1965:148).

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE: DIVISION OF LABOR

As is true with most Plains Indian groups, the Poncas observed a strict division of labor by gender. Generally speaking, domestic tasks were the responsibility of women, for example, cooking, food processing, child-rearing, preparing and decorating hides, building dwellings, and making ceramics. In addition, women were primarily responsible for performing horticultural duties, with the exception of harvesting which the men assisted with. Male activity spheres included leadership roles in hunting, raiding, and ceremonial and political arenas. Men were also responsible for manufacturing lithics and other tools and weapons associated with the hunt and warfare.

POLITICAL ORGANIZATION

The political hierarchy included two categories of chiefs, responsible for both civil and ceremonial leadership duties. Of the 14 Ponca chiefs, seven were chiefs of the first rank, or "big chiefs" and seven were chiefs of the second rank, "little chiefs." Chiefs of the first rank were generally promoted from the rank of "little chief" and were commonly descended patrilineally from chiefs of the first rank. Each chief was a pipe carrier and, "as a symbol of his rank wore, on ceremonial occasions, an otterskin cap with a downy eagle plume erect in a socket at the back" (Howard 1965:92).

The head chief was always chosen from the ranking clan, the Wasabe clan, and was responsible for the sacred tribal pipe. In addition, he presided over council meetings and installed new chiefs (Ritter-Knoche 1990; Howard 1965).

As mentioned previously, each clan had a hereditary chief.
This chief was generally, but not always, a member of the council of chiefs. Strictly speaking, this hereditary chief had authority only over members of his clan. Howard (1965) also recognizes the Ituzpa, who were successful warriors who had demonstrated behavior consistent with protecting the welfare of the people. In addition, the Buffalo-police played an important role in implementing the policies of the hunt leader and/or council of chiefs.

Tribal decision making was often characterized as consensus-based, which required a majority of tribal members to support the decisions of the council of chiefs. This style of governing often required protracted council and discussion to reach broad-based agreement. Howard (1965) suggests this style of government was a source of dissatisfaction with Euroamericans who dealt with the Poncas and were more accustomed to a strongly hierarchical decision-making process.

LIFE CYCLE

Howard (1965:141-143) characterizes Ponca attitudes towards sexuality and childbirth as "natural." While promiscuity was not generally tolerated, men and unmarried women were allowed many freedoms. As was true with many plains tribes, the Poncas reportedly allowed men (usually warriors) to take berdaches as wives (Howard 1965). According to Williams (1986) a berdache is "a morphological male who does not fill a society's standard man's role, who has a non-masculine character".

Childrearing was "permissive," with little physical discipline used. For Ponca boys, the vision quest was an essential part of their supernatural instruction. Howard's (1965) informants indicate that young boys often began accompanying Ponca warriors in raiding and warfare at the ages of twelve or thirteen. Adolescent girls had puberty ceremonies, but evidently this custom did not extend to boys.

Marriage customs are sparsely documented; however, Howard (1965) suggests that marriage feasts typically accompanied the nuptials. The Poncas practiced polygyny, preferring sororal polygyny, and accommodated divorce. Remarriage, after death of a spouse or divorce, was permitted for women as well as men.

In aboriginal times, elders had high status and were well-respected. It was considered an honor to hunt for the aged.

The Omahas and Ponkas never abandoned the infirm aged people on the prairie. They left them at home, where they could remain till the return of the hunting party. They were provided with a shelter among the trees, food, water, and fire... The Indians were afraid to abandon (wagda) their aged people, lest Wakada should punish them when they were away
from home. (Dorsey 1884:274-275 in Howard 1965:149)

Whitman (1939:192-193) suggests that acculturation undermined this value system.

Death, in Ponca society, was seen as the result of various malevolent or supernatural causes, and could therefore be prevented by a medicine man. Dorsey (1894) suggests that the Poncas believed in an eternal spirit that existed after the death of the physical body. It was customary for the Poncas to conduct a giveaway ceremony after the death of a relative. Ponca funerary customs included using the scaffold (during winter when the ground was frozen) and interment was often accompanied by grave goods. The Poncas typically chose to bury their dead in the hills surrounding their encampments (Blakeslee and O'Shea 1983).

RELIGION

The Ponca people characterize themselves as being a spiritual people, with strong religious overtones interwoven throughout every aspect of their daily lives. It is relatively difficult to separate Ponca aboriginal belief systems from influences gained as a result of contact with Euroamericans as well as neighboring tribal groups (1965). Howard (1965:99) suggests that the documented Ponca concept of an all-powerful creator, Wakanda, is a notion which may have been influenced by contacts with Euroamerican representations of the Judeo-Christian god. For the Poncas, Wakanda is described as "the mysterious" or "powerful one" (Howard 1965; Ritter-Knoche 1990).

One prevalent religious theme is the concept of xube, which is an animatistic supernatural force. The Poncas believed that certain individuals, as well as animate and inanimate objects and places could attract and maintain this supernatural force. Xube could be sought on a vision quest, publicly at the Sun Dance or bought and sold in the form of medicine packets (Howard 1965).

Xube was often "stored" in medicine packets or bundles, packets which were usually individually owned and related to the owner's special vision. Bundles were larger and frequently "owned" by the clan, society or the tribe as a whole. The packets and bundles were considered sacred and treated with great reverence. (Ritter-Knoche 1990:31)

Ceremonials and ceremonial preparations consumed considerable time and resources in nineteenth-century Ponca life. Among the most important of these ceremonials to survive into the historic period were the Sun Dance, the Pipe Dance or Wa-wa, and the Heduska or War Dance. For more detail on these and other Ponca ceremonials see: G.A. Dorsey 1905; Howard 1961, 1965, 1971; Fletcher and La Flesche 1992; Skinner 1915.
As earlier mentioned, ceremonial activity and symbolism was interwoven into many aspects of Ponca daily life. As a result, it is often difficult to distinguish between purely "ceremonial" versus "secular" activities. This characterization is particularly true in regards to societies, games, and dances. In particular, the various "medicine societies" had definite ritual elements, generally relying on the power of various animal spirits, contacted during vision quests, to aid in healing. Howard (1965) estimates that nineteenth-century Poncas dedicated up to one-third of their time to these categories of activities. The societies, e.g. dance, medicine, warriors', women's, etc., were intra-tribal organizations which cross-cut clan affiliations. Membership was often "purchased", as, for example, with the Medicine Lodge Society, and entailed various ritual prerogatives and responsibilities. Many societies owned their own sacred bundles.

Footraces were quite popular with the Poncas, and perhaps predictably when horses were obtained, horse racing became an important pastime. Howard (1965:126-130) also mentions the shinny game, the Magađeze or arrow game, the bowl dice game, the moccasin game, the hand game, and various children's games as important diversions for the Poncas.

CONCLUSIONS

Howard (1965) suggests that the Southern Poncas have been more successful in retaining their traditions than the Northern Poncas, who have endured considerably greater assimilationist pressures (see Chapters 7 and 29). However, the Southern Poncas have adopted many traditions from neighboring tribes since settling in Oklahoma. For example, the Native American Church, or peyote religion, is highly popular among the Southern Poncas. The Northern Poncas, for the most part, have not become peyotists. Perhaps reflecting the influence of the Lakota and other northern Plains tribes, many Northern Poncas continue to practice the sacred pipe religion, including an annual Sun Dance (under the guidance of Lakota medicine men). The Northern and Southern Poncas sponsored an historic re-unification ceremony at the first annual Northern Ponca powwow in 1994 (at the historic self-help community building powwow grounds near Niobrara, Nebraska). This symbolic ceremony marks the renewed commitment of both Ponca Tribes to share their collective cultural destinies to heal the Ponca Nation's sacred hoop.
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Table 3-1. Historical population figures for the Ponca Indians, 1780-1898. The Poncas were removed to Indian Territory in 1877, so estimates of the Poncas in Oklahoma begin in 1878; estimates of Poncas who returned to Nebraska begin in 1880.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Northern Ponca est.</th>
<th>Southern Ponca est.</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>800 persons</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mooney, cited in Jablow 1974:365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>50 warriors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vilemont, cited in Jablow 1974:365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca. 1803</td>
<td>400 warriors</td>
<td></td>
<td>de Finiels 1989:93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td>250 warriors or persons</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chouteau, cited in Jablow 1974:365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>50 warriors; ca. 200 persons</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lewis and Clark, cited in Jablow 1974:365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>300 warriors; 1,400 persons</td>
<td></td>
<td>Louisiana Gazette, 25 Apr 1811, cited in Jablow 1974:365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>750 &amp; 1,250 persons</td>
<td></td>
<td>Morse, cited in Jablow 1974:365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>180 warriors; 900-1,000 persons</td>
<td></td>
<td>Atkinson, cited in Jablow 1974:366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>300 warriors;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doughtery, Estimate...Upper Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>1,500 persons</td>
<td>Agency, 1 Sep 1829, cited in Jablow 1974: 366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>600 persons</td>
<td>Schoolcraft, cited in Jablow 1974:366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>400-500 persons</td>
<td>Catlin, cited in Jablow 1974:366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>300 warriors</td>
<td>Maximilian, cited in Jablow 1974:366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>800 or 1,000 persons</td>
<td>Merrill, cited in Jablow 1974:366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>800 persons</td>
<td>I. McCoy, Annual Register of Indian Affairs with the Indian (or Western) Territory, 1835, cited in Jablow 1974: 336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>600-800 persons</td>
<td>Parker, cited in Jablow 1974:336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>75-100 men</td>
<td>Doughtery to Clark, 20 Aug 1835, cited in Jablow 1974:336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Ca. 100 warriors</td>
<td>Pilcher to Clark, 26 Aug 1835, cited in Jablow 1974:336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>800 persons</td>
<td>ARCA, 1836, cited in Jablow 1974:337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>900 persons</td>
<td>Schoolcraft, cited in Jablow 1974:337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>900 persons</td>
<td>ARCA, 1837, cited in Jablow 1974:337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>800 persons</td>
<td>Farnham, cited in Jablow 1974:337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>800 persons</td>
<td>ARCA, 1841, cited in Jablow 1974:337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>800 persons</td>
<td>ARCA, 1842, cited in Jablow 1974:337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>800 persons</td>
<td>ARCA, 1843, cited in Jablow 1974:337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>777 persons</td>
<td>ARCA, 1844, cited in Jablow 1974:337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>777 persons</td>
<td>ARCA, 1845, cited in Jablow 1974:337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Estimated Population</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>1,600 persons</td>
<td>ARClA, 1847, cited in Jablow 1974:338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>1,000 persons</td>
<td>Schoolcraft, cited in Jablow 1974:338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>1,000+ persons</td>
<td>De Smet, cited in Jablow 1974:338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>800 persons</td>
<td>Schoolcraft, cited in Jablow 1974:338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>700 persons</td>
<td>Schoolcraft, cited in Jablow 1974:338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>716 persons</td>
<td>Gregory to Wilson, 20 Jul 1858, cited in Jablow 1974:338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1000 (approx.)</td>
<td>Graph, notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>ARClA, 1861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>ARClA, 1862</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>ARClA, 1863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>ARClA, 1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>ARClA, 1866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>ARClA, 1867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>ARClA, 1869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>730 (approx.)</td>
<td>Graph, notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>ARClA, 1871</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>ARClA, 1872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>ARClA, 1873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>ARClA, 1874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Code 1</td>
<td>Code 2</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>730</td>
<td></td>
<td>ARCIA, 1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>717</td>
<td></td>
<td>ARCIA, 1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td></td>
<td>620</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td></td>
<td>*530</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1879 (66 left reservation during year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: See Jablou 1974 for identification of many primary sources. ARCIA refers to the Annual Reports of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the year indicated.
Figure 3-1: Ponca Migration

References: Dorsey 1884; Howard 1935
Figure 2: Ponca Population 1780-1878

Source: Jablow 1974; ARCIA 1860, 1870, 1874, 1878
Figure 4: Northern Ponca Population

Source: ARCIA for years indicated
Figure #3: Area Utilized by the Ponca at the Time of First Contact

Source: Howard 1886, 1970; Jublin 1974
Figure 4: Traditional Hunting Territory Claimed by the Ponca
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Present day towns:

Figure 4: Ponca Treaty of 1865
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Figure 9: Cultural Landscape in the late 1800s
CHAPTER 4

ETHNONYMY OF THE SIOUX

Thomas D. Thiessen

A great deal of confusion exists in the literature about appropriate names for the Sioux as a group and for various linguistic, political, and geographic divisions of the Sioux. A plethora of bewildering names have been applied to the Sioux as a whole and to each of the seven major cultural subdivisions of the Sioux, as well as for the many further subgroupings and bands. The Sioux, or large segments of them, are commonly and variously called Sioux, Dakotas, Lakotas, Nakotas, Santees, or Tetons to distinguish them from more distant linguistic kinsmen such as the Chiwere-speaking tribes (Winnebagos, Ioways, Otos, and Missourias); the Dhegiha-speakers (Omahas, Poncas, Quapaws, Osages, Kansas); and others who speak languages classified within the Siouan language family (such as Assiniboins, Mandans, Hidatsas, Crows, and others). The problem is compounded by the frequent combination of these names together, such as Teton Lakotas, Santee Dakotas, Dakota Sioux, and the like, or combined with geographic descriptors or more specific subdivision names for the Sioux, such as Western Tetons, Eastern Dakotas, Middle Sioux, Oglala Dakotas, etc. The combination of these terms often results in a degree of redundancy in meaning, as, for example in the case of "Eastern Dakotas," in which both terms may be taken to designate the Eastern, or Santee, division of the Sioux. An explanation of some of these terms, and their various usages in this report, follows.

The term Siouan most commonly refers to a broadly related group of languages, called a linguistic family or stock, comprised of a relatively large number of tribes, or groups of tribes, that speak distantly related, but mutually unintelligible, languages. It is generally presumed that the tribes comprising a linguistic family at some time in the distant past shared a common language, and that the processes of cultural and linguistic change through time have caused these groups to become more and more divergent from each other both linguistically and culturally. Consequently, the Siouan linguistic family may be said to be comprised of the Sioux, the Dhegiha-speaking branch (Omahas, Poncas, Quapaws, Osages, Kansas), the Chiwere-speaking branch (Winnebagos, Ioways, Otos, and Missourias), the Northern Plains groups (Mandans, Hidatsas, Crows, Assiniboins), and several other non-Plains tribes in the southeastern United States. The term Siouan was first applied to these groups by Albert Gallatin (1836), and remains purely a broad linguistic designation.
The name Sioux, is used to collectively designate the
speakers of three dialects of a single language: Dakota, Nakota,
and Lakota. The term Sioux is a corruption of an Ojibway name
variably given as nadowe-ssi-wag (Powell in Holder 1966:187),
Natawesiwck (Howard 1980:2), Nadoesiuox (Swanton 1952:280) or
Nadoussieux (O'Callaghan 1855:153), Naduesiu or nadowe-is-ug
(Hodge 1912,2:577; Powers 1975:5), and other variations.
Naduesiu is the term that appears in the earliest written
reference to the Sioux, contained in the Jesuit Relation for 1640
and based on information gathered by the Frenchman, Jean
Nicollet, some years earlier (Thwaites 1898:231). The shortened
name Scioux appears in French records at least by 1736
(O'Callaghan 1855:1055) and probably considerably earlier.
Applied to the Sioux by their Algonkian-speaking enemies, the
Ojibwas, the term is regarded as having both diminutive and
perjorative connotation, meaning lesser "adders," "snakes," or,
generally, "enemies" (Hodge 1912,2:577: Swanton 1952:280; Powell
in Holder 1966:187; Howard 1980:2; Powers 1975:5). The original
Ojibwa term distinguished the Sioux from the "real adders," the
Iroquois, also enemies of the Ojibwas (Powers 1975:5). Because
of its perjorative meaning and the fact that it is derived from a
non-Sioux name, some writers have preferred not to use the term
Sioux (e.g., Powell in Holder 1966:188), but the name is probably
the most widely used today to collectively designate the
speakers of the Dakota, Nakota, and Lakota dialects. Indeed, it
is a name often used by Dakota, Nakota, and Lakota speakers to
designate themselves when speaking English (Powers 1975:9;
Steltenkamp 1993:3). For example, the formal corporate names for
the Sioux groups in the NIMI area are "Santee Sioux Tribe of
Nebraska" and "Yankton Sioux Tribe."

By what name do the Sioux call themselves in their own
language? The Sioux have a tradition of having called
themselves, in their original Minnesota homeland, Oceti Sakowin,
which translates as "the Seven Fireplaces" or "the Seven Council
Fires," referring to seven villages or divisions of the tribe
(Riggs 1852:vii; Howard 1980:3; Powers 1975:3-5).

Another name for the Sioux, Dakota (also variously spelled
Dahcota, Dakotah, and other ways), is widely used among Indians
and non-Indians alike. An early classifier of American Indian
languages, Albert Gallatin (1836), applied the Sioux word
Dahcota, meaning "friend" or "ally," to the "Dakota tribes proper
as distinguished from the other members of the linguistic family
who are not Dakotas in a tribal sense" (Powell in Holder

1 Goddard (1980:105) gives a different interpretation of
Nadouessiuox and the names it derives from. He believes that it
is derived not from an Algonquian form for "snake," but from
na-towe-, meaning "Iroquoian." Hence, he renders the root of the
Gallicized Nadouessiuox as "speaker of a foreign language."
1966:188; all three dialectal names have essentially similar meanings—see Powers 1975:16-17), meaning the Sioux. John Wesley Powell, whose 1891 classification of American Indian languages is still a key reference today, seconded Gallatin's use of the name Dakota. The term is often still used in much this sense, although strictly speaking, Dakota refers to one of three language dialects, not to a politically or ethnically defined group of people. Thus, as Powers (1975:8, 11) points out, "Most of the constituent members of Powell's Dakota subclass theoretically could not even say Dakota, much less be one."

Consequently, strictly speaking, it is proper to speak of Dakota speakers, but not of Dakotas as a cultural group. Nevertheless, the term has achieved considerable currency among speakers of all three dialects as a name for the cultural group widely termed the Sioux, and that usage is followed in some of the succeeding sections of this overview, in deference to the preference of individual authors. In addition, many Santees follow a similar usage in referring to themselves as Dakotas and many Lakota speakers call themselves by the name of their dialect, Lakotas. These terms appear in that sense in some of the following sections of this volume. The term Nakota has been applied to the Middle Sioux peoples (Howard 1980:4; Lowie 1982:8), the Yanktons and the Yanktonais, but Raymond DeMallie (1982:xi) has pointed out that this usage is incorrect because the Yanktons and Yanktonais also call themselves Dakotas. He suggests that the name "Nakota" be used to designate only the Assiniboins, who at one time were part of the Yanktonais (Hodge 1912, 1:103; Swanton 1952:282, 387). Other terms that equate with Sioux, which have also come into general use though their use lacks substantial time depth, are Sioux Nation, Great Sioux Nation, Dakota Nation, and Great Dakota Nation. Again, because of individual authors' preference, some of these terms will also be found in succeeding discussions of this overview. Use of dialectal terms to designate cultural rather than linguistic groups is not improper except in the strictest sense, but rather is an example of linguistic change, i.e., of how word meanings and forms change through time in any given language.

Although all of the Sioux groups believe that they resided near the headwaters of the Mississippi River in Minnesota at the time of first contact with Euroamericans, military pressure from Indian groups to the eastward, notably the Ojibwas, as well as the attractions of the Plains environment of western Minnesota and further west—a region with which at least a part of the Sioux probably were acquainted for a long time before their exodus from the woodlands (White 1978:321-322; Wood 1985; Michlovic 1985)—impelled portions of the Sioux to move southward and westward of their homeland, probably in the latter part of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (White 1978). Thus, the Sioux split into three geographical divisions, each speaking a different language dialect: the Eastern Sioux or Santees (Dakota
speakers), the Middle Sioux (Nakota speakers), and the Western Sioux or Tetons (Lakota speakers).

The original "Seven Fireplaces," or villages, were individually called:

Mdewakantonwan or Mdewkanton, translated variously as "Spirit Lake People" (Howard 1980:3), "Spirit Lake village" (Powell in Holder 1966:190), and "mystery lake people" (Hodge 1912, 1:826), referring to Mille Lacs Lake in east-central Minnesota.

Wahpekute, translated as "Shooters Among the Leaves" (Hodge 1912, 2:890; Howard 1980:3)

Sisitowwan or Sisseton, translated as "People of the Boggy Ground" (Howard 1980:3) or "lake village" (Hodge 1912, 2:580) (Powers 1975:22 points out that the literal meaning of root of this name denotes an association with the smell or slimyness of fish, an allusion to poverty).

Wahpetonwan or Wahpeton, translated as "Dwellers Among the Leaves" (Hodge 1912, 2:891; Howard 1980:3) or "Leaf village" (Powell in Holder 1966:191)

Ihanktonwan or Yankton, translated as "Dwellers at the End Village" (Howard 1980:3), "end village" (Hodge 1912, 2:988), and "End Dwellers" (Powers 1975:22)

Ihanktonwana or Yanktonai, translated as "Little Dwellers at the End" (Howard 1980:3), "little-end village" (Hodge 1912, 2:990), and "Little End Dwellers" (Powers 1975:22)

Titonwan or Teton, translated as "Dwellers on the Plains" (Howard 1980:3, 20) or "dwellers on the prairie" (Hodge 1912, 2:736) and "prairie dwellers" (Powers 1975:23)

After the Sioux movements began, the first four "Fireplaces," the Mdewkantsons, Wahpekutes, Sissetons, and Wahpetons, remained in Minnesota and came to be called the Isanyati or Santees ("Dwellers at the Knife Lake" [Howard 1980:3]), or Eastern division of the tribe. The Yanktons and Yanktonais (Wiciyela, or "Those Who Speak Like Men" [Howard 1980:3]) became the Middle division, and the Tetons became the Western division.

The Tetons, though originally only one of the "Seven Fireplaces," evolved into the classic form of Plains Indian nomads and became distributed over the vast part of the Plains
region. Mirroring the original Sioux organization of seven villages, the Tetons were subdivided into seven groups:

Oglala, translated as "they scatter their own" or "to scatter one's own" (Hodge 1912, 2:109; Powers 1975:26; Howard 1980:20)

Sicangu (or Brulé, a French term) translated as "Burned Thighs" (Hodge 1912, 2:564; Powers 1975:26; Howard 1980:20)

Hunkpapa, translated as "Campers at the Horn, or End of the Camp Circle" (Powers 1975:26; Howard 1980:20; Hodge 1912, 1:579 also gives its meaning variously as "at the entrance," "at the head end of the circle," "those who camp by themselves," and "wanderers")

Mnikowoju or Minneconjou or Miniconjou, translated as "Planters beside the Stream" (Powers 1975:26), "those who plant beside the stream" (Hodge 1912, 1:868), or "Planters-beside-the-water" (Howard 1980:20; Howard also gives the name Hohwodzu for this group)

Itazipco or Itazipcho (or Sans Arcs, a French term), translated as "Without Bows" (Hodge 1912, 1:625; Powell in Holder 1966:191; Powers 1975:26) or "Those-without bows" (Howard 1966:20)

Oohenunpa or Oohenonpa, translated as "Two Kettles" or "Two Boilings" (Hodge 1912, 2:136; Powell in Holder 1966:191; Powers 1975:26; Howard 1980:20)

Sihasapa, translated as "Blackfoot" (Powers 1975:26; Howard 1980:20) or "Blackfeet" (Hodge 1912, 2:568; Powell in Holder 1966:191)

The last five subgroups of the Tetons are also called the Saones, a term which Powers (1975:27) translates as a corruption of "forest dwellers" rather than the more commonly accepted meaning, "Shooters among the trees."

Peoples from each of the three primary Sioux divisions--the Santees of the Eastern Sioux, the Yanktons of the Middle Sioux, and the Brulés and Oglalas of the Western Sioux--have a close historical or contemporary association with the NIMI region. They are further and separately discussed below.
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CHAPTER 5

YANKTONS

Leonard Bruguier

INTRODUCTION

One of the three tribes that reside in the NIMI region is the Yankton Tribe of South Dakota, whose reservation is located along the Missouri River in Charles Mix County, South Dakota. The Yanktons, originally one of the Seven Council Fires of the Dakota Nation in central Minnesota, have lived in the southeastern South Dakota-northwestern Iowa region for over two centuries. This chapter will summarize Yankton history before the establishment of their reservation, and will describe aspects of traditional Yankton culture. The history of the Yanktons following establishment of their reservation in 1858 is reviewed in Chapter 7.

HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH

The American Indian linguist and ethnologist Ella C. Deloria (1889-1971), a member of the Ihanktonwan tribe, devoted over fifty years of her life to compiling and interpreting ethnographic materials among her people (Murray 1974; Medicine 1989; Bruguier 1989). She collaborated with Franz Boas on translating and revising data already collected on the Dakotas/Lakotas/Nakotas (Deloria 1978).

Pioneer lexicographers Samuel and Gideon Pond came to Fort Snelling, Wisconsin Territory, in 1834. The Pond brothers, assisted by missionary Stephen R. Riggs, produced Dakota as a written language. Coupled with the help of Gabriel Renville, a Sisseton leader, they expanded their works to include school and prayer books, a Dakota Grammar and Dictionary, the Bible, and other religious tracts published in Dakota (Riggs 1973 1992).

Robinson’s volume (Robinson 1904a) contains important data on experiences of the Sioux tribes from before contact through the end of the nineteenth century (Hoover 1979:1). Woolworth prepared a report (Woolworth 1974) to present to the Indian Claims Commission which supplies information concerning territorial boundaries and welfare of the Yanktons before hostilities broke out in the 1850s (Hoover 1979:1).

Thomas L. McKenney and James Hall’s History of the Indian Tribes of North America discusses the elder Little Crow, Wabasha II, and two Yanktons who were important during the first half of the nineteenth century (Hoover 1979). Royal B. Hassrick has published
The Sioux: Life and Customs of a Warrior Society (Hassrick 1964), a highly readable, comprehensive description of Sioux culture. In this chapter, information from these publications is combined with oral history and interview data obtained during the course of research on the Yankton people.

**ETHNONYMY**


From the earliest oral tradition the Ihanktonwan (Yanktons) have called themselves "the People of the End Village" and "the Friendly People." Both of these names may describe their relative position in the exodus of the Seven Council Fires, prior to the American Revolution, as they moved out into the southern plains and woodlands of what are now the states of Iowa, Missouri, northern Nebraska, Montana, Wyoming, and North and South Dakota (Dorsey 1886).

**CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC AFFILIATION**

Included among the Siouan language family, depending on the authority consulted, are the Mandans, Hidatsas, Crows, Otos, Assiniboines, Ioways, Missouri's, Omahas, Poncas, Osages, Kansas, Sioux, Tutelos, Catawbas, and others. The Sioux grouped themselves into an alliance calling themselves the Ocheti Sakowin (translated as "seven fires," seven "council fires," or tribes; see Table 5.1). Deloria and other scholars theorize that the name Dakota was given to them because "that dialect was the first to be recognized in written form by Stephen Return Riggs in his study of the Santee language" (Deloria 1983; Parks 1988).

Because the spoken languages of the three tribes differ somewhat, linguists have broken the language of the Sioux into three dialects: Dakota, Lakota, and Nakota. The dialects are mutually intelligible and share an overwhelming majority of easily recognizable words, especially those used in the Seven Sacred Ceremonies. Variations existed, as in all languages, and were ascribed to the need for new words to describe different flora, fauna, and topography confronting the people as they changed geographic locations. When Europeans arrived, the Sioux language was equal to the task of making names to describe the many new objects encountered. For example, a clock was a totally new experience in appearance and function. The Dakotas had the word iron, maza, for the appearance and they used the word skanskan, literally mysterious movement, for its function. Thus mazaskanskan, mysterious moving iron, is recognized as a clock. Certain sacred ceremonial words, such as Wakantanka (Great Holy, or Spirit), "the Creator of all things; also, all wakan beings because..."
they are all as one," (Beuchel 1970; Riggs 1992; Warcloud 1967; Williamson 1992) remained the same with all tribes of the Ocheti Sakowin, regardless of dialect.

ORIGIN AND MIGRATION TRADITIONS: FIRST EUROAMERICAN CONTACTS

The Ihanktonwan Dakotas do not believe their ancestors migrated to this hemisphere from Asia. Based on creation stories, the Dakotas believe their tribe originated in the upper northern plains at sacred sites clustered in South Dakota and Minnesota.


A map dated 1643 shows a lake designated as "Grand Lac des Nadouessiou [Great Lake of the Sioux]" where Lake Superior is today (Woolworth 1974:252; Winsor 1895). Louis Hennepin, a priest of the Recollect Order, was the first Frenchman to live for an extended time among the Dakotas (Cross 1938; Severin 1968:185-204; Thwaites 1903a). After a four and one-half month stay among the Dakotas in 1680 at their villages located at the Bde Wakan (Sacred Lake), Hennepin left a valuable record of Dakota lifestyles (written from his perspective), as they lived in the lakes and woodlands of Minnesota. Among his many observations there is no mention of horses or guns being owned by the Dakotas. Hennepin recorded a buffalo hunt noting they were on foot and armed with bow and flint-headed arrows.

Exact dates of the Dakota migration from the Mississippi woodlands is subject to ongoing speculation. Woolworth (1974) suggests that the Anishinabeg forced the Dakotas permanently from the Mille Lacs Lake area of Minnesota by the mid-eighteenth century. He is in general agreement with Robinson (1904) that the Ihanktonwan and Ihanktonwanna had separated and formed distinct tribes by 1680 and were in the process of expanding. Meyer differs somewhat in his opinion, deducing that the gradual movement of Dakotas was already underway "out onto the prairies since before Hennepin’s [1680] visit and very likely [they] had only a few small bands left in their old territory" (Woolworth 1974:27; Meyer 1980:13). George E. Hyde agrees with the earlier estimates, finding that the Yanktonais (which at that time included the Yanktons), and the Teton, moved west after the middle of the seventeenth century (Hyde 1937:3). Although there is some difference between these three assumptions, all agree that the Titonwan people were the first to move westward.

Howard maintains that the Yanktons were moving into eastern South Dakota by 1720. As the Yanktons moved westward into
southeastern South Dakota they confronted the Arikaras. Successful in battle, the Yanktons forced the Arikaras further north to the Knife River in South Dakota. Southeastern South Dakota has since been regarded as "traditional" Yankton territory (Howard 1972).

On the foggy morning of August 30, 1804, a historic meeting between the Lewis and Clark expedition and the Yanktons took place as the expedition camped on Calumet Bluff near the present site of the Gavins Point Dam powerhouse and prepared to parley with the Indians. For the Yanktons, another significant event happened that day. As befitting legendary figures, Struck By the Ree’s first encounter with the non-Indian is cloaked in legend. Oral tradition recounts that he was born and presented to the Lewis and Clark Expedition members (August 1804) when they visited the Ihanktonwan on their journey up the Missouri River. The future leader grew to manhood learning his skills from his elders Wahhaginga (Little Dish), Matosabechea (Smooty Bear), Chaponge (Mosquito), and Xuyenonke (War Eagle), men who helped lead the Yankton tribe in the struggles with the Omahas, Ioways, Otoes, and Pawnees over lands in northeast Iowa (Sansom-Flood 1986).

DEMOGRAPHY

Using the Great Sioux Trail which heads south from the western end of the Great Lake of the Sioux, Pierre-Espirit Radisson and Medard Chouart des Groseillers visited among the "Nation of the Beef or Buffalo," in 1661 (Woolworth 1974:252). The two men’s account, although much debated by scholars, provides some of the first non-Indian ethnohistorical data on the Dakotas. They reported hearing of an Indian nation numbering over seven thousand men, that subsisted on corn and hunted the buffalo for meat. Early ethnohistoric accounts do not distinguish Yanktons or other bands within the Indian nation from "Sioux."

West and southward expansion of the Dakota Oyate, beginning in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, eventually encompassed an area of approximately one-quarter million square miles, including parts of Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and all of South Dakota. An estimated population of fifty thousand people, perhaps ten thousand of whom were warriors partially armed with smoothbore muskets and not yet completely mounted on horses, began their odyssey which eventually led to the control of a corridor six hundred miles wide, stretching from the Mississippi River westward to the foothills of the Rocky Mountains (Anderson 1980:24; Deloria 1989:22; Mekeel 1943:137-205; White 1978:321).

Marquette’s Relation of 1670-1671 states there were no less than fifteen villages on and around Mille Lac (Champe 1974:254-255).

On August 27, 1804, the Lewis and Clark Expedition met with
the Yanktons nine miles up from the mouth of the James river. There were forty Sioux lodges in the camp with ten to fifteen Sioux in each lodge (Woolworth 1974:45).

In Lewis' *Statistical View* the Yanktons were described as having 80 lodges, 200 warriors, with a total of 700 people and occupied the James River and eastward to the Big Sioux (Woolworth 1974:46).

Maps from the Lewis and Clark Expedition indicated the lands then claimed by the Yanktons. One map, with a notation of 1,000 Yanktons, included the area east of the James River and across the Vermillion, Big Sioux, and up to Floyd's River (Woolworth 1974:49).

Aboriginal population figures are relatively difficult to reconstruct for the Yankton Sioux, because early Euro-American contacts seldom bothered to delineate "Yankton Sioux" from population estimates of the entire Sioux Nation. During the 19th century, with the treaty-making era, more definitive census materials become available. However, Woolworth (1974:206) questions the accuracy of many of the ethnohistoric population estimates, again, perhaps reflecting the "fluidity" of movement between bands and also the seasonal subsistence cycle (e.g. communal bison hunting). Table 5.2 shows population estimates between 1806 and 1898. Generally speaking, the Yankton Sioux population is estimated to range between 2,000 to 3,000 individuals throughout the first half of the nineteenth century (Woolworth 1974:228). The Yanktons were reportedly devastated by the 1837 smallpox epidemic, but little documentation exists regarding the consequences of other epidemics which undoubtedly impacted Yankton populations.

TRIBAL TERRITORY/ GEOGRAPHY

Omaha, Ioway, and Ponca oral traditions recorded in 1888 by J. Owen Dorsey revealed that their people were forced from their villages, established along the Des Moines River to the Red Pipestone Quarries, by the Yanktons. Scholars speculate that this expulsion occurred sometime during the second half of the seventeenth century (Hyde 1937:9-11; Dorsey 1886:218-219; White 1978:341-342; ARCIA 1858).

Further expansion from the Pipestone Quarry region by the Dakotas brought them once again up against the riverine tribes, the Arikaras, remnants of Ioway and their allies who were settled permanently along the Big Sioux and James rivers and on their confluences with the Missouri River (Howard 1972). But these peoples proved to be a nominal obstacle to the Dakotas, who were drawn by two benefits that lured them onto the plains, the bison and, ironically, the permanent settlements of agricultural tribes which functioned as trading centers. With the horse, purchased or stolen from the Arikaras whose fortified villages clustered around
the Big Bend of the Missouri River in present-day South Dakota, and other bands of Indian traders moving north from the southwest, pte (bison) became more accessible, allowing complete mobility and freedom within the region. The riverine tribes served two purposes: providing vegetables and other foodstuffs that Dakotas previously grew or tended in the woodland environment; and further, serving as a permanent trading center visited regularly by traders coming upriver from Saint Louis (Abel 1968; Brown 1989:68, 118; Meyer 1977; Will and Hyde 1964).

The Dakotas, who in the latter part of the seventeenth century and early eighteenth, were still canoe men, realized that trade with the Frenchmen, which was heavily dependent on the river for transporting goods, was accessible in any country that had rivers and streams. But with the addition of the horse, they obtained the element needed for greater mobility. In effect, their decisions to move onto the plains were pragmatic and consensual (White 1978:160-161).

Great Sioux trade fairs were located between the Missouri and Mississippi trading posts. One meeting-place often mentioned by early travellers was located below the headwaters of the James River, the eastern border of traditional Yankton territory, where the tribes of the Seven Council Fires came together once a year. The western groups brought "horses, lodges of leather, buffalo robes, shirts and leggings of antelope-skin" to trade for "guns, kettles, red pipes, and bows of walnut" (Abel 1968:122-123; Hyde 1937:8; 1974:19-21; Robinson 1904b:21; White 1978:324-327).

The exact date that the Yanktons moved into southeastern South Dakota is unknown. Jean Baptiste Truteau, while at the mouth of White River on September 30, 1794, observed three Yankton families with a Teton hunting party. Woolworth feels that the Yanktons were then only superficially hunting that area, and not in large numbers (Woolworth 1974:37).

Pierre-Antoine Tabeau, who traded in the vicinity of Cedar Island, complained of the small amount of beaver skins that the Yanktons, hunting in the area of St. Peters River, had brought to trade in 1804. This would indicate that game had already become overhunted east of the Missouri which would further enhance the territory westward for the Yanktons.

After the horse was integrated into their lifestyle, tribes were not dependent on maintaining their own permanently established villages. Sunkawakan was truly a gift to an inherently gregarious people, expediting their need to maintain relationships with other tribes. The Dakotas moved continually while hunting, visiting, and living with relatives and friends across hundreds of miles. In their enlarged cultural complex, they depended on food sources at known locations. Their movements coincided with harvesting times (Picotte 1968).
After this migration they often returned to the old camps east of the river during the eighteenth century to hunt, fish, and trap when necessity dictated.

The Yanktons adopted the seasonal and settlement patterns of the Arikaras they displaced. The Yanktons joined in the two annual tribal bison hunts in the spring and fall. Crops were planted before the spring hunt and harvested after they returned from the hunt. Fishing also comprised a significant portion of their diet, especially during spring and summer. At other times hunting was done in small groups. The Yanktons’ large, permanent villages were on the Missouri and James rivers (Howard 1972).

However, the Yanktons did not stop at the James River: As of 1830, the Yankton were hunting west of the Missouri river and up the valleys of the White and Niobrara rivers, and southward to the north fork of the Platte river. At about this same time, the main body of the Yankton centered themselves near Fort Lookout which was on the north bank of the Missouri river and above the mouth of the White river. Other Yanktons were further north along the Missouri, about a distance of 250 miles above the mouth of the Vermillion river. (Woolworth 1974:200-201)

This also reflects the Euroamericans’ search for more land as they push west as well as the overhunted lands.

Scarcity of game escalated during the 1840s in southeastern South Dakota and by this time the Yanktons rarely hunted east of the Missouri River (Woolworth 1974:200-201).

SUBSISTENCE

The Dakotas were a modified hunting-gathering people, utilizing both plant and animal foods found within the cultural complex they inhabited. After their arrival in the vast and varied environment of the Wisconsin and Minnesota woodlands, including eastern portions of North and South Dakota, northern Iowa, and eastern Nebraska, new foods were added to their diets. Maize, an ancient food grown and traded by the Dakotas, was supplemented by roots, stalks, and seeds of plants indigenous to the land. In particular, nutritious rice grew abundantly in the wet, marshy land found east of the 98th meridian and became a staple in their diet (Densmore 1974; Gilmore 1919; Jenks 1919; Sculley 1971; Webb 1986:239-241). Tobacco for routine smoking and sacred rituals was grown by the men. Sweet grass and sage, two plants that emit pungent, sweet-smelling odors when burned or crushed, were picked with respect and used in sacred ceremonies. Flat cedar, also used to sweeten the air by burning, was easily obtainable. Protein was obtained from bison, present in great numbers throughout the Mississippi Valley, along with deer, bear, moose, and elk. Small game such as rabbits, squirrels, and porcupine were hunted and
eaten in appropriate seasons. Ducks, geese, turkey, and prairie chickens provided not only meat but eggs. Maple trees (on the plains, box-elder) were tapped and sugar refined for use as a sweetener in foods. Fish of many species abounded in the clear cold waters of Minnesota's lakes and streams, affording a ready source of food. Rivers and streams were filled with shellfish and edible reptiles and amphibians such as turtles and frogs (though not all tribes developed a taste for fish), and made them valuable items in their diet (Blair 1969:166-167; Gillmore 1919:66; Thwaites 1903[a or b?):188). Oils rendered from the fat of bison, bear, fish, and skunks were used for cooking and medicinal and cosmetic purposes (Cross 1938:107; "The Engages" 1989:2-7; Gilmore 1919).

The exact decade when the horse was introduced to the Dakota people is unknown but there is some evidence to suggest that Indians of the northern plains were mounted by the middle of the eighteenth century. When the Dakotas acquired the horse its presence changed their worldview to the point where legends grew around the magnificent animal.

American Indians were intimately acquainted with animals and perhaps the shunka or dog, used for both practical and sacred use, is an outstanding example. Dogs furnished security and provided valuable protection by alerting the village when unknown animals or people came near. Dogs ate discarded food and bones (but also contributed their own form of refuse). When it came time to move camp, they served as beasts of burden carrying household goods lashed to travois or sleds. In times of famine, dogs provided protein; certain sacred ceremonial feasts required dogmeat to feed the participants.

It should not be surprising that the Dakotas would name their horses Sunkawakan, or holy spirit dog. Sunkawakan placed different and great demands on the people. Care for its physical needs and its training, whether for hunting, as a war mount, or beast of burden required specialized skills. The horse required more open space where grass and water were plentiful. Sunkawakan transformed the Dakota culture, opening challenging new vistas for exploration and exploitation (Bol 1989; Coues 1965:475-477; Cross 1938:145, 148-149; Neihardt 1988:243; Schusky 1975:18-22).

TECHNOLOGY

Specialization depended as much on skill as the tiyospaye's (band's) physical location. Trade and gift items depended on materials that were present within the environs of the camp. Tribes located near the copper deposits of the Western Great Lakes region manufactured knives, axes, spearpoints, and other cutting-edged implements for trade. Common items such as arrow shafts, bows, flint, and copper arrowheads were continually in demand by hunters and warriors. Basketmakers, fishnet makers, potters, leatherworkers, canoe makers, and other artisans provided
utilitarian and cosmetic articles useful and necessary for the tribe (Cross 1938:99-100).

Female and male societies made songs for particular rituals and dances as did informal sewing or quilling groups. Drums were made of hollowed out cottonwood boles or handdrums with frames formed from thin willow saplings, then covered with hides. The drums, said to reproduce the heartbeat of mother earth, provided the most important accompaniment for the songs. Rattles made from skins, turtle shells, or gourds, courting flutes, eagle bone whistles, and sticks with deer dew claws attached were shaken or blown when appropriate. Implements made of iron, brass, and copper influenced the Dakotas in different ways. Lack of trained gunsmiths (or blacksmiths), and scarcity of replacement parts made simple repairs burdensome. These drawbacks did not stop the Dakotas from obtaining the weapons and incorporating them into their hunting, trapping, and warfare techniques (Ewers 1968:9-13, 34-44; Garavaglia and Worman 1984:343-360; Holder 1974:114-116; Russell 1957:1-61, 103-141).

Indian contributions to the European market system consisted chiefly of animal furs and meat, although many of their craft items such as baskets, beaded articles, including wampum belts, found their way back to Europe for personal and economic usage. But the non-renewable resource of animal life was seriously affected by the market system. For example, during periods of sustained European demand for beaver pelts, Indian trappers were very successful in meeting the challenge. In their zeal they contributed materially to the depletion of these fur-bearing animals in cultural areas by overharvesting the population.

Other metal implements were incorporated into Dakota households. Iron cooking kettles brought mixed results, although they did provide improvement on one traditional method of boiling food. Leather bags or buffalo stomach paunches were usually used for this purpose when earthen pots were not available. After the paunches were filled with water, meat, vegetables, and heated rocks were added until the food was cooked to satisfaction. If the metal pot cracked, repairing it was virtually out of the question. Oftentimes the pot was broken into pieces and the shards used to fashion arrowheads or scrapers.

**SETTLEMENT**

Between 1794-1804 the majority of Yankton Dakotas occupied the Upper Des Moines River. They had some gardens and in spring and early summer hunted bison on the prairies. After the fall hunt they wintered in sheltered areas along the Des Moines River in groves of trees which protected them from the winds. They utilized the wood for fuel in heating and cooking.

In 1805, Lt. Zebulon M. Pike stated that the Yanktons were
never settled, but travelled with the Teton Sioux. Pike also
indicated that they followed the bison, utilizing its hide for
clothing, tipis, and horse gear as well as its flesh for food.
Pike said that the Yanktons had many horses and could travel 500
miles in ten days, feeling at home wherever they pitched their
tipis (Woolworth 1974:51-52).

By the first half of the nineteenth century, the Yanktons
searched the east banks of the Missouri River during the winter and
spring months for beaver. They traded the beaver pelts for
euroamerican goods on which they were then dependent (Woolworth
1974:42).

TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTION

It can be surmised that when the Ihanktonwan (perhaps aided by
their relatives), evicted the Omahas, Poncas, and Ioways from their
Des Moines and Pipestone Quarry villages they were undoubtedly
pedestrian (Hyde 1937:16-18; Robinson 1904b:28). At this time they
would have been armed with a few guns to supplement the traditional
war weapons, the bow and arrow, hatchet, and war club (Hassrick
1964:70).

However, with the horse, Dakotas were suddenly empowered with
the means to enlarge their culture and hunting areas and establish
new tiyospayes when groups broke off and started new bands. In
this cultural change, one finds the addition of new words, even
dialects, to the basic language. In the different environments,
reinterpretations of theology and cosmology by succeeding
generations of people raised away from the old cultural climax
center were completed. A splitting apart of a compact, dense
culture occurred. With the mobility afforded by the horse, the
Dakotas scattered over vast expanses of rolling plains covered with
prairie grass. They shaped a new society of people who were
astride horses, ten feet above the ground, a people whose horizons
were expanded, both physically and mentally.

Tribes were known to pick up and move without hesitation,
utilizing dogs and then horses to pull travois that carried the
tipis and household goods. Movements which might cause
difficulties to the tiyospaye required a consensus from a general
council. All plans for tribal moves of this nature relied on
thorough scouting beforehand after which reports were evaluated and
discussed in general council. Once this phase was accomplished, a
plan that ensured the most success was adopted and implemented.
Warfare became the principal means of forcing the Omahas, Ioways,
Poncas, and their allies from a favorable vicinity (Hyde 1937:11).

SOCIAL STRUCTURE

In addressing each other, yesterday as today, Dakota Oyate
used terms of kinship such as uncle, aunt, brother, or sister
rather than given names, recognizing their blood relationship first and foremost. Indians who joined the base blood extended family through marriage or adoption acquired kinship terms that recognized their status. *Koda* (friend), or *hunkaya*, to consider and honor as an ancestor, are kinship relations often accompanied by appropriate ceremonies that allow men and women to adopt an unrelated person as a friend or relative. The new relationship is frequently stronger than a blood relation, creating bonds that, in the extreme, call for protection unto death (Deloria 1983:23-25; Hassrick 1964:11-15, 107-120; Iktomi 1937:53-54; Riggs 1992:158).

Society's rules were kept by the *Akichita* (warriors) lodges. Justice was meted out summarily for violations; no knowledge of what constituted a jail existed among the people (Nasatir 1990, 1:300).

Sharing of all material and spiritual goods was equally important among *tiyospaye* members. The *tiyospaye* consisted of several related families within the band that hunted and lived together, and for organizational purposes was under the leadership of a "headman" (Grobsmith 1981:20,21). From Hare's (1912:322) rememberance, "not one of their number hungered while another had food; none of them went naked while another had a robe to spare; and none were shelterless while there [was] a tepee in sight." Children were rarely neglected (Chittenden 1905, 3:1059-1061 and 4:1283-1284; Cross 1938:154-156; Hare 1912:322).

Marriage and the courting rituals were a prominent part of *Dakota* life. Strong taboos existed, with incest or marriage to blood relatives forbidden. Marriages were usually arranged by families according to set customs, but men and women were not bound by these arrangements (Iktomi 1937:66-70). Courting rituals ranged from simple elopement to time-consuming consultation with elders or medicine men who offered advice and medicines to aid in the quest. Marriages between members of different tribes was not a foreign concept. *Dakota* women and men sought partners from other tribes for many reasons, but especially to escape the strong taboo against incest.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, marriage with non-Indian traders was a common although not completely accepted behavior among the *Dakotas*.

Usually a man who was a good provider took on extra wives, preferably a wife's sister or some woman in her family (sororal polygeny). Often interpreted as an economic arrangement to enhance a man's wealth, this usually amounted to no more than adding another pair of trained hands to assist with everyday chores. A man frequently took a deceased brother's wife (known as the "sororate") as his own so that she and her children were provided for and protected (Cross 1938:150-154; Deloria 1988:134-141; Fool Bull 1971:61; Gilmore 1919:70, 80, 98, 106; Hassrick 1964:121-138;
Shared duties between genders, regardless of age group, were numerous. When tribes or tiyospayes moved camp to engage in an annual harvest, all members of the group had specific duties. Those men not engaged in security or scouting roles participated in other ways. Upon arrival and setup at the new camp, work on harvesting, such as chokecherry or plum picking, commenced with all members lending a hand. Other shared tasks included serving as guides when game was herded into a surround or over a cliff. Once this was accomplished, women, sometimes helped by men not engaged in security duties, began the task of butchering the meat, preparing it for curing, or if needed, transporting it back to the basecamp. All members of the group, helped by dogs who were rigged either with backpacks or small travois, shared carrying duties.

The principal duties of the elders of each tiyospaye involved children to whom they provided daycare and continued education covering all facets of life (Blair 1969:161-162; Fool Bull 1971:5; Neihardt 1988:57).

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE: DIVISION OF LABOR AND SPECIALIZATION

Labor divisions are routinely described as gender-based. Women owned all household goods and housing, including the tipi or other shelter, and could only forfeit this right if they violated rules accepted as the norm among the tiyospaye (Klein 1983:156-157).

Ownership brought responsibilities surrounding the everyday maintenance of the home. When the tribe changed campsites, it was the women’s responsibility to take down the tipi when leaving, and put it up in the designated location when they reached the next site.

Preparation of meat involved dual duties; once the men field-dressed the game and brought it back to camp, the women finished butchering and cooked it. Fresh meat or fish not immediately consumed, was sliced into thin strips and smoked if possible or hung to dry over wooden racks or on cords fashioned from leather or plant fiber and stretched between poles. Women were also responsible for making wapakanpi, an extremely nutritious food made of pounded meat mixed with marrow or fat. More commonly identified as pemmican or wasna, Indian women used dried bison meat mixed with fat and often sweetened the concoction by adding chokecherries, plums, grapes, or other fruits or berries.

Making and repairing everyday and special occasion clothing was usually a woman’s responsibility. Quillworkers were therefore dependent on women whose expertise included dressing and tanning hides of superior quality. Historical records often point out
that women were primarily responsible for planting and harvesting
maize and other fiber foodstuffs (Bol 1989; Coues 1965:475-477;

Child-care was viewed as primarily a woman's duty, although
the mother received help from male and female members of the
tiyospaye.

Men's duties were equally diverse and considered of vital
importance, including their demanding responsibilities as hunters,
protectors, warriors, and decision-makers for the tiyospaye or
tribe. Implicit in this division was the making and maintenance of
weapons, traps, and ropes needed for hunting, fishing, trapping,
and general use.

The horse changed the economics of traditional culture,
bringing in the concept of wealth, measured in the numbers of
horses owned. Material goods accumulated far more expeditiously as
additional measures of wealth appeared, principally centered on the
bison. With the addition of more horses, tiyospaye members were
able to transport goods on larger, horse-drawn travois
traditionally pulled by the dog. Men who owned muskets, another
cherished item obtained with the accumulation of wealth, modified
their weapons by cutting off a length of the barrel to suit the
special requirements of hunting from atop a horse, even though they
sacrificed long-range accuracy for this convenience (Denhardt 1947;

POLITICAL ORGANIZATION

The Seven Council Fires separated into three groups according
to dialect and geographic location. The four Ochetic Sakain Siouan
tribes first encountered by westward moving non-Indians were the
Dakotas, also known as the Isanti (or the corruption, Santee).
These were the Sisseton, Wahpekute, Mdewankanton, and Wahpeton who
occupied lands on the eastern borders of the council fires. The
second group consisted of the Ihanktonwan (corruption to Yankton),
and the Ihanktonwanna (Yanktonai), or "Little Yanktons." Together,
they constituted the Nakotas, the middle or wicyena division, of
the three tribes and shared the middle lands of the nation. The
third and largest group numerically were the Lakotas, composed of
the Oglala, Minneconjou, Cohenumpa, Hunkpapa, Sicangu, Sihasapa,
and Itazipco, who occupied the western lands (Murray 1974:20-21).
Each of the tribes are further divided into tiyospayes (extended
families), often called bands. These communities of extended
families were collections of relatives through blood, marriage,
adopt (including captives), and people of the same persuasion
(traders who married into the tribes) integrated into the band.
Tiyospayes were free to change tribal affiliation at any time.
There was no arbitrary ruler or band chief enforcing unity (Beuchel
The flexible (democratic) rules governing the tiyospaye allowed disagreements to be resolved by one of several different remedies. If an act merited group consideration, an appropriate council convened. If one did not agree with the group's decision or rules after mediation, then he was free to exercise a legitimate method of expressing that difference. Voluntary removal to a different location to start anew or join a like-minded tiyospaye were two appropriate forms of expressing differences (Blair 1969:145-146; Bunge 1984:113-126; Hare 1912:322; Iktomi 1937:43-71; Robinson 1904a:402-414).

Both genders had formal and informal social and political societies in which to participate. Organizations such as scouts, horse raiding parties, or war teams were formed.

Primary responsibility for keeping the camp circle in order, serving almost as a radio, was the eyapaha (crier), a man who was detailed to walk or ride among the tipis announcing forthcoming events. Part of eyapaha duties was control. As he walked and announced, he also observed events. By his presence he acted as a deterrent, but he also noted any potential problem or disorder that might be harmful to the group. If a disturbance occurred, he informed the itancan (headman) and a detail composed of an akichita (soldiers or veterans) lodge would attempt to solve the problem, informally if possible (Abel 1968:116-123; Thwaites 1903[a or b?):189, 191).

Women assumed many additional duties when the men were off hunting or raiding; thus, they were enabled to make decisions that affected tribal members remaining in the camp circle.

There were also certain groups of men and women who were travelers, though not organized formally, who moved around to stay with tiyospaye of different tribes. They spent time with a group, helping with various tasks, participating in everyday activities, and at the same time passing on the takushnishni oyaka (talk trifles, or gossip) before moving on to the next group. These individuals were extremely important because they passed on news that kept people informed about relatives who lived elsewhere (Deloria 1983:23-26; Hassrick 1964:3-31; Robinson 1910:402-408; Walker 1982:62-63).

Leadership was not inherited, it was earned. Expertise in one area of endeavor did not give one claim to overall leadership responsibilities; men and women were chosen to lead in situations where they had previously achieved success. Overall leadership in Dakota Oyate society generally devolved to the eldest male, a man who lived and practiced the tenets of the four cardinal virtues. Leadership was accomplished by moral suasion, oratorical skill, and example. Because tribal decisions were consensual, men or women who were most adept at finding the middle ground of an argument and articulating it to the council held important positions in the
One aspect of leadership hinged on the Dakota virtue of generosity, the notion that one must share all material objects with those who have less or are in need (Clifton 1977:66-68; Robinson 1910:402-403; Wabasha 1972).

LIFE CYCLE

The Sioux did not have strict legalistic boundaries for who belonged or did not belong to a family. Yet, related through descent, there was a sense of relatives and an individual was not left as an outsider. The nuclear family was part of the tiyospaye and the family’s duties and benefits were performed and received within that affiliation (Hassrick 1964:107,108).

Proper behavior was dictated by familiarity, reciprocity, gender, and generation. Familiarity or respect was the most important guide in behavior towards others; second, another’s behavior toward you would indicate appropriate behavior; third, sex of the other; and, fourth, the age group of the other helped guide one toward proper conduct (Hassrick 1964:114).

The male lineal family (grandfather, father, and son) were the basis of the tiyospaye and band organization. This lineal family was more relaxed and less bothered by differences in gender and age than affinal relationships from marriage. For the Sioux, each spouse, male and female, had equal say in the relationship, thus the system was bilateral in nature (Hassrick 1964:116).

After marriage, the spouse was to regard the new affinal relatives as strangers, to be kept at a distance. In many instances there was complete avoidance between spouse and parent-in-law (Hassrick 1964:118).

The elderly, if unwanted or without relatives, lived alone just outside the encampment. Food and supplies were brought to them by younger men hoping to gain prestige. It was an unreliable existence at best (Hassrick 1964:112-113).

Women’s communion with the Great Spirit was separated from men’s ways because of the special, sacred power of birth that was given them (Underhill:1965:51-54). While children grew to adulthood, their relatives impressed them with the four cardinal virtues of a Dakota Oyate: bravery, wisdom, fortitude, and generosity. Their knowledge empowered them as teachers, thus the teachings came full circle within two generations.

RELIGION

The Pipestone Quarry, in southwestern Minnesota, gave the Seven Council Fires material to produce their Sacred Pipes. The
Pipe, shaped from the pipestone mined at the quarry, became the physical manifestation that embodied the holistic, philosophical understanding of the Dakota Oyate world. Ideology growing from this knowledge required a reverence for all living beings occupying the maka (earth) and towanjina (sky). Dakota Oyate people believed they were just one part of that universe and they were no greater nor less than any other object within the cosmos. Living in a sacred manner among the gifts of Tunkashina Wakantanka (Grandfather, Great Spirit) became an ideal, and the teaching and maintenance of these philosophical tenets was passed on to each succeeding generation by example and oral tradition (Alvord 1965:46-51; Bunge 1984:61-91; Ewers 1968; Lame Deer and Erdoes 1976; Murray 1983; Neihardt 1988).

The canumpa wicowoyake (pipe narrative) comes from the Minnesota Quarry, the place where Grandfather, Great Spirit gave the gift of the Pipe to the Oyate "(People)"). A Sacred Pipe origin story tells how the Red People engaged in a great battle and their blood flowed onto the ground. When the Great Spirit saw them fighting, he forced them to stop. When all was quiet, he took a piece of the red stone and fashioned a Pipe, filled it with tobacco, and smoked it to the four directions, the earth, and the sky. When he was done, he told them this was the Pipe of Peace, and when men or women displayed it they should be shown respect (Alvord 1965:49-50; Bunge 1984:70; Catlin 1973:160-178, 201-206; Deloria 1978:ix-xi; Haverstock 1973; Thwaites 1903[a or b?]:125-127 vi).

Historically, it is indisputable that they recognized the Minnesota Quarry's significance on their arrival in the area. Using military force, they evicted the Omahas, Mandans, Sacs, and Poncas who were in the locale and incorporated the site into the boundaries of their nation. The Ihanktonwan, due to their strategic location on the southwestern side of the land occupied by the Dakotas, acquired the task of keeping the Pipestone Quarries secure for the Seven Council Fires in the consolidation and expansion of a cultural center (Alexander 1969:165-165; Bunge 1984:78-91; Catlin 1973, 2: 169-171; Hoover 1988; Nasatir 1990, 1:52; Sansom-Flood and Bernie 1985; Sansom-Flood et al. 1989; Sigstad 1973:136, Appendix B).

Around the concept of respect between people and all beings grew Seven Sacred Ceremonies, each intimately tied to the universal scheme emanating from the teachings of the Sacred Pipe (Brown 1989). From this perspective, it is virtually impossible to separate civil acts from what could be labelled religion. All that was Dakota Oyate was spiritual.

Spiritual and physical healing was not restricted by gender. Knowledge of healing plants, seeds, and roots was known by both sexes and shared with those who wished to learn the functional aspects, both as a layperson or in a formal apprenticeship (Cross...
Individuals who desired to learn healing practices often sought inspiration through vision quests. If their prayers were answered by receiving a vision that bestowed healing knowledge, the blessed ones usually took a tobacco offering to a mentor whose specialty or vision matched their own. If the vision was compatible, the initiate was taken on as an assistant. Healing ceremonies were directed by a pejuta wicasha na winyan (medicine man or woman), and all relatives and friends who desired took part. The people cooked and served food, aided the healer in his ceremonies, offered encouragement, and sang songs, thus helping the infirm recover (Churchill 1992:219-220; Cross 1938:146-148; Gilmore 1919; McLaughlin 1989:77-96; Nasatir 1990, 1:258).

There is a ceremony called the Feast of the Dead. In this rite, the people kept the bones of their departed relatives, usually in their private dwellings, until a general meeting of tribes was called. All remains were then gathered and carried to a central location where mourning and feasting, sponsored by the affected families, took place. After these services were completed, the bones were obliterated, usually by fire.

Hennepin became ill during his captivity, and after his prayers failed to bring relief, his host Akepagidan (Again Fills the Pipe), recommended he partake in a sweatlodge ceremony. Akepagidan performed a series of three sweats and restored Hennepin to health. In relating his experience, Hennepin introduced the European world to one of the seven rites, the Dakotas' initipi or sweat lodge, used for "curing diseases" and reaching a state of "communication with the spirit world" (Brown 1989:31-43; Riggs 1973:101).

Besides the Sweatlodge Ceremony and the Feast of the Dead Ceremony, the other ceremonies of the Seven Sacred Rites included the Vision Quest, where one sought direction or an answer to a specific question, the Sun Dance, the Girls' Puberty Ritual, Throwing of the Ball (also associated with a female coming of age), and the Making of Relatives (where one can be adopted into a family) (Grobsmith 1981:65, 66).

Smoking the pipe of peace during the Lewis and Clark Expedition signified the importance of pipes and tobacco as used by Yanktons and most Indian tribes of the North American continent. Anthropologist George A. West wrote of the meaning attached to the pipe:

Its sanctity [was] seldom violated. It was used in the ratification of treaties and it afforded its bearer safe transport among savage tribes. Its acceptance sacredly sealed the terms of peace, and its refusal was regarded as a rejection of the same... (Parkman 1963:228)
Sioux games frequently reflected real life situations. The games ranged from the complex Moccasin Game, which was played by adults, while a rowdy Swing-Kicking Game was played by young boys. The Sioux enjoyed gambling and wagers were invariably placed to make the sport more intense.

The diversity in Sioux games encompassed children's games, sports for men and women, and more leisure activities for adults. There were seasonal games, games for just two individuals, or competition for large teams.

Winter games for children involved ice-sliding, with the one sliding the farthest winning a small toy. Another winter game was Sticking-together; boys and girls would spin their tops on the ice and the winner would be the one whose top outspun and outbumped the others (Hassrick 1964:143).

Team games could get rough, therefore exciting. These games aided in teaching endurance and sturdiness. The Fire-throwing Game consised of teams of boys attacking in close formation, with flaming sticks. If the teams did not retreat, and met in the center, each team would strike out at the other (Hassrick 1964:144).

The games that reflected life situations helped to relieve the struggle between self-expression and self-denial, such as hostility against one's tiyospaye or friends. The Sioux played for high stakes (horses, wives), which also indicates the conflict between self and others (Hassrick 1964:151).

Sioux storytelling was woven with traditions. Chronology was not an important consideration in relating legends and myths from the past. Storytelling was usually the main pastime in the winter season, a leisure season for the Sioux.

The old people told stories around the campfire at night and the narrative usually consisted of a tale of an important past experience of the people as told to the elderly when they were young. Phrases such as "It is said" or "They say" were customary introductions (Hassrick 1964:153).

Ceremonies or celebrations included songs accompanied by musical instruments (drum, rattle, flutes, and whistles) as well as dancing. A dance may be given by a warrior and female relatives in victory celebrations, or in honor of a woman's virtue, or by soldiers displaying their bravery (Hassrick 1964:156).

**COGNITIVE CULTURE**

Hassrick (1964:119-120) has aptly described the social meaning of home and family to Dakota people:
Home was not so much one’s own lodge but rather one’s village, and the tiyospaye, the assembled tipis of one’s family, might be likened to an airy dwelling with many rooms...Here were codes of behavior devised to reduce tensions, and conversely, to promote harmony. By conforming to the etiquette, the individual could find an automatic sense of security, wherein the need to choose was reduced to a minimum and the chance of social faux pas was equally minimized. Consequently, existence within such a formalized family system as the Sioux devised could only imply devotion of self to the welfare of others. Members were a cog in a wheel, working first in relation to the common good and secondly for themselves. ... The success of the tiyospae was dependent upon the cohesive functioning of its members, and the kinship system was ideally suited to implementing it.

The stylization of Sioux behavior suggests in what awe the people held social dissension. The Sioux had wrapped themselves with protective devices to meet almost every conceivable exigency—devices which appear so stultifying and restrictive that personal expression, in group relations, would seem to have been hampered to the point of constriction. It is true that the studied stoicism, the careful reaction in interpersonal affairs characterized the Sioux people’s approach to life.

Respect for the earth and sky and all living things did not cause the Dakotas to become a stoic, humorless people. Their lives were balanced by a keen sense of amusement and expansive tolerance of kinsmen’s behavior. Dakota humor differs from non-Indian forms of wit, but it serves the same two-fold purpose, providing relief from everyday mundane chores and functioning as a form of social control. Indians devised their humor by finding something funny in all of life’s activities. Everybody and anybody was subject to careful scrutiny and often the retelling of their actions found its way into a joke or story.

Indian groups are still predominantly oral societies. Certain characters, some seemingly profane and others sacred, were devised as a means of standardizing meaningful stories, some of which are mythical in nature. Among this group of mythical characters one finds miyasleca (coyote), unktomi (spider, a fabulous creature), and heyoka (an unnatural being) (Buechel 1970:174,337, 507; Neihardt 1988:20-47, 187-193; Riggs 1992:144-145; 317, 485; Walker 1980:155-56). These characters can be counted on to perform or accomplish impossible acts, and in the case of a heyoka, who did everything backward, for example, washing with dirt rather than water. Parts of the stories involving these three characters are strikingly similar to Biblical parables, allegorical tales used to reveal the foibles of mankind. In this way, Dakota people avoided using personal examples that would show disrespect to that person and possibly cause harm or dissension in the tiyospaye. Teasing, which
could be devastating, was accepted as a way of correcting improper behavior; it also taught one not to take oneself so seriously. Shaming, shunning, jeering, "uncomfortable sarcasm, challenge, hint or pointed remarks and blunt thrusts," were valuable Dakota social control mechanisms used to keep family members aware that bringing discredit upon one's family was a form of disrespect and therefore unwanted behavior (Iktomi 1937:60). To keep proper distance between certain relations, designated behavior was enforced. Normal conversation and close, physical location between the male and his mother-in-law was forbidden. Other kinships, such as the uncle and nephew relationships, were designated as teaching and teasing affiliations (Hassrick 1964:143-163; Neihardt 1988:60, 80, 86).

CONCLUSION

Along the way, Indian cultural traits were modified as amalgamation affected the Yanktons to a greater degree than other tribes of the Seven Council Fires. This was surely a blessing on one hand, but a difficult transition on the other. It seems a miracle that after nearly two hundred and fifty years, Yanktons are still intact as a nation and still practice their cultural ways today (1993).
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Table 5-1. The Seven Council Fires (from Woolworth 1974:7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>1) Mdewakanton (Spirit Lake Village)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Isanti</td>
<td>2) Wahpekute (&quot;Shooters in the Leaves&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Wahpeton (&quot;Dwellers among the Leaves&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>4) Sisseton (Lake village or Fishscale village)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle or Wiciyela</td>
<td>5) Yankton (&quot;End Village&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6) Yanktonai (&quot;Little End Village&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7) Teton (&quot;Dwellers on the Prairie&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-2. Historical population figures for the Yankton Sioux, 1806-1898.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Population Estimate</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>500 warriors; 2,000 persons</td>
<td>Keating, cited in Woolworth 1974:206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>540 warriors</td>
<td>Dougherty, Estimate of the sun necessary for the Upper Missouri Agency, 1 Sep 1828 to 31 Aug 1829, cited in Woolworth 1974:206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>540 warriors; 2,700 persons</td>
<td>Dougherty, Estimate of the sun necessary for the Upper Missouri Agency, 1 Jan to 31 Dec 1830, cited in Woolworth 1974:206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>200 warriors; 1,125 persons</td>
<td>W. Clark to D. Kurts, 2 Sep 1833, cited in Woolworth 1974:206 (&quot;About half of tribe; includes Santee&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>750 warriors; 2,500 persons</td>
<td>&quot;Excessive&quot;; ARCIA, 1842, cited in Woolworth 1974:206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>3,000 persons</td>
<td>&quot;Excessive&quot;; ARCIA, 1853, cited in Woolworth 1974:206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>700 warriors; 3,000 persons</td>
<td>&quot;Excessive&quot;; Schoolcraft, part 5, p. 494, cited in Woolworth 1974:206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1715</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Secondary sources include Woolworth 1974. ARCIA refers to the Annual Reports of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the year indicated.
CHAPTER 6
SANTEES
By Michele Moray

INTRODUCTION

HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH

The preponderance of literature available on the Eastern Dakotas pertains to the 1862 "Sioux Uprising," and the removal of much of the Eastern Dakotas from Minnesota after 1862. Ethnographic information on the Eastern Dakotas is generally lacking, in that the ethnocentric views of the early researchers often colored their interpretations and descriptions of Dakota culture. This paper focuses primarily on the Eastern Dakotas, with emphasis on the Mdewakanton tribe, but also presents general information on the "Sioux Nation" (Lakota/Nakota/Dakota) in general.

The sociology of the Mdewakanton has been written by Ruth Landes (Landes 1968). The territorial range of the Eastern Dakotas in Minnesota is documented in a volume by Harold Hickerson, although this work may contain some bias, as it was written for litigation before the Indian Claims Commission (Hickerson 1974). An extensive record of Euroamerican contact with the Eastern Dakotas in the seventeenth through nineteenth centuries is reviewed in Gary C. Anderson’s thesis (Anderson 1978). Several authors report a clan system among the Eastern Dakotas (Carver 1778, Dorsey 1889, 1890, & 1897, Eastman 1849 [Dorsey and Eastman references are NIRC], Howard 1966, Riggs 1893), while other authors have questioned this conclusion (Lesser 1930, Stipe 1971, Howard 1979). The conditions leading up to the "Sioux Uprising" and the consequences of it, including the removal many of the Eastern Dakotas from Minnesota, are analyzed by Anderson (1980), Blakeslee and O’Shea (1983), and Meyers (1964, 1967).

ETHNONYMY

The name Dakota means "allied", or "leagued", and refers to the affiliation of seven tribes commonly called the "Sioux" (Riggs 1976). A Dakota word describing the unity of these seven tribes is Oceti-sakowin, or "council fires" (Howard 1966). The names of the Dakota tribes reflect their geographic locations
stretching from the woodlands in Minnesota west across the Northern Plains to the Black Hills (Howard 1966:3):

- Mdewakantonwan, "Spirit Lake Dwellers"
- Wahpekute, "Shooters Among the Leaves"
- Sisitonwan, or Sisseton, "People of the Boggy Ground"
- Wahpetonwan, or Wahpeton, "Dwellers Among the Leaves"
- Ihanktonwan, or Yankton, "Dwellers at the End (Village)"
- Ihanktonwana, or Yanktonai, "Little Dwellers at the End"
- Titonwan, or Teton, "Dwellers on the Plains"

These Dakota tribes are further classified into three groups by their location and cultural affiliation. The Mdewakantonwans, Wahpekutes, Wahpetons, and Sissetons make up the Eastern Dakotas or Isanyati, "Dwellers at the Knife," the Yanktons and Yanktonais make up the Middle Dakotas or Wiciyela, "Those Who Speak Like Men," and the Tetons were termed the Western Dakotas (Howard 1966:3).

The Eastern Dakotas are also referred to as the Santees which most likely is derived from the word Isanti, or Isanyati, a name given to them when they lived around Mille Lacs Lake called Isantande or "Knife Lake" (Hodge 1968; Riggs 1893; Landes 1968). Although Santee is used to refer to all four Eastern Dakota tribes, in this report Eastern Dakota will be used to refer collectively to the four tribes, since the inhabitants of the Santee Reservation in Nebraska, presently known as the Santee Sioux Tribe, are principally Mdewakantonwans and possibly some Wahpekutes.

CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC AFFILIATION

The Dakota Nation belongs to the Siouan language family as do other Siouan speaking tribes including the Omahas, Winnebagoes, Mandans, and others (Howard 1966:1). As mentioned previously, the Dakota Nation consists of three linguistic dialects: Dakota, Nakota, and Lakota. The four Eastern Dakota tribes speak the Dakota dialect, the Middle Dakota groups speak the Nakota Dialect, and the Tetons speak the Lakota dialect. Howard (1966:2) points out that Dakota tribal members often will use the linguistic term to identify which the tribal division to which they belong, e.g., Teton Dakotas may identify themselves as Lakotas, Yankton Dakotas as Nakotas, etc. In his preface to the Bison Books edition of Robert H. Lowie's classic monograph, Indians of the Plains, Raymond J. DeMallie, a noted authority on the Dakota tribes, asserts to the contrary that while the Yanktons and Yanktonais may be accurately described as speaking the Nakota dialect, only the Assiniboins call themselves Nakota people (Lowie 1982:xi).

Howard (1966:4) suggests that the Eastern Dakota culture "closely resembles" the culture of the Central Algonquian tribes,
particularly the Minnesota and Wisconsin Ojibwa, the Menominee, the Potawatomi, the Sauk, and the Meskwaki."

ORIGIN, MIGRATION, AND FIRST EUROPEAN CONTACTS

The Eastern Dakotas are believed to have migrated from the northeast, moving southwest into the area of the Great Lakes region. No date is given for this migration, although in the seventeenth century when French explorers ventured onto Eastern Dakota lands in Minnesota, they found them well established in their woodland setting (Anderson 1978).

Pond (1986) reports a tribal migration from the far north were the Eastern Dakota knew Eskimo. Oral tradition tells of an ancestral Mdewakantonwan migration westward "long ago and far away in a land of long winters" (Landes 1968:22). The tribe continued a migration westward, eventually reaching the Great Lakes where the climate was warmer and game was abundant. They remained there for several years, but after conflict with the Ojibways, the Dakotas continued their migration and eventually arrived at the Mississippi River ("mni ses", meaning "water-whirling"), where they built their villages (Landes 1968:24). Here they "remained on both banks of the great river, near Lake Pepin...with their...villages at the present site of Winona and LaCrosse: (Landes 1968:24). Also according to the migration tradition related by Landes, after the tribal population grew, the Dakotas split into seven "subgroups," or council fires, of which the Teton Dakotas migrated furthest west, to the Black Hills in South Dakota. Howard (1966:3) reports this westward migration was partially a result of pressure by the Ojibway who were armed by the French, and partially "because it was the path of least resistance." The Eastern Dakotas remained in the Mississippi River region until their removal in 1862.

The earliest documented European contacts with the Eastern Dakotas began in the early seventeenth century, when the Dakotas were exposed to intense European trade. The territory they occupied was heavily exploited in the fur trade. Anderson (1978) reports that in 1606, Nicholas Perrot established the first fur post among the Dakotas on Lake Pepin. According to Meyer (1967), Daniel Greysolon (the Sieur Du Luth) and the Recollet missionary, Father Louis Hennepin, were the first white men to contact the Eastern Dakotas at their Mille Lacs, Minnesota, location. In 1679, Sieur Du Luth left the French flag at an Eastern Dakota village (Margry 1888). Hennepin was taken prisoner by the Eastern Dakotas and later released. During the time he spent with the tribe he recorded some of the earliest observations of their culture (Hennepin 1903, 1966; Margry 1888; Meyer 1967:6). In 1695, Pierre Charles Le Sueur established a fort at Prairie Island along the Mississippi River, and another near the Blue Earth river in 1700 (Anderson 1968, Meyer 1967). By the late seventeenth century, the Eastern Dakotas were immersed in the
struggle between France and England for economic and political control of North America (Meyers 1967).

In 1723, a Jesuit mission station was built near the Eastern Dakota villages (Anderson 1968). The expansion of French commercialism in the eighteenth century eroded and eventually destroyed the intertribal trade system. French expansion also promoted exploitation of the woodlands, leading to intertribal conflict over available hunting grounds and wild resources. Ultimately, this resulted in war between the Eastern Dakotas and the Ojibways in 1737 (Anderson 1978:23). In 1778, Charles Gautier de Verville visited a band of Mdewakantons under the leadership of Wabasha on the St. Croix River (Anderson 1978:36).

Lewis and Clark visited Eastern Dakota villages in the early 1800s, and Zebulon Pike established relations between the U.S. government and the Eastern Dakotas in the early 1800s which lasted through the mid-nineteenth century (Anderson 1978). Lawrence Taliaferro recorded Eastern Dakota occupancy in Minnesota during his time as agent to the tribe from 1819 to 1839 (Hickerson 1974:162). For a more comprehensive account of European contact with the Eastern Dakotas, see Anderson (1968).

DEMOGRAPHY

As previously reported, the Eastern Dakotas were divided into four tribes: the Sissetons, the Wahpetons, the Wahpekutes, and the Mdewakantonwans. The Eastern Dakotas were also divided into an Upper and Lower Council. The Sissetons and the Wahpetons belonged to the Upper Council, and the Mdewakantonwans and the Wahpekutes belonged to the Lower Council (Howard 1966).

In the late eighteenth century, 300 lodges were counted at a site along the St. Peters river called "Tetankatane", a village where the Mdewakantonwans congregated in the summer (Anderson 1968:74). Population figures in the 1800s begin with an estimate recorded by Zebulon Pike around 1805, reporting 2,105 Mdewakantonwans, while Lewis and Clark give a lower figure of 1,200 in the same year with a total Eastern Dakota population of 3,100 people (Anderson 1968:71; Hickerson 1974:249). In 1823, at the village of Shakopee (a Mdewakanton village), 15 bark lodges were counted "each with a capacity of 30-50 people" with an estimated population of 450 to 750 people (Anderson 1968). A report in 1836 by Lawrence Taliaferro, an Indian agent, estimates the Eastern Dakota population at 5,000, and another estimate in 1844 reports the Mdewakantonwans with 417 men, 572 women, and 726 children, for a total population of 1,725 people (Anderson 1968).

TRIBAL TERRITORY/GEOGRAPHY

When the Eastern Dakotas resided in Minnesota, they made use of a large area with their territory encompassing "what is now
the southern two thirds of the state of Minnesota with adjacent parts of Iowa, Wisconsin, and North and South Dakota" (Howard 1966:2). Within this territory, the Eastern Dakota villages were dispersed over a wide area; however, the region of Mille Lacs Lake became the cultural center of the Mdewakantonwan tribe (Hodge 1968:826). According to Anderson (1968), the Eastern Dakotas hunted as far south as the Buffalo River, and also exploited the Blue Earth and Cannon River regions. Landes (1968:33) relates that the Eastern Dakotas declare as their ancient hunting grounds the territory from the Cannon and Straight Rivers, to "the headwaters of the Blue Earth River, as well as the land in the vicinity of the Iowa border."

Pierre Charlevoix reported the Eastern Dakota and Fox tribes raiding as far south as what is now Peoria, Illinois (Hickerson 1967:78). Hickerson (1967) also reports the Santees raiding as far north as Lake of the Woods.

The Eastern Dakota territorial range was "bounded by a curved line extending east of north from Prairie du Chien on the Mississippi, so as to include all the tributaries of the Mississippi, to the first branch of Chippewa River: thence by a line running west of north to Spirit Lake (Mille Lacs); thence westwardly to Red River (Sioux River), and down that stream to Pembina; thence south westwardly to the east bank of the Missouri near the Mandan villages, thence south westwardly to the east bank of the Missouri to a point probably not far from Soldier River; thence east of north to Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin." (From Long's expedition, quoted in Hickerson 1967:21).

This description may include some of the territory inhabited by the Middle Dakotas. While the Eastern Dakotas' hunting and raiding activities extended over a vast region, their core occupancy lay along the Mississippi River region in Minnesota. Their hunting territory was challenged by the Algonquian tribes to the south and east, and by the Chippewas from the north.

**SUBSISTENCE AND DIVISION OF LABOR**

In the woodlands of their Minnesota homeland, the Eastern Dakotas practiced a diverse subsistence strategy including hunting, fishing, trapping, and gathering. Murdock (1967:47) gives the following estimate of the contribution of each strategy to Santee subsistence: hunting (which includes trapping and fowling) constituted from 66-75 percent; gathering of wild plants from 6-15 percent; fishing from 6-15 percent; and agriculture from 6-15 percent.

Eastern Dakota women were responsible for gathering wild plants, and a wide variety was utilized. The wild foods included...
in their diet consisted of plants of both the woodlands, such as maple sugar, aquatic rice, berries, and plums; and of the plains, such as beans, potatoes, and turnips (Landes 1968, Pond 1986). The wild turnip, waterlily, and wild rice were some of the more important of the plant resources gathered (Landes 1968). The turnip grew in marshy ground or shallow lakes, and was shaped like a hen's egg but about half the size (Landes 1968, Pond 1986). In the summer while the hunting party had left to pursue game, small gathering parties would set out in different directions; some searching for berries, others looking for turnips, potatoes, and wild onions in the prairies. Then beginning in the fall around August or September the Eastern Dakotas began harvesting rice. The usual number of people in the rice party was two, with "a man poling the dugout canoe or boat, the woman sitting in the bottom of the craft to tie the standing rice into sheaves as the boat passed slowly through a lane" (Landes 1968:178).

Agriculture did not play a significant role in Eastern Dakota subsistence as they lived primarily on the products of their hunting, gathering, and fishing activities (Pond 1986). A small quantity of corn was raised by the Eastern Dakotas, which was the responsibility of the women. Pond (1986:27) reports that they planted as soon as they found the strawberries ripe, and they favored areas where wild artichokes grew, as this indicated areas with rich soil.

Although the Eastern Dakotas did not grow tobacco, they made a mixture of the inner bark of red willow with additional plants called tcucaca, which gave off a pleasing aroma when smoked (Landes 1968:204).

Eastern Dakota men were primarily responsible for hunting, trapping, and fishing. Primarily big game was hunted, including buffalo, deer, and bear. Landes (1968) reports that the buffalo hunt was the largest group activity of the Eastern Dakotas, as villages from all four Eastern Dakota tribes would congregate for a communal bison hunt. This communal hunt usually began in May when a chief from one of the villages, who was an "old seasoned hunter," would summon other villages to join in the tribal hunt (Landes 1968:162). One part of organizing the tribal hunt included coordinating the camp police (discussed in more detail in political organization). The chief, or hunt leader, depended greatly on his knowledge of the habits of the herd, of the land, and of friendly as well as hostile tribes (Landes 1968).

Women also played a significant role during the tribal hunt. After an animal was killed, women butchered, cooked, and cured the meat and hides (Landes 1968, Pond 1986). Landes (1968:165) reports that women sometimes pursued buffalo with the hunting parties, and although they were considered eccentric, they were not prevented from doing so. Landes also reports women
participating in trapping, owning hunting dogs, and joining war parties to avenge a relative's death (1968:166). Some women were "accorded...the honors of career men" (Landes 1968:49).

The buffalo hunt went on until the end of summer when people began leaving to prepare for fall activities such as trapping, duck hunting, going to the rice beds, and deer hunting (Landes 1968, Pond 1986).

The deer hunt usually began in October "with the onset of cold weather", and lasted until sometime in January (Landes 1968:172). The rules of the fall deer hunt were very similar to the summer buffalo hunt, but the hunting parties for the deer hunt were usually much smaller. Landes reports hunting parties varying in size from two men up to parties consisting of a whole village. However, the average group was 8-12 hunters (Landes 1968:172).

Unlike the summer which was completely devoted to the bison hunt, in the winter the Eastern Dakotas participated in "side pursuits" of elk, moose, and bear (Landes 1968:185). The bear was "highly respected and was given ceremonial consideration in ways similar to the forms of more northern tribes" (Landes 1968:185).

When the hunters returned in the winter, they then began fishing until early March when spring trapping and sugar-making began (Pond 1986). Trapping took place in the fall and in the spring, and is characterized as the most individualistic economic practice in which the Eastern Dakotas participated (Landes 1968). In the fall beaver and otter were trapped, while muskrat were trapped in the spring; raccoon and skunk were also trapped (Landes 1968, Pond 1986).

Fishing was both a summer and winter activity. Several methods of fishing were used in the summer, employing either a line, a net, or a spear. In the winter, fishing was accomplished by cutting a hole in the ice and using a spear (Landes 1968, Pond 1986).

TECHNOLOGY AND DIVERSIONS

In technology, the Eastern Dakotas closely resemble Central Algonquian adaptations (Skinner 1919). Household utensils included bowls which were made from knots cut from the sides of trees; spoons and ladles were made from either wood or buffalo horn, and "the bowls and spoons used in medicine feasts and dances, especially the wakan watipi, had animal-head handles, and were held sacred (Skinner 1919:165). The Eastern Dakotas wove mats made of braided corn husks or reeds. They made pottery from pounded clay tempered with burnt flint or crushed rock. Knives, scrapers, and arrowpoints were made from stone. They
used stone berry crushers made of a flat stone slab with round flat pebbles used to mash the berries and cherries. Canoes were made by hollowing out logs, and the Sisseton and Wahpeton made bark canoes. The weapons made by the Eastern Dakotas included bows, arrows, rawhide shields, and warclubs.

After the introduction of trade goods, the material culture of the Eastern Dakotas was significantly altered. Bone and stone implements were replaced with metal, and the manufacturing of pottery gave way to metal kettles and dishes (Pond 1986).

Diversions among the Eastern Dakotas included foot races, gambling games, and they made bark sleds in the winter (Pond 1986). Well known field games include snow snake, lacrosse, and shinny with other games like hoop and javelin, bowl and dice, and icasdohe (______) also being noted (Howard 1966, Skinner 1919). Men played a gambling game called the moccasin game, while women participated in a "plum shooting" game (Howard 1966:9).

The Eastern Dakotas made musical instruments such as the double-headed tambour drum and the tall wooden water drum, the latter of which was used during important ceremonies like the Sun Dance (Howard 1966). Rattles made of deer hooves and gourds were used "especially, by shamans and in the Medicine dance" (Howard 1966:8).

Both men and women painted on tipis, but used different styles. Men would paint directly on the tipi in a style called -wo.w(ae) (______), while the women used a different style by first cutting an outline of the pattern on a separate piece of material and then tracing this on the tipi (Landes 1968:162). Paintings usually represented visions, or sometimes just the local landscape. Pipes were carved from pipestone found in the quarries of the sacred Pipestone area in southwest Minnesota (Landes 1968:162).

SETTLEMENT

The Eastern Dakotas lived in two types of dwellings: the tipi-tanka in the summer, and the tipi in the winter. The tipi-tanka was a large, bark-covered house which was supported by a frame of poles (Howard 1966; Pond 1986):

These posts were set a foot or two apart, and were about three inches in diameter. On the sides of the house, they were five or six feet long reaching to the eaves, and on the gable ends they were longer toward the center, reaching to the roof...forked posts were set at each end of the house...The upper ends of the rafters rested on the ridgepole, and the lower ends on horizontal poles, which were fastened to the tops of the posts at the sides of the house. Small poles were
placed transversely across the upright posts and the
rafters, and were tied to the latter with basswood
bark, so that the whole frame was a kind of wickerwork
made of poles crossing each other at right angles.
(Pond 1986:37)

Bark of elm trees was used for the covering of the house, each
piece being approximately five to six feet long (Pond 1986).
Directly outside the door of the tipi-tanka was a flat roof which
extended eight to ten feet and was supported by poles (Howard
1966:5). This area was used for, lounging and for drying
vegetables. These bark houses could accommodate a large number
of occupants during the summer when villages regrouped from
winter expeditions to conduct the communal bison hunt, tribal
ceremonies, and gathering activities.

In the winter the Eastern Dakotas resided in tipis made of
dressed buffalo skins which were sewn together with sinew, and
stood around 12 feet high and 10 to 12 feet in diameter (Pond
1986:38). Tipis were used in the winter for their warmth and
because they facilitated mobility when the village groups
separated into smaller units, usually consisting of one to three
families who migrated together to hunting and trapping
territories (Howard 1966).

According to Landes (1968), tipis were put up close together
to facilitate early morning and evening announcements made by a
camp officer. Landes also reports that the plan of the village
was a semi-circle. However, Moses Wells, her informant, says
there was "no strong commitment to the circular plan" as the plan
depended on the landscape, for instance, a straight line may have
been used when in the woods, or along the banks of a river or a
lake (Landes 1968:30).

The locations of the villages of the four Eastern Dakota
tribes are reported by Pond (1986:4) and Landes (1968:4). The
Mdewakantonwan villages were located along the Mississippi from
Winona to the falls of St. Anthony in present-day Minnesota, and
along the Minnesota River extending to Shakopee. The villages of
the Wahpekutes were located at Traverse de Sioux, also near the
Wisconsin border at Lake Pepin, and in the vicinity of Faribault
on the Cannon River. The Wahpeton villages were north of
Shakopee on the Minnesota River, and at Big Stone Lake (where the
Sissetons also had villages), Little Rapids Lake, and Lac Qui
Parle, all west of the Mississippi. The Wahpetons and Sissetons
had additional villages at Lake Traverse, where some villages of
the Yanktons were located.

Reports of the number of villages included in the
Mdewakanton division are variable. Pond (1986) documents eight
villages, Landes (1968) reports only seven, while her informant,
Moses Wells, identified ten villages. The following list of
villages and their locations shows those identified by Landes and Pond:

Kiuksa, located south of Lake Pepin, near present Winona;
Kaposia, located a few miles south of what is now St. Paul;
Black Dogs village; two or three miles above the mouth of the Minnesota River;
Reyata Otonwa, located at Lake Calhoun;
Tewapa, located at Eagle Creek;
Xemenitca, or Hill-Water-Trees, at the present site of Red Wing city; and
Tintatonwan, (the largest village) located at Shakopee (Landes 1968:5-7, Pond 1986:5).

Villages listed by Landes' (1968:8-9) informant, Moses Wells, include:

Shakopee, named for the chief;
Itcaxdake, located east of Shakopee village;
Mendota, where the Minnesota River enters into the Mississippi River;
Light Baggage Carried on the Warpath, southeast of St. Paul on the Mississippi River;
Big Trees, or Tcokantank, on the Mississippi River near St. Paul;
Red Cloud Island, on an island in the Mississippi River south of St. Paul;
Eagles (or possibly another cliff dwelling bird), located on top of a hill just north of the present city of Hastings;
Prairie Island, located between the Vermillion and Mississippi Rivers;
Standing Rock, located on the Cannon River; and
Hill-Water-Trees, at Red Wing city.

TRAVEL AND TRANSPORT
The Eastern Dakotas travelled on foot, using the domesticated dog as a pack animal to carry their necessities before the introduction of the horse in the seventeenth to early eighteenth centuries. After the Eastern Dakotas obtained the horse, the dog probably remained a secondary pack animal, and also was used to participate in hunting activities (Landes 1968). Horses were also used as pack animals and to pursue large game such as bison and deer. Although horses played a significant role in Dakota life, canoes continued to be highly valued for transportation in this land of lakes and streams. Deloria (1967:4) writes that the canoe was their principal means of transportation. Canoes were also used for gathering rice (Landes 1968, Pond 1986). Deloria (1967:4) gives a description of the canoe making process:

Boats were made out of single logs. First they were cut to the correct length; and then they were shaped to a point in front and back. Then one side was planed to a flat surface, and that was the bottom...

The top was hollowed out, and then the canoe was balanced, and sealed.

SOCIAL STRUCTURE

There is substantial controversy in the literature dealing with Eastern Dakota social structure, particularly regarding the existence of a clan-based kinship system. Many authors have reported a clan system among the Eastern Dakotas (Carver 1778; Dorsey 1889, 1890, 1897; Eastman 1849; Howard 1966; Riggs 1881), but Stipe (1971) argues that there is no evidence for this conclusion. In a later article, Howard (1979:133) reexamined his earlier position on Eastern Dakota clans, concluding:

While it is now clear that the Eastern Dakota did not possess patrilineal clans...the village groups of this division of the Sioux possessed many of the attributes of patri-clans.

The Eastern Dakotas were made up of village groups composed of close kin. This is apparent in one Dakota term for village--tiwanzi--meaning "family" (Landes 1968:29). Village exogamy was practiced, greatly facilitated by extensive intervillage and intertribal visiting (Landes 1968:128). Stipe (1971) notes that village membership was fluid, with people moving freely from one village to another, with the same being true between bands.

Murdock (1967) reports families were organized into independent polygynous units, with no commitment to unilineal descent; therefore, he concludes that the Eastern Dakotas practiced bilateral descent. The idea that no emphasis was placed on either the maternal or paternal line is supported by
Lesser (1930) and Stipe (1971). The Eastern Dakotas practiced both levirate and sororate marriage (Landes 1968). But Pond (1986) suggests that polygamy was more the exception than the rule among the Dakotas. According to Landes (1968:130), an honorable marriage was called woxbapi, meaning "presenting valuables as gifts," referring to the practice of the groom’s close kin contributing gifts for his parents to give to the parents of the intended bride.

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE

The villages of the four Eastern Dakota tribes were economically self-sufficient units, although they were dependent on the redistribution of goods. Villages were autonomous, with the necessary leaders, warriors, and novices to secure village independence (Landes 1968). A reflection of village solidarity was "village concern for the needy, the widowed," the poor, and the disabled, with "prime responsibility rest[ing] upon...close relatives, and after these, upon the village" (Landes 1968:37). Distribution and feasts also reinforced and exemplified village solidarity.

When a hunter was successful in obtaining meat, the meat had to be shared with other village members. This system was accomplished through strict rules during the hunt, and in holding feasts to which villagers were invited. During the deer hunt, when a deer was killed, the hunter had to give notice to other hunters nearby with a shout; the first three to arrive had claims on the deer meat, but if no other hunter heard the call, the killer of the deer kept the meat. This rule only applied to the first deer shot, whatever was killed after the first was kept by the hunter:

No one might appropriate a whole deer to himself simply because he had killed it. Rules required anyone killing a deer to give the shout-notice. If no one came, the waiting hunter cut up the deer and carried it home. If one did come the meat was divided equally, the killer taking the hide. The first three to arrive had claims on the meat. (Landes 1968:173)

The meat was taken back to the village where feasts were held. Similar rules applied to bison and bear hunts and in the distribution of the meat.

Intertribal trade was largely disrupted by the fur trade, going as far as to instigate hostilities between neighboring tribes over the competition for resources. Eastern Dakota and Chippewa conflicts continued until the middle of the nineteenth century as trade expansion and the "French policy of pacification, exploration and exploitation" depleted valuable hunting grounds (Anderson 1978:29). But even after extensive...
contact with European traders, Meyer states "the influence of white culture was evident mainly in the form of tools, weapons, and utensils...if white contact had also made the Santees more dependent on the trade system, the integrity of their culture was largely intact" (Meyers 1967:20).

POLITICAL ORGANIZATION

The Mdewakanton, Wahpekute, Wahpeton, and Sisseton were each composed of self-sufficient, sovereign villages, or bands. Every village had its own chief, shamans, and police, the last of which were called akitzita (Landes 1968:57). An example of the expression of village sovereignty is seen in intervillage gambling. A chief from one village would invite another village to join in a gambling game; this also facilitated the exchange of marriage partners (Landes 1968, Pond 1986). The chief generally held office for life and through inheritance, however, it was through merit and character that he gained the recognition and respect which insured his authority (Howard 1966, Landes 1968, Pond 1986). Within each village the chief was considered "father," and the villagers his "children", and in his daily conduct the chief was to exemplify hospitality and largess (Landes 1968:82,88). The chief’s duties included appointing the akitzita, organizing hunting and war expeditions, and addressing the village in early morning and evening "homilies" stressing personal character, respecting others, concern with camp welfare, and obeying and listening to elders (Landes 1968).

The akitzita were made up of men and sometimes women who were "endowed provisionally with the fullest powers to execute the chief’s interests and orders" (Landes 1968:57). However, the authority invested in the akitzita was strictly limited to the specific jobs assigned by the chief. The members of the akitzita were selected from experienced warriors within the village group, and although highly respected, their authority was derived from their association with the chief (Landes 1968:67).

The principal governing body of the Eastern Dakotas was the village council, which was composed of twenty wakiconze, or councilors (Howard 1966, Skinner 1919). Decisions of importance were made in council with the village chief and the wakiconze.

During intervillage and intertribal activities (of the four Eastern Dakota tribes) such as the communal bison hunt, or ceremonies, villages "lost" their sovereignty and became part of a larger unit. At this time the most respected and influential leader would be chosen to conduct the intervillage/tribal activities, with the akitzita composed of members from each of the villages or tribes present.
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Table 6-1. Historical population figures for the Santee Sioux, 1835-1898.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Population Estimate</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>38 warriors; 130 persons</td>
<td>Santees at Vermillion River; J. Pilcher, &quot;Abstract showing the different bands of Indians...and the aggregate number of Indians in the Sub Agency, Upper Missouri,&quot; 6 Oct 1835, cited in Woolworth 1974:206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Lower: 2547 Upper: 4363</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Lower: 2225 Upper: 2811</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Meyer 1993:146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>Meyer 1993:166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>ARCIA, 1898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Secondary sources include Woolworth 1974. ARCIA refers to the Annual Reports of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the year indicated.
CHAPTER 7

HISTORY OF THE NORTHERN PONCAS, YANKTONS, AND NEBRASKA SANTEES
FOLLOWING ESTABLISHMENT OF THEIR RESERVATIONS

Beth R. Ritter, Oliver Froehling, and Michele Voeltz

INTRODUCTION

The establishment of reservations for the Poncas, Santees, and Yanktons marked a new era in the histories of the three tribes. Reservations were delimited in the NIMI study area under treaties of cession and Executive Agreements (see Appendix II). The establishment of reservations fostered dependency on government rations and services and facilitated government assimilation programs. The early reservation years, as discussed below, were extremely difficult for all three tribes. This chapter discusses the legacy which was begun by the establishment of reservations in the latter half of the nineteenth century and traces the separate development of each tribe through the present.

The authors of this chapter have contributed to it in various ways. Ritter and Froehling co-authored the section about the Northern Poncas, while Ritter and Voeltz separately prepared the discussions of the Yanktons and Santees, respectively.

THE NORTHERN PONCAS

In the historic period, the Poncas were a small prairie-plains tribe whose aboriginal territory emanated from the confluence of the Niobrara and Missouri rivers (Howard 1965; Grobsmith and Ritter 1992). The Poncas acquired the reputation of "following the chase," particularly bison hunting, which accounted for their having ranged well into the Black Hills, Rocky Mountains and as far south as the Platte River (see Map __). As seasonal bison hunters, the Poncas also managed to maintain a semi-sedentary village life, farming the river bottoms of various creeks and rivers in northeastern Nebraska. The Poncas are Dhegiha speakers with close linguistic and cultural affiliation to the Omahas, Quapaws, Kansas, and Osages (Howard 1965; Fletcher and La Flesche 1992).

The Ponca Treaty of 1858 ceded 2.3 million acres of the Ponca's aboriginal territory in return for a small reservation in the Niobrara river valley (see Map __) (Wishart 1990). The supplemental Ponca Treaty of 1865 eventually expanded the reservation to 96,000 acres, which included traditional Ponca burial grounds and cornfields (Wishart 1994; Ritter-Knoche 1990).
From the outset, the Poncas were plagued with inadequate annuities, poor luck in farming and persistent raiding on the part of the Teton Sioux (particularly the Brulé band under Spotted Tail) (Howard 1965).

The Poncas lost their reservation to the Teton Sioux in the Ft. Laramie Treaty of 1868 (Howard 1965; Ritter 1994). In the treaty, the government established the southern boundary of the Great Sioux Reservation as the Niobrara River, which effectively dispossessed nearly the entire Ponca reservation set aside in the Ponca treaties of 1858 and 1865 (Lake 1981; Wishart 1994). The government was unwilling to rectify the error, despite the apparent indifference of the Brulé about keeping the Poncas' land (Wishart 1994). The Brulé did, however, take advantage of the increased license to raid the Poncas who were "squatting" on their lands (Mulhair 1992; Wishart 1994).

In 1877, the government's solution to the Poncas' problem was to relocate them to Indian Territory (see Chapter 29 for discussion of the Ponca Trail of Tears). The Poncas were forcefully marched to Indian Territory and their former reservation was turned over to Spotted Tail in 1877. Spotted Tail abandoned the agency in 1878 to return to his former territory upriver from the Ponca reservation (Wishart 1994). The Poncas suffered considerable hardship on the journey to Indian Territory and after settling in Indian Territory on the Quapaw reservation. Within two years of removal, the Poncas had lost nearly one-fourth of their tribe to disease, exacerbated by malnutrition and exposure (Howard 1965).

One of the traditional chiefs of the Poncas, Standing Bear, had resisted the removal from the outset and had never accepted their fate (Wishart 1994). On January 1, 1879, Standing Bear led a contingent of 29 Poncas out of Indian Territory toward their former home on the Niobrara. Standing Bear was prompted to attempt the escape from Indian Territory by the dying request of his son, who wished to be buried with his ancestors. The journey was a difficult one and the group was taken into custody after they stopped on the Omaha reservation.

Historic events surrounding the separation of Standing Bear and his followers from the main group of Poncas remaining in Indian Territory and the subsequent trial of Standing Bear (see Chapter 29), resulted in the eventual division of the Ponca tribe into two separate tribes. Standing Bear's followers came to be known as the Northern Poncas and were eventually allowed to re-establish a landbase on their former reservation on the Niobrara. The "Southern" Poncas who chose to remain in Indian Territory received a 101,000-acre reservation. The histories and cultures of the two tribes have been separate since 1881.

In 1881, Northern Ponca heads of household were allowed to
re-settle 640-acre plots on the former Niobrara reservation (Wishart 1994). However, these were not the eventual Ponca "allotments" discussed below; this was a special allowance which pre-dated the Dawes Allotment Act of 1887. The Poncas were not officially granted allotments (under the Dawes Act) until the breakup of the Great Sioux Reservation in 1889 (Wishart 1994).

Allotment Period

The Northern Ponca reservation was allotted under Sections 8 and 13 of the Act of March 2, 1889, to break up the Great Sioux Reservation (Kappler 1972, 1:328). Each head of household received 320 acres, orphans and single persons over 18 years of age received 160 acres, and every person under 18 was entitled to 80 acres.

The allotments were taken out in the summer of 1890, after last-ditch efforts of Standing Bear and some of his followers to avoid allotment by temporarily relocating to Indian Territory. The total acreage of allotments taken out amounted to 27,202 acres. In addition, a family of Rosebud Sioux also took out allotments on the Northern Ponca reservation. These allotments were initially protected by a 25-year trust period, during which the land was protected from alienation. The remainder of the 96,000-acre reservation was settled by non-Indians under the Homestead Act (Fig. 7-1).

The Ponca allotments were generally on the best land, located in the floodplains of the Missouri and Niobrara, and were concentrated on the eastern side of the reservation where the floodplains are the widest. The terrain becomes more "broken" in the western part of the reservation. The allotments were strung along the major rivers, and along some of the smaller creeks in the region. Families tried to occupy continuous plots, taking their allotments next to each other. When this was not possible, due to the limited floodplain acreage available, a family's allotments were spread over several clusters. (The information regarding the location of the initial Ponca allotments was obtained from the Land Index of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Regional Office in Aberdeen South Dakota. Information on the sale of allotments was compiled from the Numerical Index and the County Deed books, for both Boyd and Knox counties, Nebraska, [see Boyd County Registrar of Deeds n.d.a and n.d.b, and Knox County Registrar of Deeds n.d.a and n.d.b].)

During the first decade after allotment, the Northern Poncas farmed as individuals on their allotments, with some help from the agent and the agency farmer. However, due to the dynamics of Indian policy, this decade also saw the initiation of leasing and the onset of the heirship problem. Because land could not be willed to one heir, a parcel had to be either divided up, or several heirs received an undivided interest in the land parcel.
On the Ponca reservation, the latter was generally the case. Since the population was growing, this quickly led to significant numbers of land parcels being owned by an increasing number of individuals. In order to combat this problem, and to satisfy the landhunger of settlers in general, several federal laws were passed that effectively eroded the trust protection of the land. Exceptions that allowed for land alienation were made for inherited lands: some allottees were judged able to handle their own affairs and were allowed to sell outright, while other allottees were judged incompetent, in which case the agent was empowered to sell the land on their behalf. These exceptions to the trust period led to an accelerating loss of land for the Poncas. Land that was removed from trust status was generally sold after a short time period, often well below market value (Froehling 1993).

By 1916, the end of the initial 25-year trust period, over half of the allotted land had already left Ponca hands (Fig. 7-2). The trust period was extended several times until tribal termination in 1962, without ever effectively ending Northern Ponca land alienation. Fig. 7-2 also shows the pattern of alienation of the "continuous allotment areas" sold by 1916; the result of whole families receiving fee patents and then selling them. Alienation of the Northern Poncas' allotments ceased only after the Indian Reorganization Act was passed in 1934, which ended allotment as a policy, extended the trust period indefinitely, and put emphasis on reestablishing an Indian land base. At this time, there were two kinds of Ponca lands (Fig. 7-3):

1) Land held in trust for the individual allottee or his/her heirs by the federal government. These lands were tax exempt and could not be mortgaged. In the case of inherited allotments, this often meant that one land plot was owned by a large number of heirs with different interests in the land, since the Ponca population was growing.

2) Land held in fee simple title by an individual Ponca. This meant that the owner had the same title to the land as the non-Indian settlers in the area. Land could be mortgaged and was not tax exempt. Lands in this category were usually sold quickly, even though the owner had to petition the agent to release the land and in so doing usually stated that the land would not be sold but used for cultivation. A few Poncas however did try to farm and held out for a while, but then fell victim to the depression in the 1930s. The fee lands shown in Fig. 7-3 are some of the lands used by these Ponca farmers. The last of this fee lands was sold in 1946.

Fig. 7-4 shows the fate of the Ponca allotments which were officially protected from alienation (trust status). Fifty-three
percent were sold after a fee patent was obtained by the
allottee, usually within six months after the fee patent was
received. The large continuous areas result from families who
received fee patents and sold their allotments within a short
amount of time. Forty-five percent of the allotted acreage was
sold by the federal government for the heirs after the original
allottee was deceased. This type of transaction became
increasingly more prevalent as the original allotted generation
aged. Only 0.9 percent of the acreage, or two allotments, were
sold for allottees that were declared incompetent, which is a
fairly low percentage compared to other reservations. A total of
1.2 percent were either submerged in the Missouri before it could
be sold, as happened to the allotments in the far north, or were
cancelled.

Land Tenure Between 1934-1965

The Northern Ponca Tribe incorporated under the Indian
Reorganization Act in 1936; however, there were very few land
parcels left to protect (Fig. 7-3). The remaining lands were
scattered throughout the reservation, with a center at the agency-
allotment and another in the north along the Missouri, where most
of the allotments had been taken out in the first place.

After incorporation, tribal trust lands were acquired, among
them the old Standing Bear allotment located in the southeast
corner of the reservation area (Fig. 7-5). This was the only
land parcel located in the floodplain; all the other newly
acquired land parcels were located in the uplands, away from the
major rivers. However, lands held in fee and inherited lands
continued to be sold.

World War II and relocation policies, thereafter, continued
to promote the out-migration of Poncas, resulting in a dispersed
pattern of residence by the time the tribe was terminated. Fig.
7-6 shows the location of residence of the 442 Northern Ponca
tribal members listed on the final tribal roll in 1965. This
pattern shows the impact of the relocation programs, as well as
demonstrating affiliation with other tribes, like the Omahas.
Even though the pattern is dispersed, the core of the Northern
Poncas were still located in the reservation area. Clearly
marked are the centers of the Indian Relocation Program in Salt
Lake City, Seattle, Chicago, and Los Angeles. Ponca City,
Oklahoma, also received a fair number of Northern Poncas,
illustrating the strong ties between the two Ponca groups.

During the time of out-migration (1940s until termination),
many of the remaining tribal lands were leased to non-Indian
farmers and ranchers (U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of
Indian Affairs 1958). The few lands still held in fee by Ponca
farmers were sold piecemeal, as were some of the inherited lands.
Because the permission of all heirs was needed to sell inherited
lands, this became more and more difficult, since some parcels were owned by perhaps as many as 50 to 100 heirs. In the 1950s, the reservation population continued to drop. All the lands, including the tribal and inherited lands, were sold during the course of termination and the proceeds distributed among the tribal members (Fig. 7-7).

Termination

In the post-World War II political and economic climate, outright assimilation of American Indians into the dominant American culture was seen as the final solution to the centuries-old Indian problem (Wilkinson and Biggs 1977; Olson and Wilson 1984; Prucha 1984). The Northern Ponca Tribe of Nebraska was among the 109 American Indian tribes and bands to be Congressionally-terminated in the 1950s and 1960s. Tribal termination resulted in the severing of the special federal-tribal "trust" relationship and ended federal responsibility and supervision, guaranteed by treaty, in the areas of education, health, welfare, natural resource, and trust land management (LeRoy and Tyndall 1987; Grobsmith and Ritter 1992).

As discussed earlier, previous government policies such as allotment and relocation had effectively resulted in the out-migration of the majority of Northern Poncas from the reservation in northeastern Nebraska by the 1950s. At the time of tribal termination in 1962, only 834 acres remained under tribal control. The former reservation was located in a predominately rural agricultural economy, dependent on ranching and farming. The majority of Ponca families did not have adequate acreage to pursue either occupation; for many Ponca families relocation was an economic necessity. The demise of the traditional community arguably contributed to a loss of tribal identity and customs (Ritter 1994).

The Northern Poncas were the last tribe to be congressionally-terminated under termination policy in 1962 (Prucha 1984). When termination began in 1954, the government targeted wealthy, highly-assimilated tribes (like the Menominee and Klamath) who were considered "ready" to handle their own affairs. Later, partially because of resistance from the more powerful tribes, the government turned to concentrate on the smaller, poorer tribes, like the Northern Poncas, who were ill-prepared to oppose their termination.

Interestingly, the Northern Ponca tribe actually voted in favor of termination, a fact which has puzzled many (Ritter-Knoche 1990). Some Ponca informants suggest that they "walked out of the election" and boycotted the vote when they saw that many were in favor of termination (Grobsmith 1989). Looking back, there is a broad perception among many Northern Poncas that they simply did not understand the consequences of termination.
Many felt that they were "lured" by the promise of per capita cash payments that would result from the liquidation of their remaining tribal assets (including the pending award from the Indian Claims Commission which would not have been distributed individually unless the tribe terminated--non-terminated tribes, the Southern Ponca tribe included, received their Indian Claims Commission awards in lump sum). Many report that they felt it was over anyway, termination just made it official. (Informants' opinions are summarized from personal communications with the author between 1989-1995.)

The Northern Ponca tribal termination bill was introduced by Senator Church in April of 1962. The bill provided for the drawing up of a final tribal roll, the division of tribal assets and the transfer of trust property to individual tribal members (which returned trust land to the local tax rolls) (Grobsmith and Ritter 1992). Termination became effective on October 18, 1966 (Kappler 1972). The final tribal roll included 442 Northern Poncas, who lost their federally-recognized identity as American Indians and the special services that accompany such status. Termination also resulted in the liquidation of the remaining 834 acres of reservation land. The Northern Poncas were allowed to retain their tribal cemetery, roughly 14 acres. Commenting on termination, LeRoy and Tyndall suggest:

What transpired as a result of termination has been a decline in the customs and traditions of the Ponca Tribe, the loss of federal services, employment-job training, health services for the young and elderly, Indian child welfare protection, higher education and youth programs. The loss of recognition as American Indian has had the most profound effect on tribal members and their descendants. (LeRoy and Tyndall 1987:2-3)

While there is widespread consensus that termination hurt the Northern Poncas socio-economically (LeRoy and Tyndall 1987; Grobsmith 1989; Grobsmith and Ritter 1992), comparative data from the 1960s is presently unavailable. The Poncas requested that information from the BIA in preparation of their restoration bid, but the BIA was unable to locate the Poncas' records. Evidently, the BIA failed to anticipate the possibility that tribal termination would not be a permanent state or that any future need to access records pertaining to terminated tribes would arise.

One tangible consequence of termination was the continued out-migration of tribal members from the aboriginal homeland. A 1989 socio-economic study, initiated by the Northern Ponca Restoration Committee, Inc. (NPRCI), revealed that the Northern Poncas were dispersed in 26 states, including Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico (Grobsmith 1989; Grobsmith and Ritter 1992). In 1989, the majority of Northern Poncas (54 percent) continued to
cluster residually within the general vicinity of the former
reservation, in the states of Nebraska, South Dakota, and Iowa
(Grobsmith 1989; Grobsmith and Ritter 1992). Of particular
significance were population concentrations in the Nebraska
cities of Omaha, Lincoln, and Norfolk (Grobsmith 1989; Grobsmith
and Ritter 1992). Arguably, the aforementioned residential
patterns have provided considerable obstacles to organizing
tribal restoration efforts and to perpetuating community
activities, such as cultural and social events.

Restoration

Various attempts to reverse tribal termination were
Finally, in 1986, a meeting of representatives from the Northern
Ponca Tribe, National Indian Lutheran Board, Sequoyah, Inc., the
Lincoln Indian Center, and the Native American Development
Corporation of Omaha met to discuss the feasibility of reversing
termination (Grobsmith and Ritter 1992). The Northern Ponca
Restoration Committee, Inc. (NPRCI), a non-profit organization,
was chartered in the state of Nebraska in August of 1987 (LeRoy
and Tyndall 1987; Grobsmith and Ritter 1992). The corporation
was chartered specifically:

1. to perpetuate the identity of the Tribe of Native
Americans known as the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska;

2. to seek to establish said tribe as a State recognized
tribe of Native Americans;

3. to seek to reinstate said tribe as a federally recognized
tribe of Native Americans; and

4. to perpetuate the culture, traditions, and customs of the
Ponca Tribe of Nebraska. (LeRoy and Tyndall 1987:3)

The Ponca Tribe of Nebraska achieved their goal of state
recognition in April of 1988, with the passage of Resolution No.
428 by the Nebraska Unicameral (Grobsmith and Ritter 1992:11).

After securing state recognition, the grass-roots
restoration effort focused on courting Nebraska Congressional
representatives to introduce and support their restoration bill
in Congress. The Ponca Restoration Bill was modeled, with the
assistance of Mike Mason, an experienced restoration attorney
from Oregon Legal Services, after successful restoration bills
initiated by various terminated Oregon tribes. The NPRCI sought
support from Nebraska Senators J.J. Exon (D) and Bob Kerrey (D).
Senator Exon was particularly receptive and "co-introduced"
Senate Bill 1747, the "Ponca Restoration Act" in October of 1989
with Senator Kerrey (Grobsmith 1989). The Senate Select
Committee on Indian Affairs endorsed the bill and, it
subsequently gained unanimous approval in the Senate.

The Ponca restoration legislation encountered considerably more resistance in the House of Representatives and with representatives of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Grobsmith and Ritter 1992). The primary obstacle in the House of Representatives was the general lack of support from the Nebraska House delegation. The concern focused on the relatively vague language in the Bill regarding the possibility of eventually re-establishing a residential reservation for the Poncas in northeastern Nebraska. The Poncas were not seeking the re-establishment of their reservation; they had opted instead for a federally-funded economic development plan which would presumably better serve their dispersed, urban membership. Ultimately, in order to secure the support of the Nebraska delegates, the tribal representatives agreed upon compromise legislation that explicitly barred the Ponca Tribe from ever seeking the re-establishment of their reservation. With the eventual support of the Nebraska Representatives, the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska was able to secure a favorable vote in the House of Representatives.

The issues with the Bureau of Indian Affairs centered primarily on administrative questions. Initially, the Bureau was concerned about blood quantum requirements and the number of service delivery areas the Bureau would be responsible to fund. The Bureau estimates an average cost of $3,000 per enrolled tribal member (Grobsmith and Ritter 1992; Ritter-Knoche 1990), so questions regarding tribal membership criteria are of especial interest to the Bureau. The NPRCI leadership (particularly Fred LeRoy) was able to successfully argue that the Poncas have the sovereign right to establish their own criteria for tribal membership. For the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska this meant dropping the standard "blood quantum" requirement in favor of lineal descendency, a radical departure from the historical policies of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Jaimes 1988; Grobsmith and Ritter 1992; Ritter-Knoche 1990). The Bureau eventually agreed to fund six service delivery areas (Knox, Boyd, Madison, Lancaster, and Douglas counties in Nebraska, and Charles Mix County in South Dakota). This was also a departure for the BIA, which generally prefers to limit service-delivery areas to reservations.

Finally, the Bureau sought to oppose the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska's restoration by questioning whether the Tribe adequately fulfilled the six administrative criteria, set forth to regulate the eligibility of terminated tribes to pursue restoration. The criteria address: 1) the existence of an identifiable community; 2) residential vicinity to the former reservation; 3) evidence of on-going self-government functions; 4) retention of aboriginal language, customs, and culture; 5) marked deterioration of socio-economic status; and 6) comparative data regarding the severity of their condition to adjacent areas/groups (Grobsmith and Ritter 1992:11). While
representatives of the Bureau testified at the House of Representatives' Committee Hearing on Interior and Insular Affairs that they "felt" the Poncas did not satisfy the administrative criteria, they were unable to demonstrate why (Grobsmith and Ritter 1992). As a result, the testimony of the Bureau was discounted and proved ineffective in halting the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska's restoration.

With the Nebraska House delegation's support and a successful House hearing, the bill won approval and was forwarded to President George Bush who signed the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska back into federally-recognized existence on October 31, 1990 (P.L. 101-484; see Appendix I).

The grass-roots restoration effort, spearheaded by the Northern Ponca Restoration Committee, Inc., with dedicated leadership from Mr. Fred LeRoy and the Board of Directors, raised an estimated $180,000 from private and public sources to finance the restoration effort (Ritter-Knoche 1990). The restoration team also included an attorney, a Washington, D.C.-based lobbyist, and two anthropologists (Grobsmith and Ritter 1992).

Upon restoration, leadership duties were officially vested in the Board of Directors of the Northern Ponca Restoration Committee as the "interim Tribal Council." The legal duties of the interim Tribal Council included submitting a Tribal constitution for Bureau of Indian Affairs and subsequent ratification by tribal members; overseeing tribal elections to seat a constitutionally-elected Tribal Council; preparing and submitting an economic development plan to Congress; enrollment of Tribal members; service delivery; and initiating Tribal infrastructure and administration. Because of the timing of the restoration, the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska missed the Bureau of Indian Affairs funding cycle and did not begin receiving regular tribal funding until October, 1991 (Ritter 1994).

The newly-restored tribe has experienced considerable political and legal challenges. The initial interim council administration, headquartered in Omaha, was successfully challenged by an opposition group, who held an independent election to replace the NPRCI Board of Directors (the interim Tribal Council). For several months in 1992, two rival Ponca Tribal Councils vied for legal and federal government recognition as the legitimate Tribal administration. The dispute, which revolved around Nebraska statutes for non-profit organizations, was eventually settled in district court in October, 1992, with the Niobrara-based coalition prevailing.

The new constitution of the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska was ratified in June of 1994 and the first Tribal Council and Tribal Chair were elected in October, 1994 (see Chapter 30). Tribal headquarters are in Niobrara, Nebraska, with field offices in
Omaha, Norfolk and Lincoln. (For more detailed documentation of
termination, restoration and current tribal politics see: LeRoy
and Tyndall 1987; Grobsmith 1989; Ritter-Knoche 1990; Grobsmith
and Ritter 1992; Ritter 1994.)

THE YANKTON SIOUX

Aboriginal Territory

The first documented European contact with the Dakota Nation
(Sioux) was in 1679, when Duluth visited them at Mille Lacs Lake
in present-day Minnesota (Woolworth 1974:14). The Yanktons’
aboriginal territorial core was most likely north-central
Minnesota (Woolworth 1974; Bruguier 1993; Hoover 1988). The
westward migration from a woodlands-based economy to a prairie­
plains economy commenced during the historic period. According
to Woolworth (1974:178), the Yanktons had become a prairie-plains
group by 1700, and were located near the sacred Pipestone Quarry
in southwestern Minnesota, a place that holds significant
spiritual and cultural significance for the Yanktons to this day
(see discussion below). Continued conflicts with the well-armed
Chippewas on the eastern frontier, confined the Yanktons to
southwestern Minnesota and northwestern Iowa throughout the
eighteenth century (Woolworth 1974). The Yanktons began to
migrate into Royce Area no. 410 (see Fig. 29-1a [ex-4]) at the
turn of the twentieth century. Eventually, the Yankton Sioux
aboriginal territory, recognized officially through U.S. treaty
cessions and eventually by the Indian Claims Commission, would
emanate from Royce Area 410 (see Fig. 29-1a [ex-5). The land
eventually ceded as Yankton "aboriginal territory" lies largely
within the modern state of South Dakota and is commonly known as
"Royce Area no. 410" (Royce 1899).

In the Treaty of 1858, the Yankton Sioux ceded nearly
11,000,000 acres to the United States (Royce 1899; Woolworth
1974). The Treaty of 1858, negotiated by Chief Struck-by-the­
Ree, provided for a 430,000-acre reservation and continued rights
to the Pipestone Quarry in Minnesota. The Yanktons were awarded
$1.6 million in annuities or 14.9 cents per acre (Wishart
1990:98), to be paid over a 50-year period. In addition to the
annuities, $50,000 was committed to aid in the transition to
reservation life (e.g., houses, implements, livestock), including
the construction of various facilities associated with the
Greenwood Agency.

The Reservation Era

The Yanktons began to settle on their newly-established
430,000-acre reservation in 1859. The Yankton agency was
established at Greenwood, near the Missouri River, to facilitate
delivery of supplies and payment of annuities (see Chapter 28).
Hoover (1988:36) described early reservation life:
To outsiders, reservation existence through the 1860s may have seemed like traditional life confined in a small space. Agency employees were at work to make it otherwise, however, as quickly as they could. No item on their agenda seemed more urgent than the order to move Yankton people from their band villages into permanent housing on scattered family farms.

These policies included encouraging Yanktons to replace tipis with log cabins and most importantly, communal land with private property. It was believed that physically separating tribal members would discourage participation in traditional activities (religious ceremonies, dances, giveaways, etc.) which stood in the way of "civilizing" the Yanktons.

Chief Struck-by-the-Ree encouraged the Yanktons to accommodate the policies of the federal government. However, the Yanktons were victimized by a corrupt agent, Dr. Walter A. Burleigh, a political appointee of President Lincoln, during the early reservation years (Sansom-Flood and Bernie 1985). This, compounded by the resistance of the "upper bands," who were traditionalists led by Feather Necklace, and natural disasters (drought, grasshoppers, early frosts, blizzards, and floods) made the early years of reservation adjustment difficult indeed.

Generally speaking, the Yanktons suffered a steady decline in population during the first four decades of reservation life (see Fig. ex-6 and Table 5-2). The population of the Yanktons reached an all-time low of 1,715 in 1892/1893 from a high of 2,530 in 1865 (ARCIA 1865; 1892; 1893). When mortality is discussed in their reports, the Yankton agents typically attribute the high mortality to disease. In 1880, the Yankton agent reported a 16.8 percent mortality rate due to disease (ARCIA 1880). In 1882, the Yankton agent reported 93 deaths and 84 births, perhaps illuminating one factor in the steady population decline in this era (ARCIA 1882). The Yanktons' agents neglected to document any possible out-migration of tribal members during the early reservation years, making interpretation of the population figures tenuous.

The Sacred Pipestone Quarry

In the negotiation of the Treaty of 1858, Chief Struck-by-the-Ree was determined to secure the retention of the sacred Pipestone Quarry as Yankton territory. Because the Santees had failed to treat for that right in the Mendota and Traverse des Sioux treaties of 1851 (see Appendix II), the Yanktons were in a position to legally reserve the quarry for themselves (Corbett 1978:100). In the Treaty of 1858 (Treaty of Washington), ratified in 1859, Article 8 stipulated that the red pipe-stone quarry would be reserved for Yankton use. In addition, the federal government assumed the responsibility of surveying the
site. It was described as, "an open pit...several hundred yards long and about 12 feet wide" (Corbett 1978:102).

The Pipestone Quarry is located approximately 150 miles northeast of the Yankton Sioux reservation in South Dakota. Because the Yanktons were not resident in the proximity of the quarry, it became increasingly difficult to maintain their claim to the site, particularly in the face of growing American settlement in the area. In the 1870s, the Yanktons' title to the land was challenged by the settlers (Corbett 19778:102). Tribal leaders filed a formal complaint with Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Carl Schurz, in 1878. Encroachment continued, a railroad was built across the northern portion of the reserve (1884), and the government constructed an Indian industrial school (1892) which appropriated the entire 640 remaining acres of the reserve (Corbett 1978:104-11). These developments strengthened the growing belief by non-Indians that the quarry was not "owned" by the Yanktons:

The attorney general ruled that the title of the land was with the U.S.; and therefore, the government did not have to obtain permission from or pay compensation to the Indians. (Corbett 1978:108)

This was an example of the exercise of plenary power held by Congress over Indian tribes.

The Agreement of 1892, attempted to resolve the outstanding grievances of the Yanktons regarding the dispossession of the sacred site. Article XVI of the Agreement of 1892 (28 Stat., 318) provides,

If the Government of the United States questions the ownership of the Pipestone Reservation by the Yankton tribe of Sioux Indians under the treaty of April 19th, 1858, including the fee to the land as well as the right to work the quarries, the Secretary of the Interior shall as speedily as possible refer the matter to the Supreme Court of the United States, to be decided by that tribunal. And the United States shall furnish, without cost to the Yankton Indians, at least one competent attorney to represent the interests of the tribe before the court.

If the Secretary of the Interior shall not, within one year after the ratification of this agreement by Congress, refer the question of the ownership of the said Pipestone Reservation to the Supreme Court, as provided for above, such failure upon his part shall be construed as, and shall be, a waiver by the United States of all rights to the ownership of the said Pipestone Reservation, and the same shall thereafter be solely the
property of the Yankton tribe of Sioux Indians, including
the fee to the land.

The Yanktons sought monetary compensation ($3 million) for
the appropriated reserve, while the Government offered only
$64,840 ($100 per acre) (Corbett 1978:112). The U.S. Senate
decided that the Treaty of 1858 had created nothing more than an
"easement...which gave the Yanktons the right to use the quarry
but nothing more" (Corbett 1978:113). Eventually, the case was
referred to the Supreme Court, which ruled that "the Yanktons
held title to the pipestone reserve as a result of the Agreement
of 1892 and were entitled to just compensation" (Yankton Sioux
Tribe of Indians v. United States, 272 U.S. 351, 47 S.Ct., 71
L.Ed. 294, 298 [1926], quoted in Corbett 1978:114). In 1929,
Congress appropriated $328,558.90 in per capita distributions to
1,953 persons, who received $151.99 apiece for their sacred
quarry (Corbett 1978:115).

Allotment and the Agreement of 1892

The Dawes Severalty Act or General Allotment Act of 1887,
signalled Congress' intent to dismantle the tribal communal land
tenure systems as a definitive step in the assimilation process
(see Chapter 29). As Deloria (1987:86) observes, the General
Allotment Act did not in and of itself dispossess the Indian
landbase, it simply gave the President of the United States the
authority to negotiate the cession of "surplus" lands freed up by
the allotment process. In fact, many reservations had already
been allotted previous to the 1887 Dawes Act. By 1887, Congress
had allotted 584,423 acres of treaty-guaranteed reservations,
e.g., 76,000 acres of the Omaha reservation was allotted in 1882
(Olson and Wilson 1984:66).

The actual vehicle which transferred "surplus" lands into
the public domain were a series of statutes enacted over a span
of nearly 30 years after the passage of the Dawes Act: "These
statutes provided for the allotment in severalty of tracts of land
on specific reservations to individual tribal members, and then
for the opening of surplus lands to settlement" (Campbell
1986:57). These statutes are known collectively as the Surplus
Lands Acts.

The Yanktons were opposed, sometimes violently, to accepting
the allotment of their reservation (see Sansom-Flood et al.
1989:39-42). The resistance was lead by Feather Necklace,
Struck-by-the-Ree's traditional headman. In the 1887 report to
the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, John F. Kinney (Yankton
agent) described the situation:

When surveyors began allotment work on the Yankton
Reservation, Feather's men surrounded them. Instead of
backing off, the whitemen pounded more stakes into the
ground. Warriors yanked up the stakes and grabbed the tripod. A month later, Tribesmen stopped surveyors at the Chouteau Creek bridge and refused to allow them on reservation land. During the summer of 1887, Feather attacked the surveying party three times. A cavalry regiment was finally called in from Fort Randall to stop the resistance. (quoted in Sansom-Flood et al. 1989:27)

Struck-by-the-Ree, completely blind and deaf by this time, did not oppose allotment. He was, however, committed to stopping the sale of surplus land on the Yankton reservation and proposed that each Yankton be allotted 480 acres ("twelve forties") of tribal land, which was calculated to leave no surplus land (Sansom-Flood et al., 1989:27). Struck-by-the-Ree, Padaniapapi, was unable to secure his last wish for his kinsmen; he died in 1888 before he could stop the sale of surplus land and before the allotment process was completed (Sansom-Flood et al., 1989:30).

The allotment process evidently proceeded as the Yankton agent, Everett W. Foster, reported 1,484 patents issued in 1891 (ARCIA 1891). Each Yankton head of family received 160 acres, single people over the age of 18 received 80 acres, and singles under the age of 18 received 40 acres. Originally, the allottees were to have 25 years of trust protection for their allotments; this period was shortened through various amendments to the Dawes Act.

Far from reducing the federal responsibility for Indian affairs, the Dawes Act increased the federal presence: "The Dawes Act created a nightmare of paperwork for the Interior Department and it failed to make Indians into farmers" (Sansom-Flood et al., 1989:36). By 1896, the Yanktons had lost an estimated 230,000 acres of their 430,000-acre reservation (Sansom-Flood et al., 1989:36). Hollow Horn, a prominent Yankton, observed with uncanny foresight:

You know what is going to happen after the allotments are all gone? They will take our land...we will lose it. And then they'll probably take our gravestones and build their buildings on top of us. (Sansom-Flood et al., 1989:36)

In 1892, three commissioners sent from the Secretary of the Interior came to the Yankton reservation to negotiate for the sale of surplus lands with a council of 24 tribal members:

The commissioners...were determined to make a success of their undertaking, and when the opposition showed strength, they became liberal in expending money. They employed a small army of interpreters, couriers, and messengers...Since then, those whose names were attached to the document have asked me many times what their names
are signed to, and many of those who refused to sign have
desired me to ascertain the terms of the agreement they
decided to sign; but as no copy of it was left here, and
as it was never read in open meeting but once, and was
kept closely sealed from the public, I have not been able
to make any satisfactory explanation... (ARCIA 1892:310-
311)

In the Agreement of 1892, the Yankton Sioux reluctantly
agreed to sell approximately 160,000 acres (of 430,000 acres) for
$600,000, plus a $20 gold piece for each male over the age of 18
(Sansom-Flood et al 1989:41). They received $2.98 per acre for
the surplus cession, fair market value was later estimated at
$6.65 per acre (Wishart 1990:99).

In 1895, the Yanktons received the first installment of
their payment, $161,475 (Sansom-Flood et al. 1989:41). Tribal
members received as much as $100 dollars apiece in a lump-sum
payment;

When the payment came, the tribe had the first relief
from poverty in nearly forty years. When word of the
payment reached the newspapers, unscrupulous "vultures"
descended on the reservation from adjoining settlements
with all kinds of schemes devised to take Indian money.
(Sansom-Flood et al 1989:41)

By 1902, the Greenwood Agency had ceased providing gratis
supplies for the needy: "within half a century, most officials
thought Yanktons were ready to move from tribalism to
citizenship, and they began to cut back on their training
efforts" (Hoover 1988:52). The final payment of their 50-year
annuities (per the Treaty of 1858) was paid out in 1908.

Under the Agreement of 1892, individual allotments on the
Yankton reservation totalled 267,943 acres; 1,253 acres were
reserved for the church, Indian schools, and the Greenwood
Agency. This left an available surplus of 151,692 acres for
settlement and 8,065 acres were set aside for South Dakota
schools (McCurdy n.d.). On May 16, 1895, President Grover
Cleveland proclaimed the ceded Yankton lands open for settlement
(29 Stat. 865). Within a decade of the 1892 agreement, the
surplus lands had been settled by non-Indian settlers (mostly
Czechs), who founded the towns of Lake Andes and Wagner (Hoover
1988).

By the 1920s most Yanktons had received their allotments in
fee patent and the majority had either lost or sold their land
(Hoover 1988). With fee patents came full citizenship status,
including voting rights and taxation. Many fee patents were sold
for taxes. An "Industrial Survey" initiated by the Commissioner
of Indian Affairs in 1922 found that of over 2,000 tribal
members, only three or four family heads supported their families by farming and ranching (Hoover 1988:56). The Survey also reported food shortages, alcoholism, and inadequate housing. The chronic poverty on the Yankton reservation in particular and in Indian Country in general was compounded by the regional decline in the agricultural economy in the 1920s and further exacerbated by the Great Depression in the 1930s.

Indian Reorganization Act

In 1932, the Yankton Sioux adopted their first constitution. This pre-dated the passage of the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA—a.k.a. Wheeler-Howard Act, 1934), which allowed tribal governments to incorporate and participate in certain federal programs designed to strengthen tribal sovereignty. Perhaps the most important feature of the IRA was that it ended allotment in severalty, and provided for trust protection of any remaining individual patents or tribally-held lands.

The Yanktons chose to forego participation in the Indian Reorganization Act (see Chapter 29). The Yanktons delayed ratifying a new constitution until 1963, at which time they modified their original 1932 constitution.

By the 1950s, less than 42,000 acres remained as individual allotments from their 268,000 acres allotted in 1892; this figure represents less than 10 percent of the reservation set aside by the Treaty of 1858 (Hoover 1988:66). With dispossession of the tribal landbase and federal policies favoring relocation, many tribal members left the reservation in search of economic opportunities, further undermining the transmission of traditional religion and culture.

Disestablishment of the Yankton Sioux Reservation

In the 1970s and 1980s the Yanktons suffered yet another loss to their reservation base and perceived tribal jurisdiction. Emboldened by a court decision which ultimately disestablished the boundaries of the Lake Traverse reservation (Sisseton and Wahpeton Sioux) in South Dakota (DeCoteau v. District Court), the State of South Dakota moved successfully to disestablish the Yankton Sioux reservation in the state’s Supreme Court. The Yankton reservation is still a federally-recognized reservation. The following discussion is specific only to the lack of state recognition, which has had profound implications for competing jurisdictions within the external boundaries of the federally-recognized Yankton Sioux reservation.

On two occasions (State v. Thompson [1984] and State v. Williamson [1973]), the South Dakota Supreme Court ruled that the language of the Agreement of 1892 disestablished the Yankton Sioux reservation boundaries. The South Dakota State Supreme
Court rulings are based on the premise that the U.S. Congress intended to disestablish the U.S. reservation system with the Dawes Act and the subsequent surplus lands statutes.

In *U.S. v. Celestine* (215 U.S. 278, 185 [1909]), the Supreme Court ruled that only Congress can divest reservations of land and diminish reservation boundaries. The Yankton case has never been tried in a federal venue. The timing of the court cases came when the Yanktons were unable to finance adequate litigation to change the venue to federal court. Arguably, as part of the trust responsibility, the BIA should have underwritten this expense and provided the necessary assistance to protect the jurisdictional issues at stake.

The state disestablishment of the Yankton Sioux reservation boundaries has had profound consequences on the exercise of tribal jurisdiction within the external boundaries of the Yankton Sioux reservation. Recently, the Yankton tribe filed an injunction against Charles Mix County for attempting to build a landfill within the external boundaries of the reservation without tribal permission. In June of 1994, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) held informational hearings to solicit feedback on the issue of establishing solid waste landfills within the "former" external boundaries of the Yankton and Rosebud Sioux reservations. This situation further complicates the definition of the federal status of the Yankton reservation, which had not previously been challenged. The state disestablishment has not, however, affected tribal jurisdiction over hunting and fishing rights, which are still recognized by the state of South Dakota.

With the increased revenues received from the tribal casino at Pickstown, South Dakota, the tribe is now in a position to litigate if necessary. The Yankton Sioux Tribe opened the Fort Randall Casino in 1991. The casino employs approximately 600 individuals and is the single largest employer (Indian and non-Indian) in the vicinity. The casino reportedly generates nearly $30 million annually, a percentage of which is paid to the tribe. The increased revenues are being used to set up infrastructure to facilitate the expression of reservation jurisdiction, e.g., tribal courts, zoning, etc. It is assumed that setting up tribal infrastructure (court system, police, zoning, etc.) will de facto achieve some of the jurisdictional goals of the Yankton Sioux tribe. Gaming revenues are also being used for various social programs targeting the elderly and youth.

**THE NEBRASKA Santee Sioux**

**Introduction**

In his book *History of the Santee Sioux*, Roy W. Meyer (1993:371) observes that "the history of the Santee Sioux is the
history of the American Indians." The Santees' history follows a
familiar and oft-repeated historical pattern of land cessions,
attempted resistance, removal to undesirable land, and "a massive
onslaught on the native culture, partly deliberate, partly
fortuitous" (Meyer 1993:371). Reservation-era history for the
Santees' began before their arrival in Nebraska and provides an
important context for understanding why they live where they do
today. Consequently, this section will trace the Santees' history after settling on their initial Minnesota reservation, by
describing treaty and legislative history, including the
assimilation policy inherent in Indian legislation; the causes of
the 1862 uprising; the process of their resulting removal to
Nebraska; and the current state of the Santees' reservation.

Treaties

The name Santee refers to the easternmost four of the seven
traditional "council fires" (see Chapter 4) of the Sioux or Dakota Nation: the Mdewakantons, the Wahpekutes, the Sissetons,
and the Wahpetons, although only the Mdewakantons and Wahpekutes use this name for themselves (Albers and James 1986:13). The Santees in Nebraska are mainly from the Mdewakanton and Wahpekute divisions. Previous to and during early contact with Europeans, the Santees inhabited southern Minnesota and adjacent portions of Iowa, Wisconsin, and the Dakotas (Howard 1966:2-3).

Early American governmental contact with the Santees was instituted "to establish United States sovereignty over the territory," and ultimately to achieve an advantage over the British (Meyer 1993:24). The American military officer, Zebulon Pike, negotiated with the four bands to obtain land cessions for military posts, to make peace between warring tribes, and to "lay the groundwork for a series of 'factories'," government-operated trading posts which sold goods to Indians at lower prices than commercial traders (Meyer 1993:24).

Pike's treaty with the Santees was signed in 1805 (see Appendix II). Signed by seven "chiefs" (not all of whom may have been regarded as such by their own people), it ceded two tracts of land, comprising about 100,000 acres, for $2,000 (Meyer 1993:24-5). Although far less than the worth of the land, this went unpaid until 1819, when a military fort was built between the Mississippi and Minnesota rivers (Meyer 1993:32). In 1806, Pike attempted to negotiate peace between the Santees and their long-standing enemies, the Chippewas, without success (Meyer 1993:26-7). Failed American attempts to negotiate intertribal peace were to become chronic; in 1823 a council was held to draw boundaries between the Sacs and Foxes, the four Santee bands, and the Chippewas, in order to end intertribal warfare over the control of territory (Meyer 1993:39-40). Another attempt in 1830 (Treaty of Prairie du Chien) caused the Santees and the Sacs and Foxes to cede 20-mile-wide strips along their territorial
boundaries in return for a cash annuity, educational fund, and blacksmith and tools (Meyer 1993:50). Santee dependence on annuities assisted the government in its goal of "civilizing the Sioux," otherwise known as the policy of assimilation (Meyer 1993:50).

An 1837 treaty effectively ceded the Santees' claims to lands east of the Mississippi, satisfying pressure to open timberlands for use and ostensibly placing an additional buffer on Santee/Chippewa hostility (Meyer 1993:55-6). In return, "the United States promised to invest the sum of $300,000 and to pay to the chiefs and braves annually forever an income of not less than five per cent" of that amount (Meyer 1993:58). In addition, money would be spent for medicine; agricultural tools; livestock; the salaries of a physician, farmers, and blacksmiths; and goods and provisions (Meyer 1993:58).

The result of this treaty was the opposite of what was planned; the annuities were often considerably delayed and fell short of what was promised. Also, rampant whiskey selling in the vicinity brought about increased alcohol-related problems for the Santees. As a result of these pressures and many others, Sioux/Chippewa hostilities actually increased (Meyer 1993:59-61).

In spite of these early setbacks, the "civilization" programs forged ahead. As agent R.W. Spicer commented in 1861, "the cardinal and fixed object of the government being the civilization of the Indians, the best means to that end should be sought out, adopted, and vigorously and systematically pursued" (ARCA 1861:88). Thus, Santee agent Lawrence Taliaferro established projects such as the Eatonville farm for the agricultural education of the Santees (Meyer 1993:49-50). The Santees were relatively interested in this scheme, due to the scarcity of game. In 1833, missionaries began arriving to teach agriculture and convert the Santees to Christianity (Meyer 1993:52). These two themes, Christianization and settlement on family farms, were major goals of the assimilation policies carried out with the Santees throughout the remainder of their history.

The treaties of 1851 (Mendota and Traverse des Sioux) constituted an advance for both assimilation and the interests of American settlers. Governor of Minnesota Territory Alexander Ramsey and Commissioner of Indian Affairs Luke Lea began negotiations with the intention of buying land for white settlement (Meyer 1993:77). They first negotiated the Treaty of Traverse des Sioux with the Upper Santees, who had not been involved in earlier treaty-making and had less experience in protecting their interests. This treaty was a "fait accompli" used to coerce the Lower Santees into accepting similar terms (Meyer 1993:78, 80).
The negotiators next made the Treaty of Mendota with the Mdewakantons and Wahpekutes, who comprised the Lower Santees (Meyer 1993:81). The two treaties were similar, both including cash annuities; the establishments of schools, blacksmiths, mills, and farms; goods and provisions; funds for "general agricultural and civilization purposes"; a reservation; and the costs of removal to the reservation (Meyer 1993:80). The Treaty of Mendota differed from Traverse des Sioux in that it promised a smaller payment, an promise to pay all 1837 annuities in cash, and, initially, a different reservation area (the last provision was subsequently stricken by the U.S. Senate) (Meyer 1993:83-4). The final document did not include the promise of a reservation, despite Santee dissatisfaction with this alteration (Meyer 1993:86).

The Senate finally confirmed Santee title to the reservation in 1860 (Meyer 1993:89), but by 1858 the Santees were already living on this stretch of land along the Minnesota River valley, which was 150 miles long and 10 miles wide (Wilson 1981: 284). The reservation was, for "both the Upper and Lower Sioux...a tract of land extending...from Little Rock creek to Lac Traverse" (ARCIA 1859: 83). The move to the reservation was a major step forward for assimilationists. In 1850, the members of the Dakota Mission had created an "Outline of a Plan for Civilizing the Dakotas" (Meyer 1993:96), recommending a move onto separate family farms, the imposition of laws and government, and an educational fund. The Santees would be taught to read and write in their own language, and manual labor boarding schools would be built and training would be taught in English. Annuities would be paid to families rather than to chiefs (Meyer 1993:96-7). The treaties included many of these ideas, which became policy on the reservation (Meyer 1993:97).

According to Meyer (1993:97), "The object of this plan was to break up the community system among the Sioux and eliminate the favoritism that prevailed when the chiefs controlled the distribution of annuities." This plan dissolved the former social organization, and assimilated the Santees into Euroamerican patterns of economic and social behavior and government.

Resistance

The uprising of 1862 which eventually led to the Santees' removal to Nebraska resulted from displeasure with treaties and agents, as well as generally poor relations between the Santees and Euroamerican settlers (Brown 1981:29; Wilson 1981:284-5). In 1857 the situation worsened when a band of Wahpekutes, led by an outlawed chief named Inkpaduta, killed some white settlers and took others hostage (Meyer 1993:97). According to Meyer (1993:100-101), this event caused a dangerous change in the attitudes of both Indians and Europeans: while "the Indians
learned that attacks on whites could go unpunished and that Indian Bureau officials could be induced to back down from previously stated positions," the attacks increased settlers' anxiety about a possible uprising and hostility against the Santees increased as a result.

Punishment of "the whole Sioux nation" for Inkpaduta's misdeeds, as well as encroachments of settlers near and onto the reservation, added to the Santees' grievances (Meyer 1993: 115). In 1862, frustrating delays in the delivery of goods and annuities to the nearly starving Santees intensified the situation (Brown 1981:29). The uprising was touched off by the killing of several settlers by a group of young Santee men (Wilson 1981:285). In response to this event, a council held by Chief Little Crow decided that war, now considered inevitable, may as well be started (Brown 1981:29).

The war began on August 18, 1862, when Santee warriors attacked the Lower Agency and looted agency stores (Meyer 1993:117). The Santees were never united in the war effort; the vast majority of Sissetons and Wahpetons did not join (Albers and James 1986:14); and the chiefs did not have adequate control over their warriors to effect coordinated actions (Brown 1981:32-3). As a result, the Santees won only one engagement during the brief war (Meyer 1993:118). The war ended on September 27, when former Governor Henry H. Sibley retook the Santees' captives and Little Crow and his followers fled to the Dakota prairies (Meyer 1993:123).

Following the failure of the uprising, anti-Indian sentiment was at its peak. Santee agent Galbraith strongly reflected this in his annual report:

Of the Sioux I know a little from observation. They are bigoted, barbarous and exceedingly superstitious. They regard most of the vices as virtues...[the Reverend S.R. Riggs] says the 'devil' caused the outbreak; and if ever the devil was well represented on earth, he certainly is in the ancient religious and social customs of the Sioux Indians. (ARCIA 1863:275, 277)

Meanwhile, the general public demanded the total extermination of the Santees (Meyer 1993:124-125).

These sentiments were not conducive to conducting fair trials of the captured Santee combatants. The investigation focused on all adult Santee males and was based on the principle that 'the innocent could make their innocence appear.' Thus the revered Anglo-Saxon principle of law that a person is considered innocent until proved guilty was reversed in the
case of Indians. (S.R. Riggs quoted in Meyer 1993:125)

A major participant in the trial proceedings, the missionary S.R. Riggs himself had serious doubts about the accuracy of the trials, noting that the greater part of those charged "were condemned on general principles, without any specific charges proved" (Meyer 1993:127).

The judges found 303 Santee individuals guilty of murder and sentenced them to death by hanging. President Lincoln reviewed the cases and reduced the number to 39. In the end, 38 Santee men were executed on December 26, 1862 (Brown 1981:35).

The remaining prisoners were held at Mankato until April, 1863, when they were moved to Camp McClellan near Davenport, Iowa (Meyer 1993:136, 143-144). Their families were held at Fort Snelling (Meyer 1993:136). The crowded conditions of these camps, which contributed to the spread of the disease, and the cold of winter caused many deaths among those held (Meyer 1993:137-138).

Removal

Extermination not being carried out, the citizens of Minnesota demanded the expulsion of all Indians from the state (Meyer 1993:133), including the Winnebago tribe even though they had taken no part in the uprising. Two acts provided for removal. An act of February 16, 1863, abrogated all treaties with the Santees, denying them all associated benefits, including rights of occupancy (ARCIA 1865:567). An act of March 3, 1863, called on the President to assign the Santees a reservation outside Minnesota, with enough land "to provide each member of the tribe willing to farm with 'eighty acres of good agricultural lands...'" (Meyer 1993:140). Proceeds from the sale of the Santees' Minnesota land was to be used to advance farming, rather than to be directly paid to the Santees. Congress also appropriated funds for removal and establishment of the Santees on a new reservation (Meyer 1993:140-141).

Accordingly, Superintendent Clark W. Thompson chose a new reservation on Crow Creek, 80 miles above Fort Randall, in May, 1863 (ARCIA 1863:30), a choice made hurriedly since the Santees were already on their way to the area (Meyer 1993:142). In his report, Thompson noted some apprehension about the prospects for the agricultural season: "the only drawback that I fear is the dry weather. On the hills the grass is already dried up; but this is said to be an unusual season" (ARCIA 1863:305).

The season proved not to be unusual for Crow Creek, however. A year later, the agent described it in his annual report as a "wilderness of dry prairie for hundreds of miles around" (Meyer 1993:146, quoting from ARCIA 1864:411). Out of the original
1,300 Santees who made the move to Crow Creek, 300 died during the first few months (Brown 1981:35). Agriculture was impossible, the food brought was rotten, and funds were inadequate to feed the Santees (Meyer 1993:147-148).

In the fall of 1865, a peace commission visited Crow Creek. In response to the state of "semi-starvation" there, it was decided to move the Santees again (ARCIA 1866:225-228). The Santee reservation in Nebraska was created through a series of Presidential Orders (see Appendix I). On February 27, 1866, four townships on the Niobrara River in what is now Knox County, Nebraska, were set aside for them (Meyer 1964:63-64). On July 20, the amount of land was nearly doubled, supplementing scarce timberland (Meyer 1964:76). On November 16, 1867, one full township and part of another containing valuable timber were added while two townships, including the town of Niobrara, were returned to the market (Meyer 1964:83) (see Map ___).

In 1890 the agent noted that the land was about three-fourths rocky. The Missouri River bottomland was rich but subject to flooding and the land on Bazile and Mini Waste creeks was the best on the reservation (ARCIA 1890:141). When the boundaries were finally determined in 1869, the reservation was a "rectangular tract of land, twelve miles from east to west and averaging about fifteen miles from north to south" (Meyer 1964:94) (See Map ___).

The 1868 Treaty of Fort Laramie provided for individual allotments on the new reservation. The removal act of 1863 "had contained a similar provision, but now the Indians' consent was obtained and the size of the proposed allotments increased from 80 to 160 acres" (Meyer 1993:162). The Dawes Act of 1887 changed the amount of Santee-owned land again. It provided for general allotment and opening of nonallotted land to settlers (Meyer 1993:180). After allotment, the Santees held 71,784.56 acres plus 1,310.7 reserved for agency, school, and missionary use, and 42,160.56 acres were opened for settlement (Meyer 1993:182).

According to Meyer (1993:175), "the Santee Agency had a remarkably placid history during the last three decades of the nineteenth century." The Santees experienced no upheavals during this time; rather "there were the singing of hymns, the daily routine of the classrooms, the seasonal round of planting and harvest" (Meyer 1993:175). During this time, the main force in Santee life was assimilation.

Assimilation continued on the Nebraska reservation as allotments encouraged farming, and missionaries and government schools continued the education effort. The agents' influence, the schools, and the missionaries were the means of assimilation,
while their efforts were backed up by dependence on annuities. In 1860 agent Joseph R. Brown noted that, in encouraging the desired behavior among the Santees, "the annuities form a powerful engine with which to govern refractory Indians" (ARCIA 1860:61).

Assimilation continued in Nebraska through new means. In 1866 the use of the Dakota language was banned in all schools (Meyer 1993:188), for while Indians were educated in their native tongue...they were still Indians. And, as everyone knew, the primary aim of our Indian policy was to transform Indians into white men. (Meyer 1993:177)

In 1878 the Santees voted to abolish the traditional chieftainship system in favor of a system of elected councilors, further replacing the Santee pattern of government with a European pattern (ARCIA 1878:99). Citizenship and the right to vote also later reinforced this shift from a traditional form of governance (Meyer 1993:194). According to Meyer, the initiative had passed from the Indians themselves to the representatives of the white man's government in Washington...the dependence on the white man for much of their material culture was being extended to a dependence on him for their social and political organization as well. Coupled with the mass acceptance of Christianity, this meant that the Santee Sioux were losing their specifically Indian cultural identity. (Meyer 1993:154)

The Santees in Nebraska

Assimilation did not proceed altogether smoothly, however. Droughts in the 1880s and 1890s and the rental of most Santee land to white farmers held back farming efforts (Meyer 1993:190, 196). In addition, the Santees became citizens when they became landowners, so special liquor laws no longer applied to them and intemperance increased (Meyer 1993:194-5). Meanwhile, in 1893 two payments were made, one for the purpose of buying land for the children who had been born since allotments were made, and the other as a result of the Indian Appropriations Act, which allowed the payment from the sale of the old reservation to be made in cash (ARCIA 1893:95).

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the amount of Indian-owned land continued to dwindle and the Bureau of Indian Affairs began withdrawing services from some tribes (Meyer 1993:294). The 1926 Meriam Report reflected the effects of this policy, for the first time casting doubt on the efficacy of assimilationism. It
described the economic plight of the Indian in sober prose, backed by statistics, and emphasized the failure of allotment. It offered recommendations for the reform of Indian policy—recommendations that amounted to a repudiation of the time-honored thesis that the Indians must ultimately be totally assimilated to the larger society. (Meyer 1993:295)

Between the 1930s and 1960s Indian policy wavered back and forth between assimilation, self-determination, and termination (Meyer 1993:295-296; see also Chapter 29). The 1934 Indian Reorganization Act reversed the policy of assimilation by encouraging Indians to retain their culture and by allowing them an opportunity to "organize as legal entities and draw up constitutions for effective tribal government" (Meyer 1993:295). However, in the 1950s the government’s policy returned to the self-sufficiency of the Indian and the end of government services.

The Santees’ history in the twentieth century reflects these policy shifts. Their land dwindled as it was subdivided into virtual uselessness among inheritors and subsequently sold. Exacerbating the problem, a competency board began issuing first-class patents to land in 1910. Upon receiving these patents most Santees immediately sold their land (Meyer 1993:298-299). In addition, "there was a gradual withdrawal of government services, marked by the closing of the agency in 1917" (Meyer 1993:296).

In 1917 came the culmination of a claims case instituted by the Mdewakantons and Wahpekutes for restoration of annuity payments included in the treaties of 1837 and 1851, which had been abrogated after the uprising of 1862 (Wilson 1981:285, 290). The underpinnings for this case had begun much earlier, at a council held in December, 1884 (Wilson 1981:285). After legislative entanglements lasting for more than 30 years, the litigants were awarded $386,597.89 (Wilson 1981:290).

The Santees accepted the Indian Reorganization Act in 1934, and in 1936 voted to accept a constitution and bylaws which reflected a wish to move toward state rather than tribal control (Meyer 1993:308, 311). The depression years caused a crisis for the Santees, leading to nearly total dependence on the federal government for work and other relief (Meyer 1993:307, 308-309, 312). There was a 30 percent increase in Indian population on the reservation between 1930 and 1940, but lack of local employment opportunities and the government’s new policy of termination and relocation led to a 65 percent decrease of reservation population between 1940 and 1960 (Meyer 1993:312-313). In addition, Indian-owned allotted land decreased from the original 69,100 acres allotted in 1885 to only 6,162 in 1962 (Meyer 1964:94).
In the 1960s, the population of the Santee reservation had dropped to below 300, and most remaining tribal land was rented to white farmers. It seemed that the Santees had indeed been victims of rapidly changing government policies. Since then, however, prospects for the Santees have brightened considerably. Speaking of the community of Santee, Meyer (1993:373) has observed that the town...has become a busy, vibrant community, its population and employment opportunities growing, its identity and sense of Indianness revived.

The growth of job opportunities near the reservation contributed to this revival. Jobs have become available in education, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Public Health Service, tribal government, contracts with the state of Nebraska, and at a local pharmaceutical company (Meyer 1993:373-4). The tribe has also been negotiating for possible recreation-oriented enterprises on nearby Lewis and Clark Lake and in commercial gaming (Meyer 1993:374). In 1974 the Santees acquired land for a tribally-owned ranch which supports 600 cattle. Since 1960, tribal land increased from 2,563 acres to 20,000 (Meyer 1993:374).

Recently, an interest in traditional culture has revived as well, and a powwow is held every third week of June (Meyer 1993:275). The Nebraska Santees were shorn of much of their traditional culture following their defeat in an armed conflict with the United States, but now look forward to the gradual resumption of former customs and beliefs:

Tribal leaders have expressed the belief that three or four generations will be needed for the recovery of the old culture and for acceptance by the non-Indian population of their neighbors' right to preserve this culture. (Meyer 1993:375)
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CHAPTER 8

OMAHAS

By Rebecca Hautzinger

History of Anthropological Research

During the 1880s, ethnologists James Owen Dorsey, Alice C. Fletcher, and Francis La Flesche compiled detailed ethnographies about the Omaha people for publication by the Smithsonian Institution's Bureau of American Ethnology. Dorsey's *Omaha Sociology* (1884), and *The Omaha Tribe* by Fletcher and La Flesche (1911), remain fundamental references for information on Omaha society, culture and history. Included in these works, and in a brief tribal history written by Henry Fontenelle (1885), are tribal oral traditions, virtually the only sources for Omaha history before the early eighteenth century (O'Shea and Ludwickson, 1992a:16). The methodology and conclusions of later ethnographies by Reo F. Fortune (*Omaha Secret Societies*, 1932) and Margaret Mead (*The Changing Culture of an Indian Tribe*, 1932) have been criticized, but offer some insight into the cultural and environmental stresses faced by the Omahas during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

More recent publications have expanded, clarified or challenged earlier research. Norma Kidd Green (*Iron Eye's Family: The Children of Joseph La Flesche*, 1969) utilized family papers and other unpublished sources to recreate the history of this influential Omaha family. *Omaha Tribal Myths and Trickster Tales* is an extensive collection of oral myths and legends with new translations and interpretations by Nebraska folklorist Roger L. Welsch (1981). In *Two Crows Denies It: A History of Controversy in Omaha Sociology*, R. H. Barnes (1984) challenged accepted models of Omaha kinship affiliations and tribal organization. Michael L. Tate (1991) synthesized numerous scattered references to the Omaha into one volume, *The Upstream People: An Annotated Research Bibliography of the Omaha Tribe*. John M. O'Shea and John Ludwickson (1992a) incorporated unpublished archaeological work performed by John L. Champe between 1939 and 1942 into *Archaeology and Ethnohistory of the Omaha Indians: The Big Village Site*. In addition to their archaeological analysis, their work constitutes the most recent comprehensive review and interpretation of Omaha ethnohistory. Recent journal articles and ongoing research include Robin Ridington's discussions of Omaha cosmology and cultural renewal (1987, 1988), Karl Reinhard's research in physical anthropology concerning burial practices, the presence of lead in skeletal remains (1992), and the effect of the fur trade on
women's health. Tanis C. Thorne (1993) and John Ludwickson (1995) have explored the leadership of Chief Blackbird during the fur trade era.

**Ethnonymy**

In their own language, the Omaha people's name for themselves is *umo'ho*\(^n\), meaning "upstream" or "against the current." This name differentiated the Omahas from the Quapaws during their migration into the Mississippi River valley as part of a larger linguistic group known today as the Dhegiha tribes. The Quapaws (*uga'xpa*) followed the Mississippi River downstream while the remaining Dhegiha bands continued upstream (Fontenelle 1885:77; Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:36, 72). Europeans first became aware of the name *umo'ho*\(^n\) in 1541, when Spanish explorer De Soto encountered the Quapaws in the Arkansas and Missouri region. Europeans often misunderstood the name or purposely shortened it, and "Maha" or "Mahar" appear on early maps, written records, and peace treaties. By 1830, the United States government was referring to the tribe as the Omahas (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:36; Green 1969:1).

**Cultural and Linguistic Affiliations**

The Omahas are closely related linguistically and culturally to the Quapaw, Osage, Kansa and Ponca tribes, collectively referred to as the Dhegiha tribes of the Siouan linguistic family. A second group of Siouan-speakers, the Chiwere, includes the Iowa, Oto, and Missouri tribes, who are associated historically and geographically with the Dhegiha. The cultures and languages of the two groups, however, remained separate (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:35). There is almost no archeological record for the Omahas prior to their arrival in Nebraska in the mid-eighteenth century (O'Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:16). Oral traditions refer to an Eastern Woodlands tradition, including the use of bark houses and canoes, and a ceremonial life centered around maize. The Omahas were possibly associated with Middle Mississippian towns that are known to have existed in the Ohio River valley, but this relationship has not been demonstrated (O'Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:16). When the Omahas settled along the Missouri River, they adopted the Plains culture of the neighboring Pawnee and Arikara tribes, including the buffalo hunt, and the use of earthlodges, tipis, and horses (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:75, 80).

**Origin and Migration Traditions**

The origin and migrations of the Omahas are shrouded in traditional oral myths and legends, with little documentary evidence appearing until the late seventeenth century. The Dhegiha tribes are believed to have lived for many generations in the lower Great Lakes region before starting their gradual
migration through the Ohio River valley (Fontenelle 1885:77; Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:80). As they migrated westward, the Dhegiha splintered into smaller groups, starting with the separation of the Quapaws at the mouth of the Ohio River and followed by the Osages and Kansas at the confluence of the Osage and Missouri rivers (Dorsey 1884:212). The Omahas and Poncas, along with the Iowa, Oto, and Missouri tribes moved north through the Des Moines River valley, reaching the Pipestone Quarry region of southwestern Minnesota, where they appeared on European maps by about 1700. The Omahas occupied perhaps two villages along the Big Sioux River (Fontenelle 1885:77; Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:80, 81).

Fletcher and La Flesche believed that while living in this area, the Omahas reorganized themselves into their modern tribal circle, and cut the Sacred Pole, although Fontenelle and Dorsey reported that this occurred later (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:73). Omaha villages along the Big Sioux came under repeated attack from Dakota Sioux bands. At one site near Sioux Falls, now called Blood Run, as many as a thousand Omahas may have been killed. Following this loss, the tribe buried their dead beneath a large mound surrounded by a stone wall and deserted the village (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:73; Smith 1974:160; O’Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:17).

After abandoning the Blood Run site, the Omahas and Poncas moved into the Missouri River country of South Dakota. Dorsey (1884:212, 213) placed them at the mouth of Chouteau Creek near Lake Andes, where he reported that they found the Sacred Pole. Following the Missouri northward, the tribe settled near the mouth of the White River. During this time, the Poncas traveled as far west as the Black Hills, but eventually returned to the White River settlement. Poor harvests and subsequent hunger drove the tribes down the Missouri River into Nebraska around the year 1720 (Dorsey 1884:213; Fontenelle 1885:78).

The Ponca band remained near the Niobrara River while the Omahas built a village near the mouth of the James River on Bow Creek in Cedar county (Fontenelle 1885:78; Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:85). This first known Omaha occupation of Nebraska became known as "Bad Village" (To’a’wo’pezhi) because quarrels divided the tribe, causing them to desert the village (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:85). They were later reunited at the mouth of the Big Sioux, near present day Dakota City, at a village called Tti’ttaga zi’ga, translation unclear (O’Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:21). Shortly after the Omahas moved into the Dakota City-Homer area, the Iowas permanently left the area (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:86). By 1758, the Omahas reportedly lived in forty densely populated villages, although some of these villages may have belonged to other tribes (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:21). Their population was estimated as high as 3,000, and they were directly involved in
European trade (Smith 1974; O’Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:277, 278). The Omahas were clearly growing into a position of power along the Missouri River.

In the early 1770s, the Omahas established themselves near the mouth of Omaha Creek at the Missouri River, one half mile north of present day Homer in Dakota County. The "Big Village" (To•'wo•to•'gatho•) location proved to be ideal, not only because of its fertile bottomlands but because it allowed the Omahas to control the growing flow of trade along the river (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:86; Barnes 1984:5). Omaha power reached its peak during the occupation of Big Village, roughly from 1775 to 1845, under the leadership of Chief Blackbird, the Omahas’ most powerful and controversial chief (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:82; Thorne 1993). At the height of their power and influence the Omahas were struck by the smallpox epidemic of 1800-1801, during which Chief Blackbird died along with as many as four hundred others (O’Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:30; Ludwickson 1995:141; Thorne 1993).

Big Village was temporarily deserted following the epidemic, the Omahas launching a "mourning war" against other tribes on the plains (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:87; O’Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:31). After their return, continual attacks by Sioux and Sauk bands, along with a general shift of the bison herds to the west, caused the Omahas to periodically move west, along the Elkhorn River. From 1819 to 1833 they resided near Stanton, and later, from 1841 to 1843, near the mouth of Logan Creek (Fontenelle 1884[1885?]:79; Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:85; O’Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:36). After a two-year return stay at Big Village, Sioux attacks forced the tribe out of the area to the forks of Papillion Creek, about four miles west of Bellevue. The Omahas signed a treaty creating their present reservation in Thurston county, south of the old Big Village site, in 1854 (Fontenelle 79; O’Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:37).

Early Euroamerican Contacts

The Omahas first appear on European maps generated by the explorations of Louis Joliet and Father Jacques Marquette in 1673-1674, although Joliet and Marquette probably did not have direct contact with them (Smith 1972:43; Barnes 1984:4). Occasional traders may have dealt with the Omahas while they were still living in the Ohio River valley, but any early trading contacts remained sporadic and undocumented (Smith 1974:49).

In 1695, Pierre Charles Le Sueur established a trading post along the Blue Earth and Minnesota rivers. He was aware that both the Iowas and Omahas were living on the Big Sioux, but he left no record of having traded with them (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:80; Smith 1974:49). Despite the lack of documentation, the Omahas apparently became more directly
involved with European traders, and by 1702 there were French traders living among them (Barnes 1984:4). In 1739 Paul and Pierre Mallet visited the Omahas at Bad Village (Fontenelle 1884:85; O'Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:21).

**Tribal Territory**

Once the Omaha tribe reached Nebraska, their villages remained on the right, or west, bank of the Missouri River. They moved through an area reaching from the mouth of the Niobrara River to the mouth of the Platte River, westward along the northern bank of the Platte River to Shell Creek and north to the Missouri River in South Dakota (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:88). Early in this period their hunting grounds extended as far east as the Raccoon and Des Moines rivers in Iowa to near the forks of the Dismal River in the Sand Hills (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:89).

By the eighteenth century, the Omahas found themselves under increased pressure from the hostile Sauk and Fox tribes from the east and Teton Dakotas from the north (O'Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:31). Continual Sauk and Fox raiding forced the Omahas to abandon hunting expeditions east of the Missouri while the Teton Dakotas confined their activities to south of Omaha Creek. The Pawnee remained a forceful presence to the southwest, especially along the Platte River. The Central Plains region of Nebraska, specifically the Sand Hills, was claimed by the Cheyenne, Dakota, Pawnee, Ponca, and Omaha tribes until finally ceded to the United States in 1857 (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:89).

**Subsistence**

The Omahas engaged in a combination of horticulture and hunting supplemented by fishing, some trapping, and gathering. Tribal survival depended on the gardens and the annual summer bison hunt, so these two endeavors were conducted communally, controlled by ritual and ceremony to help insure success. Other subsistence activities were undertaken more informally by smaller groups, families, or individuals (Dorsey 1884:302; Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:261). Gardens were planted in spring, the tribe leaving for the summer buffalo hunt once crops were well established, in June or July. They returned for harvesting by September or early October, and from late October to December, hunted and trapped near the river, small parties hunting buffalo for hides (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:269).

Gardens were planted along streams, plots ranging in size from one and a half acres to over three acres. Garden plots belonged to any family willing to work them, with both men and women tending the gardens. Crops included corn, beans, squash, melons, and sunflowers. Surplus crops were cached over the winter in pits measuring six to seven feet in diameter, and four
The summer bison hunt (te'\'u\'e) provided the people with most of their meat for the year. Virtually the entire tribe participated in the hunt, which covered hundreds of miles and lasted about three months. Every aspect of the hunt was closely governed by ritual, including the use of the tribal circle (hu'thuga) in setting up camps (Dorsey 1884:283-293; Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:275-283). The bison hunt was followed by ceremonies of thanksgiving, including Anointing the Sacred Pole and the He'dewachi ceremony (Dorsey 1884:293-299; Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:230-251).

Demography

The first historical estimates of Omaha population occur after their arrival in the Big Sioux River area, and while accounts are plentiful, they tend to be ambiguous and inconsistent. Among the earliest reports are those of D'Iberville, who reported 1,200 Omaha families in 1702, with a total population of 2,500 in 1750 (Barnes 1984:8; O'Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:271). Mooney's report of 2,800 people in 1780 would seem to be in accord with D'Iberville, but in 1796, Truteau counted only 1,100 (Smith 1974:218). O'Shea and Ludwickson (1992a:271) estimate that Omaha population numbered about 2,800 in 1750.

The smallpox epidemic that swept through the Plains in 1800 and 1801 had a profound impact on the Omaha people not only in terms of the number of lives lost directly to disease, but on the influence the tribe had gained in the region. Again, historical accounts of the actual number of lives lost during the epidemic are inconclusive, but O'Shea and Ludwickson (1992a:288) estimate the losses may have been about 500. Included among those deaths was the great Chief Blackbird, whose death created a leadership vacuum that lasted until the ascent of Big Elk about ten years later (O'Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:31; Ludwickson 1995:141). In the wake of the epidemic, the Omahas abandoned Big Village for awhile, perhaps engaging in a "mourning war" against the Ponca, Pawnee, Cheyenne, and Oto tribes (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:86; O'Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:31).

As devastating as the epidemic was, it seemed to produce no major demographic shifts in the population, nor was there a collapse of the social or political structure (Barnes 1984:9; O'Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:288). The Omahas faced a greater threat in their increased vulnerability to attacks by the Sioux and Sauk tribes. One source lists at least twelve attacks against the Omahas between 1804 and 1848 in which at least 73 Omaha lives were lost, plus the loss of prisoners (Smith 1974:218; Barnes 1984:7). Following a period of slow growth,
disease and warfare resumed the assault on Omaha population figures from about 1820. With the start of the reservation period in 1855, the population had decreased again to about 800, and by the close of the nineteenth century tended to hover at about 1,100 (Dorsey 1884:214; Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:33).

Social Structure

Traditional Omaha social structure was linked more closely to spiritual beliefs than to political or blood ties, this linkage best embodied in the tribal circle, or hu’thuga (Dorsey 1884:219; Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:134, 135). The basic kinship groups were ten clans, each clan serving as the keepers of specific ceremonial rites and taboos, often connected to a certain animal (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:136; Barnes 1984:68). Membership in the exogamous clans was determined patrilineally, as was leadership within the clans (Dorsey 1884:225; Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:38). The ten clans were divided equally between two exogamous moieties. The five clans of the Ho’gashenu (Earth People) were responsible for rites concerning the physical welfare of the people. The Inshta’cunda- (Sky People) maintained control over spiritual concerns (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:135; Barnes 1984:50).

Social and secret societies served to unify the tribe further, cutting across clan and moiety lines. Membership in the social societies was open to anyone able to meet eligibility requirements, and included warrior societies, the largest being the Hethu’shka, as well as more informal groups. The secret societies dealt with healing and mysticism, with membership gained usually by virtue of dreams or visions. Among the most important of the secret societies were the Ho’hewachi and Washis’ka athi (Shell Society). Many of the secret societies were lost by the twentieth century (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:459, 493, 509).

Political Organization

The most complete account of Omaha political organization appears in The Omaha Tribe (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:199-216). Concerns over tribal disintegration appear throughout the early ethnographies and tribal history. Sometime after their arrival in the Iowa/Minnesota area, Omaha political organization underwent a change, forming a more centralized governing body. According to tribal legend, seven old men visiting the tribe "inaugurated" the Council of Seven. This council of seven chiefs was presided over by two principal chiefs representing both moieties. Around this same period the Sacred Pole was cut, a venerated symbol of tribal unity.

Controversy remains over whether the positions of chief were inherited or gained through honor and gift-giving (Barnes...
1984:29). The most recent research supports the idea that chieftainship was inherited, with some rather important exceptions (O'Shea and Ludwickson 1992b). There existed two classes of chiefs, both emphasizing the importance of gift-giving. The first class was open to any man, but entrance was determined by the consent of the members of the second, more elite class. Membership into the second group could be gained only by completing seven grades of "acts of honor" and substantial gift-giving, often taking many years to attain (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:202, 203).

**Settlements**

Semi-permanent earthlodge villages served as the center of Omaha life, even though they were inhabited only about six months out of the year (Dorsey 1884:269). Ideally, villages were located near fertile river bottoms, close to streams and timber, with hills nearby (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:95).

Unlike the encampments made during summer bison hunts, there were no specific plans for village organization. The Omahas adopted the earthlodge structure from the Arikaras and Pawnees, after moving to the Missouri River, without the cosmic symbolism that these tribes associated with the structure (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:75, 76). Wigwams and tipis may have been intermixed with earthlodges, along with corrals for horses. Tipis were often used during the winter because they could be built in sheltered areas, away from the wind (O'Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:79). There were apparently no special structures for communal gatherings. Council meetings took place in one of the larger earthlodges, or two to three tents could be put together to make one large tent (O'Shea and Ludwickson 1992a:81).

**Religion**

When Fletcher and La Flesche did their ethnographic work among the Omahas in the 1880s, many Omaha religious beliefs and ceremonies had already disappeared or were in decline. Traditionally, the Omahas believed in a "common life-power" (Wako'‘da) that existed in all living and inanimate things, and which controlled all phases of life (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:115, 597). Wako'‘da controlled the forces of the universe, and enforced ethical behavior through natural phenomenon (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:598).

Humans were created from a union of the ancient Earth and Sky People, reflected in the dual moieties. Although humans were not believed to be descended from animal ancestors, they shared a close relationship with animals. Humans were viewed as just one manifestation of life, dependent on, rather than masters of, life on earth. All humans and animals were endowed with special gifts, and if a man prayed to Wako'‘da for help, the animal with
the necessary and appropriate power would be sent (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:600).

Life Cycle

The stages of life—infancy, youth, manhood and old age—were viewed as four hills over which one must be prepared to make a long, rugged journey. Eight days after birth, babies were ceremonially "introduced" to the universe to ensure acceptance, and the powers of the universe were asked to guide the child safely through its journey. When children were old enough to walk on their own, they went through a ceremony called "turning the child," which asked for strength from the four winds. The child became a true member of its clan, its baby name being replaced with a clan name. Boys went through a second ceremony at this time, consecrating their lives to Thunder, which controlled warfare and the destiny of warriors (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:117, 122).

Upon reaching puberty, boys undertook four days of fasting and prayer in an effort to experience a personal relationship with Wako' da. During this time, if a boy saw or heard something animate or inanimate, that object became a source of supernatural aid to him. This ceremony could be repeated over again until a boy was old enough to marry, at which time his life was considered "fixed" (Dorsey 1884:266; Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:131).
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CHAPTER 9

LAKOTAS (OGLALAS AND BRULES)

By Gloria Rial and Judith Campbell Miller

Introduction

The Oglalas and Brulés are two of the seven bands of the western division of the Dakota or Sioux Nation, also known as the Lakota or Teton Sioux. The other five bands of the Lakotas are the Hunkpapas, Miniconjous, Sihasapas or Blackfoot, Two Kettles, and Sans Arcs. The Lakotas were one of the legendary Seven Council Fires of the Sioux in their Minnesota homeland, the other Council Fires including the Wahpeton, Mdewakanton, Wahpekute, and Sisseton tribes (the eastern division of the Sioux, collectively known as the Santees), and the Yanktons and Yanktonais (the "middle" division). The Lakotas were the most numerous of the Sioux divisions, and the Brulés and Oglalas were the largest bands of the Lakotas (Grobsmith 1981; Lazarus 1991; Bray 1994). Oglala is translated as "they scatter their own" and Brulé as "burnt thigh" (Howard 1980:20; W. Powers 1975:26).

In the public imagination, Lakotas epitomize the image of the horse-born, buffalo-hunting, nomadic Plains Indian. They have long captured the romantic and scholarly interests of Americans and Europeans alike, and have thus been the subject of a great deal of historical and anthropological research, particularly in recent years. Of the Seven Council Fires of the original Dakota people in Minnesota, the Lakotas penetrated the farthest west in their travels, ranging far and wide through the Plains during their nomadic existence. Though relative latecomers to the Plains, the Lakotas venerated, and continue to revere, the Black Hills as a place of special significance. The Black Hills in South Dakota were called Paha Sapa in the Sioux language, so named, according to a Lakota chief, because the abundance of dark pine gave the appearance of dark or black hills from a distance (Lazarus 1991:8). Today, most of the Oglalas are found on the Pine Ridge Reservation in southwestern South Dakota, though some live on the Rosebud Reservation. The Brulés live on the Rosebud and Lower Brule reservations.

Brief synoptic descriptions of Oglala and Brulé history and social organization can be found in Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico, by Frederick Webb Hodge (1907-10, 1:166-168; 2:109-111)), and similarly brief information on the Dakotas in general can be found in The Indian Tribes of North America, by John R. Swanton (1952:280-284).
A number of other important studies deserve brief mention. An important series of articles on the Dakotas in general appeared in the University of South Dakota publication, Museum News, in 1966. Authored by ethnologist James H. Howard, these were recently consolidated and reprinted (Howard 1980), and continue to be a good introductory source of information on all three divisions of the Dakota Nation—Eastern, Middle, and Western or Lakota. Royal B. Hassrick (1988) presents a readable, popular ethnography of the Dakotas in general which emphasizes a sociological perspective. One of the earliest twentieth-century historical studies of the Lakotas is that by the South Dakota historian, Doane Robinson (1974, originally published in 1904). White (1978) has offered an important recent interpretation of the history of the Sioux and their expansion onto the Plains. Historian George E. Hyde’s classic histories of Red Cloud and the Oglalas (1937), as well as of Spotted Tail and the Brulés (1961), chronicle the experiences of these eminent Lakota leaders and their followers to the last decade of the nineteenth century. In another work, Hyde (1956) relates the treatment of the Dakotas on reservation lands during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Edward Lazarus (1991) surveys the history of the Sioux Nation from 1775 to the present, focusing on their claim to the Black Hills. Elizabeth S. Grobsmith’s (1981) short contemporary ethnography on the Rosebud Reservation Lakotas is outstanding for its clarity and succinct organization. The geologist Joseph N. Nicollet, who traveled through southwestern Minnesota and eastern South Dakota in the 1830s, prepared a very important set of notes on the Dakota people based in part on his own observations and queries (DeMallie in Bray and Bray 1976). James R. Walker (1982) presents an ethnohistorical description, edited by Raymond J. DeMallie, of traditional Lakota lifeways based on his 1896-1914 interviews with residents of the Pine Ridge Reservation. Lakota religious beliefs and rituals are comprehensively described by William K. Powers (1975). Hoover (1979) has compiled a useful critical bibliography of studies pertaining to the Sioux.

While the term "Seven Council Fires" originally referred to autonomous villages that subsequently became seven subdivisions of the Sioux, the Sioux Nation’s strong unity was characterized by interdependence economically, socially, and politically. The Lakotas were a nomadic people. Bands intermingled frequently, gathering for annual ceremonies and communal hunts, cooperative warfare, intertribal visits throughout the year, and for sharing information as well as marriage partners.

The language of the Sioux, though comprised of three distinct dialects, was mutually understood, promoting communication between subdivisions of the tribe. The western division of the Dakotas, who spoke the Lakota dialect (Grobsmith 1981), dominated vast areas of the Plains during their brief reign, not only because of their possession of guns and horses, but also because of the stable alliance among their assorted
bands as they ranged over large tracts of land, asserting their
territorial claims over previous occupants.

**Demography**

Because of their wide dispersal and history of frequent
hostilities with the United States, it is difficult to accurately
estimate the population of the Lakotas as a whole, much less any
of the seven tribes that comprised the Lakotas. Bray (1994) has
presented an insightful analysis and interpretation of changes in
Lakota population between 1805 and 1881, in which he concludes
that their population in general increased during the nineteenth
century, in contrast to the shrinking populations of most other
Plains tribes.

An important factor in considering nineteenth-century
population estimates for any of the Lakota bands is the effect
that repeated exposure to introduced diseases had on the Plains
tribes in general. Using native calendars called winter counts,
which were depictions made on leather or cloth to signify the
most important event that occurred in a given year, Crosby
(1992:19) has documented at least nine major episodes of epidemic
diseases such as smallpox, whooping cough, measles, and cholera
among Plains tribes between 1780 and 1851. He (Crosby 1992:15-
16) estimates that smallpox among the Plains tribes took a toll
of "Perhaps half the population between the Missouri River and
New Mexico." Especially virulent were the 1780-1781, 1801-1802,
and 1837 epidemics. Bray (1994) argues that the Lakotas, like
the Sioux in general, faced the effects of epidemic disease in
their Minnesota homeland earlier than the Plains tribes and
recovered to the point of experiencing an increasing population
during their spread into the Plains, where they were militarily
successful against the other Plains tribes who were still
undergoing depopulation as a result of epidemic diseases. The
high mobility patterns of the Lakotas throughout their annual
cycle and the vast territory utilized by them, also aided their
survival and escape of numerous epidemics which so devastated the
village tribes of the Missouri River (Lazarus 1991).

Bray (1994:174-175) has charted the population growth of the
individual Lakota bands between 1805 and 1881. From an 1805
population of about 2,400, the Brulés increased to approximately
5,700 by 1881, while during the same period the Oglalas increased
from about 1,000 to approximately 4,800 persons. The rates of
population growth experienced by these two bands during this 76-
year span markedly exceeded the overall 90 percent growth rate of
the Lakota population in general—137 percent for the Brulés and

In 1980 the population of the Rosebud Reservation (home of
many of the Brulés) was listed at 5,688 (U.S. Department of
Commerce 1989:661), and in 1990 at 12,783 (U.S. Department of the
Grobsmith (1981:18) gave the population for the Rosebud as exceeding 8,000, with the total Rosebud Sioux tribal members (including those off-reservation) as 22,000.

History

Jesuit missionary accounts place the Sioux in the Lake Superior region as early as 1640, where they are described as being settled about the head of the Mississippi River in central Minnesota, and were reportedly hunting small woodland game, fishing, and gathering wild rice (Lazarus 1991; Mails 1979; Horr 1974). Their total population at the time of first contact with the French, or about 1660, is estimated at approximately 28,000 individuals (Bray 1994:169).

The Lakotas were the first of the Dakota groups to leave central Minnesota, migrating as they followed the bison onto the Plains around 1750 (Grobsmith 1981). The Oglalas are said to have been the first band of the Lakotas to migrate west of Minnesota (Robinson 1974; Lazarus 1991). Perhaps as equally motivating as the lure of the buffalo, was their conflict with the Chippewas who were located to the north and east. The Chippewas, who experienced early, close contacts with Euroamerican traders, had access to guns before the Sioux. Their firepower was more than a match for Sioux arrows and lances (Lazarus 1991; Robinson 1974). As the Lakotas migrated to the Plains they adapted the lifestyle of nomadic bison hunters (Grobsmith 1981). The Lakotas initially used dogs as pack animals but quickly adapted to small, agile horses descended from Mexican stock (Lazarus 1991). This equestrian adaptation would prove to be indispensable in the Lakotas' short, but unquestioned dominance on the Plains.

By 1776, the Dakotas claimed virtually all of South Dakota, the western portion of Minnesota, large parcels of southern North Dakota, and parts of Wisconsin and Iowa. In Nebraska, they ranged:

...up the Missouri River to the Niobrara and west from there along the Niobrara and the Platte to the Black Hills...and by prowess ma[de] the claim good. (Robinson 1974:27)

A Lakota camp was documented at the mouth of the White River (South Dakota) in 1794-1795 by French trader Jean Baptiste Truteau, from whence they hunted bison and beaver near and on both banks of the Missouri, pushing the Arikaras north to the Knife River in present-day central North Dakota (Horr 1974).

By the late 1700s, the westering Lakotas had crossed South Dakota to the Black Hills, and had spread into North Dakota and into northern Nebraska. They followed the bison (and raided) as
far north as Canada and as far south as Texas. The Lakotas
displaced, or militarily harassed, many of the other Plains
tribal groups, both nomadic hunters and sedentary village-
dwellers, by 1800 (Grobsmith 1981; Schusky 1975; Lazarus 1991;
Mails 1979.) Later, in 1804-1806, Lewis and Clark encountered
the Brulés on either side of the Missouri, White, and Bad rivers,

Lazarus (1991:3-7) contends that Standing Bull, a leader
among the Lakotas in the last quarter of the eighteenth century,
"discovered" the Black Hills. His successors ousted the Kiowas
from the Black Hills region by 1814 and within a few years had
overpowered and evicted the Crows around the Powder River area in
eastern Wyoming and part of Montana. The Black Hills offered the
Lakotas ample water, forage for horses and buffalo, and shelter
from winter storms.

During the 1830s the Oglalas extended their territory into
southern Wyoming (Mails 1979), and diminished forage in South
Dakota encouraged the Brulés to move further south and west to
the North and South Platte rivers in Nebraska (Hyde 1961:24).
After 1834, fur trading posts built along the North Platte River
at a location later known as Fort Laramie, lured the Lakota trade
from the American Fur Company's Ft. Pierre in central South
Dakota (Hyde 1961:29-30). The southern movement of the Brulés
and Oglalas escalated their conflicts with the Pawnees. Within a
decade the Oglalas and Brulés (allied with the Cheyennes and
Arapahos) drove the Pawnees from their villages on the Loup River
(Hyde 1961:48).

During their extensive movements, both the Brulés and
Oglalas, as well as other Lakota bands, continued to maintain
their ties with the Yanktons and Santee bands in the East. They
frequently crossed the Missouri to visit and trade (Hyde
1961:19).

In 1851 the Ft. Laramie Treaty boundaries were established
in order to assure safe passage for emigrants along the Oregon
Trail. The treaty acknowledged Sioux authority over lands from
the Missouri River to west of the Black Hills, and from the
Platte River in Nebraska to the Heart River in North Dakota.
They ceded lands to the Crows (Powder River: country) and Kiowas
(hunting grounds south of the Platte River) (Lazarus, 1991).

Commencing at the mouth of the White Earth river, on the
Missouri river; thence in a southwesterly direction to the
forks of the Platte river; thence up the N. Fork of the
Platte River to a point known as the Red Bute, or where the
road leaves the river; thence along the range of mountains
known as the Black hills to the head waters of Heart river;
thence down Heart river to its mouth; and thence down the
Missouri river to the place of beginning...The tract herein
described included only a portion of what was subsequently recognized as Sioux Territory. (Royce 1899:786-787)

However, the U.S. Senate reduced the treaty’s promise of annuities from 50 years to 10 years without informing the Sioux. The Sioux, unaccustomed to annuities, particularly in the form of farming implements and seeds which they threw away, continued to hunt and raid in their ceded hunting ranges (Lazarus 1991).

Open conflict between the U.S. Government and the Lakotas erupted in 1854 at a Brulé camp near the North Platte River in Wyoming, resulting in the "Grattan Massacre," the slaughter of about 30 U.S. soldiers who sought to arrest Brulés accused of stealing a cow from a Mormon immigrant. In retaliation, a punitive U.S. Army expedition attacked the camp of some Brulés (who did not participate in the Grattan affair) at Ash Hollow in western Nebraska and killed more than 80 of the Indians, setting a pattern for hostility between the army and many of the Lakotas that would persist intermittently for more than 30 years (Ambrose 1975; Lazarus 1991:23).

Lt. G. K. Warren of the U.S. Topographical Engineers Corps was assigned to report on the region between the Platte and Missouri Rivers. In 1856, Warren observed that the Lakotas:

...are supposed to constitute more than one-half of the whole Dakota nation. They live on the western side of the Missouri. (Horr 1974:173)

The following year, the U.S. Government prepared to purchase land from the Yanktons, north, east and west of the Missouri. Before it was final, however, the sale was challenged by Bear’s Rib, a spokesman for the Lakotas, who declared that the land was only lent to the homeless Yanktons by the Lakotas and Yanktonais. Nevertheless, the purchase was completed in 1858, resulting in the 15 million-acre Dakota Territory (Lazarus 1991:25).

Gold discoveries in the West, first in Colorado in 1859 and in Montana in 1861, drew hordes of wealth-seekers and led to further incursions on Indian land. The Montana discovery resulted in establishment of the Bozeman trail through the northern bison range of the wandering Lakota hunters to Helena, Montana. Tired of broken treaties, emigrants traveling through their lands, and settlers living on their lands, many of the Dakota people resisted with force and the "Sioux Wars" commenced.

In 1862 the rebellious Santees in Minnesota were subdued with military force and 38 were hanged. Many of the surviving Santees who escaped imprisonment sought refuge to the west, where the Lakotas joined them in warfare against Government troops in 1863 and 1864 (Lazarus 1991:28).
In 1865, Congress appropriated money for two roads to be built from the Platte River in Nebraska to the Montana gold fields and appropriated $20,000 to appease the Sioux with annuities. While Governor Newton Edmunds of the newly-established Dakota Territory claimed the majority of Sioux were in agreement with the treaty, none of the 20,000 Oglalas and Bruèlés camped in the Black Hills and Powder River country were represented at the signing. The Oglala chief, Red Cloud, and the Bruél chief, Spotted Tail, came to Ft. Laramie to discuss the Bozeman trail. Having spent a year in prison following the Grattan "massacre," and having observed first-hand the resources and numbers of the whites, Spotted Tail realized that survival depended on peace. Red Cloud, angry at the increased traffic in the lands of the Lakotas in what is now Montana and Wyoming, insisted that no forts exist along the Bozeman Trail. However, as new forts were built and old ones reinforced, Red Cloud and Oglala warrior Crazy Horse attacked with their braves. The guerilla tactics of the Oglalas and Bruèlés succeeded in convincing the Government that maintaining the Bozeman Trail was not fiscally sound. The issue resulted in another treaty at Fort Laramie in 1868 wherein the Indians agreed to stop the raiding if the U.S. Army withdrew its troops from the area. The 1851 Fort Laramie Treaty stipulated Sioux cessions of land north of the North Platte River and east of the Big Horn Mountains, encompassing the western portion of the Niobrara River, and established the Great Sioux Reservation, which comprised virtually all of present-day western South Dakota (Royce 1899).

Both sides soon breached the 1868 agreement. The Sioux practice of raiding and nomadic hunting continued, while the Government permitted and protected trespassing whites. The Northern Pacific Railroad surveyed for a rail line to Montana from the east (Olson 1965).

Gold seekers continued to penetrate Indian lands. Following gold discoveries in the Black Hills and Lieutenant Colonel George Armstrong Custer's 1874 expedition there, the Government sought to gain control of the Black Hills in 1876 by sending an ultimatum to the bands within the Great Sioux Reservation to come in to an agency or be considered hostile. Red Cloud's Oglalas and Spotted Tail's Bruèlés failed to report. In March of 1876, soldiers from Ft. Fetterman, Wyoming, attacked the Lakotas and Cheyennes at the Powder River in Montana and were repelled by warriors led by Crazy Horse. The conflict culminated with the battle of the Little Bighorn, resulting in the last victory for the Sioux and their allies. Sioux territory, as set out in the Act of February 28, 1877, was confined to the mid-section of South Dakota, ceding the Black Hills on the west and roughly using the Missouri as the eastern boundary. A small area in southern North Dakota comprised the northern perimeter with the South Dakota/Nebraska border, along with the eastern Niobrara, as the southern boundary.
The Dawes(?) Act of 1889 further reduced Sioux land holdings, which were diminished to five small reservations in North and South Dakota: Standing Rock, Cheyenne River, Crow Creek, Pine Ridge, and Rosebud. The Dawes Act, probably more than any other legislation or treaty of the U.S. Government, did more to end historic tribal lifeways by dispersing Indian populations to individually allotted land on reservations, where tribal members presumably could more quickly adopt American agricultural practices and assimilate into the mainstream of American culture.

Surplus land left over after the allotment of reservations was opened for sale to non-Indians. When American Indians were paid for their land it was usually not fair market price at the time of cession and in many cases there was no payment at all (Wishart 1990). However, in an April 5, 1954, decision the Indian Claims Commission found that the Lakotas were justly compensated for their land:

In the circumstances and under the conditions existing as of date February 28, 1877, the said Act of Congress of that date provided adequate compensation for the lands and rights acquired by said Act from the plaintiff Indians, and said Indians were treated fairly and honorably by said Act. (Horr 1974:35)

In any event, the division of the various tribes and bands of the Dakotas onto separate agency lands helped to further alienate and dilute their once powerful alliance, an important goal of the Government during the western expansion of the United States (Milligan 1976; Hyde 1956; Olson 1965; Lazarus 1991).

Culture and Lifeway

The introduction of the horse caused a profound change in the lives of the Lakotas. Hunting and raiding were two activities that were particularly facilitated by horses (Osborn 1983:584). Hunting was much easier on horseback than on foot. Camps were also more easily transportable by horse rather than by using dogs as pack animals. Greater distances were covered in much less time, and this greater mobility not only affected hunting, but also the ability to raid new neighbors and dominate larger territories (Grobsmith 1981).

The Lakotas moved about freely, hunting bison, raiding (mostly for horses), and trading with Euroamericans for manufactured products. Warfare and hunting were the integral components of daily life. Camps easily transported by horses and dogs facilitated this lifestyle (Hyde 1956, 1961; Murdock 1969). Camps were made up of tipis that were constructed from skins (usually buffalo hides) supported by poles from local timber. Tipis were circular at ground level, rising in conical shape to
an opening at the top (Murdock 1969).

The Lakotas effectively utilized a wide range of available natural resources: hides were used for shelter, clothing, cooking (dropping hot stones into hide pouches of water), and trading; dogs, horses, and people for pack animals; feathers and porcupine quills and cones with coloring provided from natural dyes for decoration (Hassrick 1975:171). According to Murdock (1969), less than 15 percent of the Lakotas' subsistence was dependent on gathering and small game. More than 85 percent was derived from hunting large game. Buffalo provided food, fuel (dung), needles and shields (bone), tallow, glue (hoofs), materials for homes, blankets and robes, and trade (hides) for industrially manufactured products such as guns and pots (Lazarus 1991). Agriculture was nonexistent until very late in the historic period (Murdock 1969). Gathering products commonly consisted of berries or choke cherries, as well as prairie turnips (Grobsmith 1990; Nurge 1970). The berries were mixed with fat and bison meat to form pemmican (wasna). This mixture could be stored for long periods and eaten as is or boiled in water to form a soup or stew.

After contact, dependence on Euroamerican goods grew as trading with fur companies became firmly established in Lakota life. Stone knives, arrow points, and axes were replaced by metal equivalents. Guns facilitated and transformed hunting and warfare. The skills to produce tools from stone became largely disused. The demand for buffalo products by Euroamericans from the east and abroad helped to insure the demise of the herds. Changes induced by the fur trade were a significant factor in the ultimate collapse of the native Plains nomadic culture.

Because bison were the Oglalas' and Brulés' primary resource, the sizes and locations of aboriginal settlements were, in large part, based on the bison's patterns of mobility. A substantial degree of variability and mobility was necessary for groups dependent on bison for sustenance.

Prior to acquisition of the horse, the Dakotas traveled on foot. Their goods were transported on their own backs or by dog-drawn travois (Grobsmith 1990). After emigrating across the Missouri and acquiring the horse and gun, the Lakotas moved rapidly throughout the Plains expolitng the bison and other Plains tribes. The demand for hides and tongues to use in trade, along with the need for winter forage for horse herds, dictated increasingly larger territories (Grobsmith 1981:9; Hyde 1961:24), resulting in constant conflicts during the early nineteenth century with other groups already occupying these ranges (Hyde 1961:48-52).

A formerly egalitarian people, the Lakotas began to develop differences in wealth and status after acquiring the horse. The
horse became not only the means of acquiring wealth but also the measure of individual wealth, necessary for marriage exchanges and gaining entrance to societies (Grobsmith 1981:9).

Groups were socially and economically organized into small camps or bands, consisting of bilaterally related kin (Murdock 1969). The *tiyospaye*, glossed generally as "camp" (Howard 1980:22), was the Lakota word used to describe this basic organizational unit composed of bilateral and bilocal kin. Each *tiyospaye* recognized one or more headmen, whose limited authority stemmed from demonstrated leadership in hunting, political, and military matters (Grobsmith 1981; Walker 1982). Several *tiyospaye* combined to form a band, such as the Oglalas or the Brulés (Howard 1980:22).

The Lakotas' custom of bride-price was usually paid by the groom to the bride's family in the form of horses, their most valuable commodity for exchange. The practice of exogamy was prevalent. There were both monogamous small extended families as well as sororal polygyny with co-wives occupying the same hearth. Marital residence was usually virilocal, but uxorilocal residence was not uncommon among the Lakotas. Strictly patrilineal or matrilineal kin groups appear to have been absent by 1870. Bilateral descent was practiced, with emphasis on more renowned ancestors. Bilateral kinship allowed for greater flexibility in band membership.

Warrior, or *akicita* societies, with members from multiple bands, were another level of social organization which crosscut kin relationships, and from which an individual could seek assistance. Warrior societies served important roles in organizing and policing annual bison hunts, Sun Dances, and other events that required discipline during the aggregation of bands (Hassrick 1988).

Recognition of leadership was based on courage and success in warfare, the number of horses one owned, one's skill in hunting, or success as a shaman. Religious leaders, hunting leaders, elders, and *tiyospaye* headmen all led by group consensus. Slavery was limited to captives from other tribes and there was no hereditary rank, although Bray (1994:180, 185-186, 188 n49) cites some evidence for weak hereditary chieftainships among the Brulés prior to 1865. In accordance with non-hereditary roles, private land ownership was unknown (Murdock 1969).

Division of labor was based on gender. Males hunted and assisted in butchering; women were responsible for processing hides and meat, transportation, manufacture of clothing, and construction of living quarters (Murdock 1969). Denig (1930) and Hornaday (Niethammer 1977) estimate that a skilled woman could process 20-30 bison hides per season. As Klein (1983) pointed
out in his discussion of Plains tribes, increased Euroamerican
demand for tanned hides created a disproportionately increased
demand for female labor compared to the male. A single mounted
male was able to provide enough bison resources to employ the
processing labor of more than two females (Niethammer 1977).
Women were also responsible for making quill and bead work and
ceremonial clothing (Hamilton 1971).

Warfare was usually the domain of men, requiring a constant
state of readiness to defend the group against raiders. Large
amounts of time were devoted to securing horses. Men were
responsible for procuring horses, by raiding neighboring tribes
or searching for wild horses, and training them. Usually raids
were small-scale, allowing for "counting coup," where a charging
warrior would touch an adversary with a weapon (Lazarus 1991).

The seasons dictated life on the Plains for the Lakotas.
Winter would find small, dispersed camps in low-lying creek
bottoms near cottonwood trees. Trees provided food for the
horses while the camps, near water, were protected from the harsh
winds. As growth of prairie grasses fattened the bison during
late spring into summer, Lakota bands would come together for
hunting, religious ceremonies, and feasting (Lazarus 1991).
Annual fall gatherings were occasions for the bands to aggregate
for formal ceremonial rituals and communal buffalo hunts. These
large gatherings afforded opportunity for social mingling
(gossip, feasting, and looking for prospective spouses) and games
of chance. Most games consisted of the display of male athletic
skills (Murdock 1969).

Children were highly valued in Lakota society. The nomadic
nature of their lives made child spacing a necessity.
Religiously prescribed sexual avoidance between fathers and
mothers during the lactation period made such spacing possible
(Medicine 1987:169). Rituals marked puberty in young women and
men. The girl’s puberty ceremony, isna ta awi cha lowan,
identified her with the buffalo, marking the young woman’s
separation from the asexual world and linking her to the mythic
White Buffalo Calf Woman (M. Powers 1986:70). Hanblecheyapi, or
 crying for a vision, served a similar role for the young men,
though not strictly a puberty rite.

A woman who had completed the puberty ritual was considered
marriageable. It was her family’s responsibility to find her a
suitable husband. An ideal husband would be one who had proven
himself able to provide for a family, as well as one who could
offer parents a social bond with another band.

Marriages were easily dissolved and divorce could be
initiated by either husband or wife. A wife, who owned the
dwelling, need only place her husband’s weapons and other
personal items outside the tipi door. While the husband might
send an intermediary to attempt a reconciliation, he was expected
to accept her decision calmly and with dignity. He would either
take his things back to his family’s home or, if he was from
another tiyospaye, he might move into the lodge of his warrior
society (Lame Deer and Erdoes 1972).

Death and burial preparation was the province of women.
Older women prepared the deceased for burial and placed the body
on the burial scaffold, along with the deceased’s most valuable
possessions. The corpse was dressed in its best and specially
made moccasins with beaded soles, were placed on it (M. Powers

Tobacco smoking pipes have a highly symbolic value for the
Lakota people, being used in religious rituals and for social and
recreational uses as well. Lakotas acquired the Sacred Pipe from
a mythological figure named White Buffalo Calf Woman. The story
begins with two men who are hunting. White Buffalo Calf Woman
appeared to them and ended the life of one of the men who thought
he could possess her. White Buffalo Calf Woman bade the more
reverent hunter to tell his village about her and prepare for her­
visit. The village complied and during her visit she gave them a
sacred pipe. The pipe represents the natural world, the earth
and all that grows in it along with all the four-legged animals
and winged creatures. The people were told to respect the earth
and all that it held for them and to use the pipe in specific
rituals, whereupon the woman turned into a white buffalo calf and
walked over a hill and disappeared (W. Powers 1975).

Before leaving the Lakotas, White Buffalo Calf Woman
instructed them in a number of rituals, which were incorporated
with existing Lakota ceremonies to become known as the Seven
Sacred Rites. Inipi, the sweat lodge ceremony, and
hanblecheyapi, crying for a vision, were used by the Lakotas
before the coming of the White Buffalo Calf Woman. They were
incorporated into the Seven Sacred Rites (W. Powers 1975:83;
Brown 1953:4). Wanagi yuhapi is "keeping the ghost or soul," a
ritual to assure safe passage to the hereafter (W. Powers
1975:93-95; Brown 1953:10-30). Wiwanyag wachipi is the Sun Dance
ceremony described above. Hunkapi, the making of relatives, is a
form of adoption that creates a bond between two people that is
stronger than kinship (W. Powers 1975:100). The White Buffalo
Ceremony was also one of the Seven Sacred Rites, known as ishna
ta awi cha lowan (M. Powers 1986:70). The last of the Seven
Sacred Rites is tapa wanka yap, the throwing of the ball, which
signifies receiving knowledge (W. Powers 1973:103; Brown

The Lakotas believed that objects, people, and situations
were capable of being transformed into sacred phenomena (W.
Powers 1975). Taku wakan (sacred thing(s)) may be so either
temporarily or permanently. The permanently transformed
phenomena are known as wakantanka (wakan, sacred; tanka, great). Wakantanka is usually understood as God, or Great Mystery/Spirit. It is more complex than the traditional Christian concept as wakantanka is not understood as singular, but rather a composite of many things. While not symbolized as a whole, features of wakantanka are visibly represented in natural occurrences of Oglala life such as the weather (lightning, winds, sky), sun, and moon. Aspects of the Great Spirit may also be addressed in a kinship manner, most usually as "Grandfather," while the earth is reverently called "Grandmother" (W. Powers 1975).

Dances were performed to announce accomplishments as well as for religious purposes. The Sioux held annual summer/fall gatherings for communal bison hunts, during which time they performed the Sun Dance Ceremony. Performed only by men, the ceremony involved piercing the flesh with thongs inserted in the dancer’s chest which were then attached to a sacred pole. As the men danced, with the thongs taunt, they blew on turkey quill whistles, dancing further and further from the pole until the thong pulled out of their chests (Hamilton 1971). The purpose was to fulfill various vows and pray for the entire group through this sacrifice (W. Powers 1975; Walker 1979). Participation in the Sun Dance is the fulfillment of a personal vow and is a sacrifice given in thanksgiving or in entreaty for some supernatural assistance (W. Powers 1975:95-100, 154).

Vision quests are undertaken to understand dreams or determine outcomes of events. The person seeking a vision is under the guidance of a shaman who guides the subject in the proper rituals necessary to obtain a vision. The vision seeker is left alone in a remote place for two to four days without food or water. The rite is preceded and followed by a sweat lodge ritual. After the final sweat lodge, a holy man interprets the individual's vision (W. Powers 1975).

Yuwipi is a term applied to curing rituals within a darkened room. A holy man is wrapped in a blanket and bound. During the ritual, spirits manifest themselves to the yuwipi man (and sometimes to other participants in the room) to inform him how to heal the patient. Other participants may also entreat the spirits at this time (W. Powers 1975).

Connection with the NIMI Region

The NIMI study area comprised part of the territorial range of the Lakotas, particularly the Brulés, and was, for less than a year, home to Spotted Tail's Brulé people. The western part of the study area, from the middle reaches of the Niobrara River westward, was often described as the domain of the Sioux in general, especially for hunting and warring purposes, and of the Brulés in particular. The eastern part of the study area, from about the mouths of Ponca Creek and the Niobrara River eastward,
were frequently visited by Brulés, Oglalas, and unspecified Sioux war parties for the purpose of raiding and attacking the Poncas and Omahas.

The Brulés appear to have received their name from an incident that occurred somewhere to the north and east of NIMI, along a tributary of the Big Sioux River (Bray and Bray 1976:259-260). There, according to the winter count kept by the Brulé Battiste Good, a Brulé village was overtaken by a prairie fire during the year 1762-1763 (Mallery 1893:304-305). Many of the survivors were badly burned about the legs, hence the name Sicanzhu was applied to them, translated into French as Brulé, "burnt thigh."

Brulé raids into the eastern part of the NIMI study area may have occurred as early as 1708-1709, for which Battiste Good recorded a horse raid on the Omahas (Mallery 1893:295). Good also recorded probable raids on the Omahas in the years 1725-1726, 1731-1732, 1744-1745, and 1752-1753 (Mallery 1893:298, 299, 302, 303), although the Omahas were not necessarily living close to NIMI during all of these dates.

Some descriptions of traditional Lakota territory in the early nineteenth century include parts of NIMI. For example, Lewis and Clark describe the Lakota domain as including the "lower portion of the river Quicurre" (i.e., Niobrara River) (Thwaites 1969, 6:99), and in 1823 Duke Paul Wilhelm of Württemberg (1973:352-353) encountered a Brulé war party while hunting bison in between Ponca Creek and the Niobrara River, about 50 miles from the mouth of the former stream. In 1824, the trader Joshua Pilcher observed that the Lakotas "range through all the country watered by the l'Eau-qui-cours" (i.e., the Niobrara drainage), as well as a much larger territory (cited in Hartley 1983:1-33). In 1835, the missionary Samuel Parker described the region "from the mouth of the Big Sioux River and that on the south of the L'eau qui coure" (i.e., the Niobrara River) as part of "the Sioux country" (cited in Hartley 1983:1-33 to 1-34). The middle and upper reaches of the Niobrara River were described in the 1830s as Brulé territory (Denig 1961:16). The Oglalas are reported as having requested in 1831 that a trading post be built for them at the mouth of the Niobrara River, but the accuracy of that statement has been questioned by Hartley (1983:1-35) because that location is far from the traditional hunting area of the Oglalas. The Fort Laramie Treaty of 1851 established Sioux territorial boundaries for the Sioux, the eastern line of which crossed the Niobrara River about 2.5 miles west of the mouth of Plum Creek, thus incorporating the western part of NIMI in land reserved for the Sioux (Royce 1899:786; Hartley 1983:1-36; Hartley 1983:1-36 to 1-37 also cites several other sources that describe the Brulés as controlling the middle and western reaches of the Niobrara River during the 1850s). Brulé territory was described in 1860 as being west of a
line from "the forks of the Platte River to the mouth of White River," and the Brulés are described as being friendly to the Poncas at that time and also in 1862 (Mulhair 1992:6, 17). In an agreement with the U.S. Government dated June 23, 1875, the Lakotas ceded hunting rights in that part of the Great Sioux Reservation which lay "South and East of the southern divide of Niobrara river, west of 100° West longitude in Nebraska" (Royce 1899:882-883; Hartley 1983:1-39).

Relationships between the Lakotas and the NIMI tribes were generally characterized by hostility, with a long history of conflict between the Poncas and the Lakotas and the Lakotas even harassing their kinsmen the Santees and the Yanktons at times. Tabeau reported that Brulés had killed over half of the Poncas sometime after 1804 (Abel 1939:100). A group of Poncas, ironically returning home from a friendly visit to the Oglalas in 1824, were attacked by Brulés and 18 of the former were killed (Howard 1965:27). In 1833, the Sioux, undoubtedly Lakotas, were reported to be allied with the Poncas in a war against the Pawnees and in a joint bison hunt (Howard 1965:28). The Sioux and the Poncas are said to have jointly made war on the Omahas during the 1840s (Howard 1965:29). In 1859, the Brulés raid the Poncas (Mulhair 1992:5) and a combined party of Brulés, Oglalas, and Cheyennes fought a battle with the Poncas near the headwaters of the Elkhorn River (Howard 1965:31). The following year, Brulés attacked a Ponca hunting party on the Loup River (Mulhair 1992:6). The Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868 established the Great Sioux Reservation, which inadvertently included the Ponca lands, giving the Lakotas reason to step up their harassment of the Poncas and their neighbors, the Santees (Howard 1965:32). After 1868, numerous Lakota raids on the Poncas near the mouth of the Niobrara took place, with raids being recorded in the years 1869, 1870, 1872, 1873, and 1874 (Howard 1965:139; Mulhair 1992:35, 42-43, 46-47, 53-60). Partly as a result of this harassment, the Poncas were removed to Indian Territory (present-day Oklahoma) in 1877 (Howard 1965). Spotted Tail’s Brulé people were settled about the former Ponca Agency in the winter of 1877, but did not find the place to their liking and moved westward the following summer (Mulhair 1992:77).

Not all of the Lakota contacts with the NIMI tribes were of a negative or hostile nature, as suggested by several of the references above to peaceful interactions with the Poncas at times. Noted Ponca historian Peter Le Clair asserts that the Poncas obtained their first horses from Lakotas near the Black Hills, though other sources cite the "Padoucas" (believed to be either Comanches or Shoshones) as the source of the original Ponca horses (Howard 1965:49). Whether the animals were obtained by raiding or peaceful trade is not known. Ponca ethnographer James Howard (1965:47) states that Lakotas used to visit the Ponca Reservation to obtain kinnikinnick, a plant bark or leaf additive to smoking tobacco, from the Poncas, but this practice
evidently ceased sometime prior to about 1963.

In sum, Lakota groups, notably of the Brulé and Oglala bands, made frequent use of the NIMI study area. The western portion of NIMI was included in lands said to be controlled by the Brulés or reserved for them by various treaties of the U.S. Government, and Lakotas frequently raided the tribes who resided in the eastern portion of NIMI, particularly the Poncas. While Lakota war and hunting parties must certainly have at times camped within the NIMI study area, no village or camp sites of those people are known to exist in the study area, and such archeological sites are unlikely to be identified in the future because of the brief, transitory nature of the Lakota presence on the land.
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Some of the earliest detailed reports on the Ioway Indians come from early journal notes like those of Auguste Chouteau who's original report was published in 1816 and reprinted in Glimpses of the Past in 1940. Early ethnographers like A.R. Fulton published in 1882 The Red Men of Iowa, a history of those aboriginal tribes in the state of Iowa, while James Owen Dorsey published in 1890 detailed categories of Indian names from the Ioway and other Indian tribes. One of the first, and more comprehensive monographs on the Ioway Indians, titled The Iowa, was reprinted in 1911 by William Harvey Miner from the Indian Record and Historical Data of Thomas Foster dated 1876. In 1916 and 1926 respectfully, anthropologist and ethnologist A. Skinner authored "Societies of the Iowa," which appeared in Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, and "Ethnology of the Ioway Indians" which appeared in Bulletins of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee. In 1937, the United States Department of Interior published Iowa Tribe of Indians of the Iowa Reservation in Nebraska and Kansas, which discusses legal status, laws, government relations and more. One of the most comprehensive studies on the Ioway Indians was published by Martha Royce Blaine in 1979 titled The Ioway Indians, which continues to serve as a primary reference on the Ioway Indians today. Finally, a more recent publication that contains a section on the Ioway Indians and their presence in the NIMI area is the Missouri National Recreational River: Native American Cultural Resources, written by John Ludwickson, Donald Blakeslee, and John O'Shea, and published in 1981.

Numerous oral traditions suggest that the Ioway Indians descended from the Winnebago Nation before the turn of the eighteenth century. "The Iowa tribe of Indians forms one of the Southwestern branches of the great Dakota or Siouan stock and has been included both linguistically and ethnographically...with the Oto and the Missouri tribes, forming the so-called Chiwere group" (Miner 1911:xvii).

The Ioways were part of the Onota Culture, an Indian name for the Upper Iowa River (Blaine 1979:7). Their numerous
migrations westward brought them to present-day Nebraska for a
time, but they were eventually removed to reservation lands in
Iowa, Kansas and Oklahoma. Oral traditions suggest that the
Ioway did not migrate alone:

Dakotas have a tradition saying that, when they first
saw the Ioways, they were living near the Falls of St.
Anthony on the Minnesota River...Ponca legend says at
one time the Poncas, Omahas, and Ioways were together
near the mouth of the White River in South Dakota.
Later the tribes descended the Missouri River to the
mouth of the Niobrara. Here they separated, and the
Ioways went to the vicinity of Dixon County in Nebraska
for awhile. (Blaine 1979:4)

The Ioways, and other descendants of Oneota culture, lived
in communities which were scattered over a large area in the
Mississippi and Missouri River valleys, encompassing the present
states of Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Kansas, and
Nebraska. Other present day descendants of the Oneota culture
include the Otoe, Missouri, Winnebago, Osage, Kansas, and Quapaw
Indians. According to Blaine (1979), all of these communities
were culturally similar, sharing material traits, and cultural
behaviors such as patterns of subsistence, religious practices,
kinship terminologies, and other aspects of social organization
(Blaine 1979).

Oneota agricultural village sites were located on terraces
above the river's flood plain, which allowed the Oneota people to
utilize rich river-bottom soils, and allow them to observe
movement on the prairies about them. Evidence indicates their
houses were built of diverse and available resources such as wet
earth, chalk, bark, reed mats, wood, skins and hides. Physical
remains indicate evidence that the Oneota villagers hunted,
gathered, fished, planted, and dried, roasted, ground, and stored
goods for the hard winters. However, just how the villagers
divided these chores between men and women is not clear, but it
is speculated that a division of labor existed in which men
hunted on horseback with bows and arrows; and women maintained
the tipis and lit fires, made clothing, gathered foods and
prepared meats and hides, and were included in some ceremonies
(Blaine 1979).

Digging bowl-shaped or cylindrical pits in the ground the
Oneota people created storage, and by utilizing available
resources like clay and pounded mussel shells they made pottery.
With stone implements they ground their foods, and using reeds
and rushes from nearby rivers they made mats, baskets, and other
domestic items. "The Ioways continued to make pottery into
historic times, when trade goods replaced it with metal "trade"
kettles, iron vessels, and factory-made ceramics" (Blaine
1979:10).
Tribal territory/geography, European Contact, and Presence in Nebraska

The Ioway Indians, being first identified as part of the Oneota Culture, advanced into the Plains though Missouri and Minnesota, having come from areas east of the Mississippi near the Great Lakes in Michigan. Their sites have been found in present-day northeastern Iowa and other nearby locations (Blaine 1979:7). In an 1836 petition regarding land claims, the Ioway themselves claimed that for centuries they had occupied land extending between the Missouri and the Mississippi Rivers, an area extending from the mouth of the Missouri, and north to the head branch of the Calumet, upper Ioway and Des Moines Rivers (Blaine 1979:164).

Ioway oral tradition suggests that first European contact was made in the early 1700s at the Great Lakes. Journals of seventeenth century French explorers, however, suggest that contact was made as early as 1676:

...on April 20, 1676, the first known detailed report in which the name "Aiaoua" appears was written by Father Louis Andre from St. Francis de Zavier Mission on La Baye des Puants (La Baye), or Green Bay. (Blaine 1979:17)

Exact dates being undetermined, these and other historical accounts, nevertheless, indicate that the Ioway were present, and in the 1700s were moving around throughout the area between the Missouri and the Mississippi Rivers. It has been suggested that prior to 1700, they occupied the easternmost part of this region, an area within easy distance of tribes east of the Mississippi, and after 1700 they moved west to the Missouri-Little Sioux region, perhaps due to pressure from other eastern groups (Blaine 1979:26).

According to Ludwickson, Blakeslee and O’Shea (1981), as taken from the map of Delisle (1718), and journals of Dorsey (1884, and 1886), Dorsey and Thomas (1907), Fletcher and La Flesche (1911), and evidence from the ethnohistorical record, the Ioway Indians were present along the Missouri, within NIMI, sometime between 1690 and 1750:

Iowas [went] beyond [the Omahas] till they reached Ionia Creek, where they made a village on the east bank of the stream, near its mouth, and not far from the site of the present town of Ponca...The location is described in 1886 as "the stream on which is situated the town of Ionia, Dixon County, Neb., hence its name 'where the Iowas farmed'". (Ludwickson, Blakeslee and O’Shea 1981:40)
The map by Delisle (1718) puts the Ioway village near the Vermillion River across the river from Ionia. Another Ioway site was near present-day Florence, Nebraska (Howard 1965:15; Ludwickson, Blakeslee and O'Shea 1981:40).

Later, in the 1765-68 period, Chouteau reported the Ioway to be on the Des Moines River, an area conveniently near traders. In 1778, a Thomas Hutchins map shows two settlements on the east side of the Mississippi River, perhaps near the mouth of the Des Moines and Iowa Rivers; they were probably Ioway (Blaine 1979, 60). Blaine goes on to say,

the closest approximation of Ioway territory at the beginning of the nineteenth century would include lands that lay west of the Mississippi in present-day Iowa, somewhere south of the northern boundary of the state beyond the Ioway River watershed to the Des Moines River at forty-three degrees latitude. This area then extended to the Spirit Lake locality, which was occupied at the beginning of the previous century, down to the Little Sioux River to the Missouri, and then down that river to the Grand and Gasconade Rivers area. It possibly included the land between the Chariton and the Mississippi and south of the Jeffreton River. These lands included all those ceded by the Ioways to the United States during the nineteenth century. The peripheries of those areas were claimed by, contested by, or shared with the Otos, the Missouri, the Kansas, the Osages, the Sacs, the Foxes, the Omahas, and the Yanktonai Sioux during different periods of Ioway history. (Blaine 1979:82)

A treaty of 1824 caused the Ioway to cede a large section of present-day Missouri, including hunting and village sites. This treaty caused the Ioway to be moved to a small triangular area of land between the Missouri state line and the Missouri River, which they relinquished in trust in 1830. Having been onslaughted with pestilence, and at war with other Indian nations, their numbers at this time were estimated at only 1,000 (Fulton 1882). On September 17, 1836, the Ioway ceded all land in Missouri, and were assigned a reservation in northeastern Kansas (Blaine 1979: 142-43, 161; Miner 1911: xxxiv).

The 1836 petition to President Jackson claimed that the Sacs and Foxes had no claim to the land west of the Mississippi that had been granted to them in 1825, and objected to the fact that these tribes had subsequently made cessions to the United States (Blaine 1979:164-66). Of this petition, Blaine remarks: "For the first time we read the Ioways' description of the extent of their land...They again accuse the Sacs of taking their lands and the treaty commissioners of misleading them. The commitments made in their treaties have not been fulfilled, and they appeal
for redress" (Blaine 1979:167). A treaty was subsequently made
with the Sacs and Foxes in which they released rights to all land
between the Missouri and Mississippi rivers. The treaty of 1838
caused the Ioways to cede all right or interest in the country
between the Missouri and the Mississippi Rivers, and between the
Sacs and Fox boundary and the Sioux boundary, as well as all
cessions made by the Sacs and Foxes in those areas; thus ending
their last claim to their homeland (Blaine 1979:169-171).

Circa 1879, pressure by white settlers raised the question
of moving the Ioways to Indian Territory, and later, circa 1890,
some of these Ioway Indians moved from Kansas to reservation land
in central Oklahoma which was allotted to them in severalty. By
this time, their population had dropped to some 500, and by 1885
their numbers were reduced to some 90 persons (Hodge 1912:613-
614). Today, the Ioway Indians continue to live on reservation
land in both Kansas and Oklahoma. Refer to The Statistical
Record of Native North Americans (1990) for the current status of
the Ioway Indians in both Kansas and Oklahoma.

Synonymy/Ethnonymy

There is a diversity of opinions as to the origin of the
name "Iowa or Ioway." It has been interpreted as signifying
"beautiful," "the beautiful land," "this is the place," "dusty
noses," "grey snow," and "grey snow covered." The Ioway were
termed the Ayouas by the French, the Ajoues by the Spaniards, the
Ayouway by Lewis and Clark in 1804, the I-o-way by later
orthographers, and finally the I-o-wa. According to Fulton
(1882),

...we conclude that the word "Iowa" is of Dakota
origin, that it was from the earliest knowledge of the
whites the name applied, with slight changes from time
to time, to a tribe belonging to the Dakota race, and
that the literal meaning according to the very best
authority, is something to write or paint with. Why
the name was given to the tribe we may never know, but
we do know it became the name of our Territory and
State because it was the name of the tribe who occupied
the soil, and because it commended itself to the whites
as euphonious and appropriate. (Fulton 1882:426)

The first known detailed report in which the name Iowa or
Ioway, spelled "Aiaoua," appears was written in 1676 by Father
Louis André from St. Francis de Xavier Mission on La Baye des
Puants (La Baye), or Green Bay" (Blaine 1979:17). According to
Blaine (1979), the name by which the Ioways identified themselves
when they first met the Europeans was Paxoche (Blaine 1979:3).
While translation of this term varies, early missionaries
translated it as "dusty noses." According to the journal of
Stephen H. Long in his 1819-1820 journey recorded their name as
"gray snow." And, finally, Alanson Skinner in 1926 translated their name as "snow-covered" (Blaine 1979:3-4). For further descriptions of Ioway Synonymies see (Miner 1911:Appendix C; Wedel 1978).

Religion

The Ioway believed in many legends. Because animals were considered supernatural and sacred, they were a major part of the Ioway religious system being considered coequals (Fulton 1882). One legend of primary importance is the legend of the "Black Bear People" who mythically came out of the earth to teach them agriculture. Because farming was a primary subsistence activity, they called the month of April the "cultivation moon" (Blaine 1979:10-11). They also believed in owl-like forest men, a similar mythological being of the "Little tree-dweller" that the Dakota believed in (Howard 1965:77).

The Ioway believed they originated from eight persons who’s souls, after becoming deceased, entered the bodies of eight different animals, each of which represents a different sect, clan, or family (Wilhelm 1973:319). They are the Eagle, Pigeon, Wolf, Bear, Elk, Beaver, Buffalo, and Snake, being distinguished primarily by the their hair cut or style (Fulton 1882).

The mescal bean, sacred to many of the Prairie and Plains tribes, was utilitized by the Ioway in some religious ceremonies; it was consumed in the form of a tea (Howard 1965:124).

Social and Political Organization, and Economy

According to Miner (1911), the Ioway’s social structure was based on the "camp circle." The circle was divided into two halves, which served as phratries (Miner 1911:xxvi). According to Underhill (1953), however, these half circles were called moieties (winter and summer).

Their tribe was organized into ten exogamous father clans, membership to which was denoted among young boys by a characteristic way of cutting the hair, although all men wore their hair the same way. The Black Bear clan led the first phratry, which also included the Wolf, the Eagle and Thunder, the Elk, and the Beaver clans. This division planned the winter hunt and winter and spring activities. The tribe’s principal chief came from the Bear clan during winter. The Buffalo, Pigeon, Snake, and Owl clans composed the other phratry, which was responsible for agriculture and for the spring, summer, and fall activities. In the summer, the Buffalo clan chose the principal chief. Leadership positions were hereditary, but important decisions had to be reached by consensus (Herring 1990:71).

The Ioway were also divided into religious "Dancing Societies:" the Otter, the Red Medicine, and the Buffalo (Blaine
Additionally, they had war, animal, mystery, and shamanistic societies, to which membership was through vision (Underhill 1953:151).

Marriage was determined by a strict class system. All people had to marry within their own class, and outside their clan (Blaine 1979:211). Three classes were recognized: royalty, or hereditary chiefs and their families; nobility, or important warriors; and commoners (Skinner 1916:683-4).

The Ioway economy was diverse. Being semi-nomadic people, their subsistence practices included hunting, agriculture, and horticulture, the contribution of each, however, is not known (Ludwickson, Blakeslee, and O'Shea 1981:45).

Crafts, Traditions and Socializing

Concerning crafts, the Ioway wove floor mats out of reeds over bark, much like the Winnebagoes and the Central Algonquians. During important visits with other tribes they exchanged these crafts in addition to performing games, dances, and adoptions in order to establish and reinforce kinship ties and establish strong alliances (Blaine 1979:172).

By the 1820's the Ioway had adopted many characteristics of Plains Indian tribes (Herring 1990:72). Miner describes several of the games practiced by the Ioway. He divided the games into games of chance, which were of primary importance and games of dexterity (Miner 1911). For instance, the game of "platter," played almost always by women, consisted of "little blocks of wood marked with certain points for counting, to be decided by throws, the lot being shaken in a bowl and thrown out on a sort of pillow" (Miner 1911:xxix). Bets were made on the number of points and colors. Another game was the game of moccasin, which resembled the shell game whereby objects were hid in one of several moccasins and the opponents had to guess the right one to acquire tallies. The tallies or points could then be used to win horses, ponies, guns, buffalo robes, and more (DeMallie 1982).

Other games included the game of Arrow, which was a religious game, and the game of "Ball-playing or Racket," which was usually a man's game involving the toss of a ball using a racket with a net on the end, as in lacrosse (Miner 1911).

Miner (1911) describes several Ioway dances: the welcome dance, given in honor of visitors; the war dance, given after a war party had returned or for amusement; the approaching dance, in which the dancers portrayed methods of advancing towards an enemy; and the eagle dance, in which the dancers take the position of an eagle (Miner 1911). To this list Blaine adds descriptions of dances related to hunting and warfare: The Buffalo Hunting Dance and the Bear Hunting Dance, which were held before hunting the animals; and the Scalp Dance, which served as
a record of the ability of the warriors. The Calumet or Pipe Dance was used to conclude a peace party (Blaine 1979:178-182). They also performed the Stomp dance, a dance very similar to the Snake dance of the Eastern Woodland tradition (Howard 1965:115-116).

Ornamentation and dress

Ornamentation among the Ioway was common. Both sexes usually had each ear pierced in four places, fastening porcelain ear pendants into these holes; they often paid high prices for these luxuries. Their clothing was usually bright colored, the women wearing skirts of calico or cloth, leggings of blue or scarlet cloth set with beads or coral, and moccasins decorated with hog bristles or porcupine quills. The men typically had their hair pulled out except for a tuft on the back of the cranium to which they fastened red-dyed deer tails (Wilhelm 1973:318). This was referred to as the roach hairdress among the Ioway (DeMallie 1982:202).
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CHAPTER 11
Winnebagos
By Michelle L. Watson

Introduction

It remains uncertain where the Winnebagos originated from before they occupied Wisconsin. They themselves tell myths that give their origins along the Door Peninsula, the eastern arm of Green Bay, on Lake Michigan in what is now Wisconsin, near the place where they first encountered white explorers in 1634, members of the Jean Nicolet expedition. A large lake nearby in Wisconsin, that feeds into the Fox River and drains into Lake Michigan, is named after the tribe-Winnebago Lake. It is not definitely known, however, where the Jean Nicolet expedition met the Winnebagos, but it is presumed to be at a place called Red Banks, north of Green Bay (Hodge 1910; Radin 1937; 1970).

The Winnebagos are first mentioned in U.S. diplomatic history, "...in the reports given of a council held in July, 1815, at "Portage des Sioux," in Missouri, after the treaty of Ghent" (Jackson 1964:218), and their first treaty was made in 1816 (Jackson 1964; Coffey 1984). This treaty was called, a treaty of peace and friendship between the Indians and William Clark and others, "Commissioners Plenipotentiary of the United States and undersigned chiefs and warriors of that portion of the Winnebag Tribe residing on the Ouisconsin River. (Coffey 1984:9)

The Prairie du Chien Treaty of 1825, however, marked the beginning of treaty-making with the United States Government (Royce 1899:712).

After a series of treaties with the United States and resettlement schemes between 1815 and 1865, some 1,200 Winnebagos were resettled on reservation land in northeastern Nebraska. The remaining Winnebagos refused to leave their ancestral and aboriginal homelands in Wisconsin.

The Winnebagos, like the Kickapoos and later the Sauks and Foxes, did attempt to resist white intrusion onto their lands and the forced relocation westward. The force of this intrusion, however, was too strong. White farmers were taking occupancy of their lands, fur trappers were intruding on a trade they had
entered into circa 1665, and miners poured in, in quest of the
rich lead deposits in the upper Mississippi country of northwest
Illinois and southwest Wisconsin. By 1641, the Winnebagos had
lost some 1,500 persons to an epidemic and some 500 more to war
with the Fox (Champagne 1994). Thus, they were unable to
successfully resist further intrusions. By 1827, hundreds of
federal troops and militia had been moved onto their lands in an
attempt to forcefully persuade the Winnebagos to relocate
westward.

Today, the Winnebago Nation is comprised of those Winnebagos
living on the Omaha and Winnebago Reservation in northeastern
Nebraska, which was established in 1865, and the Winnebago
Federal Indian Reservation in Wisconsin which was established
circa 1875.

Anthropological Research

Early explorers journals like those of J. Nicolet, give some
of the earliest information on the Winnebagos. In 1910, the
Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico, by Frederick Webb
Hodge, was published for the Thirtieth Bulletin of the Bureau of
American Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institution. It continues
to serve as a classic study of Winnebago origins, social
organization, religion, and etc. The first comprehensive study
of the Winnebagos, conducted again under the auspices of the
Smithsonian Institutions Bureau of American Ethnology, was titled
The Winnebago Tribe, and completed by Paul Radin in 1923 for the
Bureau's Thirty-Seventh Annual Report. It was reprinted in 1970
and continues to serve as a primary source of information on the
Winnebago Indians. Current publications on the Winnebagos,
however, were not located.

Cultural and Linguistic Affiliations

The Winnebago Indians, unlike all the other Indians of the
western Great Lakes, spoke a Siouan language, not an Algonquian
one. Thus, they are members of the Siouan linguistic family,
"and to a subdivision comprising also the group called by J.O.
Dorsey (1897) Chiwere, which includes also the Iowa, Oto, and
Missouri" (Swanton 1952:258). They not only share similarities
in dialect, but also similarities in culture with the Iowas,
Otos, Missouris, Omahas, Osages, and Otos (Hodge 1910:958;
Underhill 1953:142).

Early on the Winnebagos were called Puants by the French,
and Stinkards by the English (Fulton 1882:146; Swanton 1952:258;
Jackson 1964:218). The origin of the name Puants may have come
from a group of American Indians called the Otchagras, who were
commonly called Puans, and once occupied the shores of Green Bay
where the Winnebagos were supposedly first contacted (Radin
1970).
The Winnebagos have historically called themselves by various names: Hoch-un-ga-ra which means Trout Nations and Horoji which means Fish Eaters. They are called Wee-ni-bee-gog (also Winnebago) by Algonquin tribes, a name formed from two Algonquin words, weenud, meaning foul, and nibeeg, meaning waters. The Otoes, Iowas, Omahas and Missouris called the Winnebagos Hoch-un-ga-ra, the Sioux called them O-ton-kah (Fulton 1882:146), and there were various other names applied to them over the decades (see Swanton 1952:258).

Historical Occupations

It remains uncertain where the Winnebagos originated from before they entered Wisconsin. They, themselves, have no oral traditions telling of their migrations from the east, but they, as well as the Otos, Missouris, Omahas, and Poncas, have many myths that give the Winnebago origins at Green Bay. Dorsey was informed by Iowa chiefs that these above mentioned groups once formed part of the Winnebago Nation and that, after migrating from homelands north of the Great Lakes, the Winnebagos stopped at Lake Michigan while the other groups continued a southward migration. Thus, when the Winnebagos were first contacted, they were surrounded by Central Algonquian tribes rather than kindred Siouan tribes (Radin 1970:4).

The Winnebagos consider their origins to be on the west shore of Lake Michigan, north of Green Bay, at a place called Red Banks. They claim the Iowas, Otos, Omahas and Missouris descended from them, as they for centuries constituted a powerful nation, and "...the Winnebago, Iowa, Oto, and Missouri, speak dialects naturally intelligible to one another, and show many cultural similarities" (Hodge 1910:958). By 1766 the Winnebagos had receded from the Green Bay area and resettled on Fox River which empties into the end of the bay, and is located near Lake Winnebago and the present-day city of Neenah (Fulton 1882:147; Radin 1937:3; 1970).

The Winnebagos came to be allies with many of the other tribes that also lived in the country around Lake Michigan. The Menominees on the opposite side of Green Bay were early trading partners. In later years, they traded with the Sacs, Foxes, and Kickapoos. In addition to being good allies, the Winnebagos could also be a dangerous enemy. Some of them fought against the British in the French and Indian Wars of 1689-1763 and then they sided with the British against the rebels in the American Revolution of 1775-1783 after the French gave up Canada. They also participated in Tecumseh’s Rebellion of 1809-1811. By 1820, the Winnebagos had too mount resistance against American settlers and miners. After the Black Hawk War of 1832, however, their numbers had dwindled greatly and they were forced to relocate west of the Mississippi River.
The Winnebagos made their first treaty with the United States in June of 1816, with numerous treaties following (see Coffey 1984:9). By 1840 the Winnebagos had ceded to the United States all of their remaining lands in Wisconsin which had been assigned to them by a treaty in 1832 (Swanton 1952:269). Many Winnebagos relocated to a reservation area in Iowa called "Neutral Ground" (Hodge 1910), while others remained hidden throughout their ancestral and aboriginal woodlands of Wisconsin (Swanton 1952:259). Because their move to Iowa was disrupting to the Foxes, Sacs, and Sioux, they agreed in 1841 to relocate on the western bank of the Mississippi River. In 1846 the Winnebagos were removed to a reservation north of Minnesota River, in Minnesota, and in 1848 they removed to a Long Prairie Reservation (Hodge 1910), which was "bounded by Crow Wing, Watab, Mississippi, and Long Prairie Reservations, Minn." (Swanton 1952:259).

The 1862 Sioux outbreak forced some of the Winnebagos from Minnesota, in 1863, to a newly established Santee and Winnebago reservation at Crow Creek, or Usher's Landing, on the Missouri River in South Dakota, some eighty miles above Fort Randall (Washburn 1975:203-204). There they found inadequate clothing and shelter, their crops were fair at best, they were receiving half rations, hunting was poor, and there was little work for them with area farmers as laborers. Many of the Winnebagos thus sought refuge on the Omaha Reservation in northeastern Nebraska (Jackson 1964:234), until the last treaty with them was made on March 8, 1865, which relocated them to the Omaha Reservation in northeastern Nebraska.

The Winnebagos ceded land in Dakota Territory at Usher's Landing in exchange for some 100,000 acres of reservation land in Nebraska, land that had been recently ceded by the Omaha Tribe for that purpose (Jackson 1964:237; Coffey 1984). Included in the treaty was the "government's agreement to provide saw and grist mills, to fence and plow a hundred acres for each band of the tribe, to supply them with seed, implements, horses and cows, as well as $2,000 worth of guns" (Hautzinger n.d.). The Winnebagos continued to experience hardships on their new reservation in Nebraska, resulting in many of them leaving to seek wage labor, or to reunite with those Winnebagos who were still living in Wisconsin.

Then, "In the winter of 1874 the Wisconsin "strays" were moved down to the Nebraska Reservation. They were discontented, fomented dissatisfaction in the tribe, and in less than a year more than half of them had wandered back to Wisconsin again" (Jackson 1964:244) where they remain today. A short time later, they were granted tribal status in Wisconsin. Today, they form the Winnebago Federal Indian Reservation located just west of Black River Falls, Wisconsin. For more information on Winnebago life prior to their removal from the western Great Lakes, see
"In 1829 the Winnebago population was estimated at 5,800. In 1837 their population was reported to be 4,500, nearly one fourth of the tribe had died the previous year from small-pox, and in 1855 the tribe had an estimated population of only 2,754 (Fulton 1882:150). Hodge (1910) gives the following population estimates: In 1867 there were 1,750 Nebraska Winnebagos and 700 Wisconsin Winnebagos. In 1886 there was an estimated 1,222 Nebraska Winnebagos and 930 Wisconsin Winnebagos. In 1910 the Nebraska Winnebago population was estimated at 1,063 while the Wisconsin Winnebago were reported at 1,270 (Hodge 1910:960). "In 1937 the United States Indian Office reported 1,456 Winnebagos in Wisconsin and 1,212 in Nebraska" (Swanton 1952:259). The 1990 Census reported 1,151 American Indians living on the Nebraska reservation and some 2,000 on the Wisconsin reservation.

Aboriginal Culture, Subsistence, and Social Organization

The social organization of the Winnebagos is based on two phratries, known, respectively, as the Upper or Air, and the Lower or Earth divisions (Hodge 1910:959). Each division was then divided into exogamous clans. The Upper division has four clans: Thunderbird, Warrior, Eagle, and Pigeon (extinct). The Lower division has eight divisions: Bear, Wolf, Water-spirit, Deer, Elk, Buffalo, Fish, and Snake (Hodge 1910:959; Radin 1970). The Thunderbird and Bear clans are considered the leading clans of their respective phratries. It's the Thunderbird clan that resides over the peace lodge and the Bear clan presides over the war lodge. Each clan has a number of customs relating to birth, the naming feast, death and the funeral wake. Of these customs, the burial rituals are of greatest importance. Members of each clan must bury their own clan members, even though they're of the same phratry (Hodge 1910:960).

The Winnebagos traditionally practiced patrilineal descent and observed patrilocal post-marital residence patterns as the norm. However, "When a Winnebago woman marries a man who either has no clan or who reckons descent in the mother's line, the children are always considered as belonging to the mother's clan. This, however, lasts for only one generation" (Radin 1970:144). According to Radin (1970), already in 1923, these traditional practices of social organization were weakening greatly, and other non-traditional practices were being accepted (Radin 1970:144-145).

In their material culture, the Winnebagos were distinctly timber people, and their houses and dress are practically identical with those of the Sauk and Foxes, Menominees, and others (Hodge 1910:960). In Wisconsin they built wigwams and lodges of animal skins, mats and bark, a Central Algonquian tradition, and utilized a fire in the center of the lodge (Radin
Their subsistence economy was based upon procured food, which was hunted, fished, harvested, and gathered (Fulton 1882). They raised primarily corn, squash, beans, and tobacco (Radin 1970:67). They also participated in communal bison hunts in the prairies to the southwest. They dressed and ornated and adorned themselves for their varying social occasions and seasons, and wore blankets as an essential article of dress at all times. Unlike some other Plains Indians, the Winnebagos buried their dead (Fulton 1882).

The Winnebagos follow examples of the Sioux in their political organization. They had two leaders of equal power, the war chief and the peace chief. The war chief was the volunteer brave who functioned only in time of battle. The peace chief was, however, chosen for wisdom and generosity, and served for life (Underhill 1953:121).

For the Winnebagos, the Great Spirit made man and woman (Fulton 1882). Spiritually, the earth is the grandmother of the Indians, and the first four men made were the north, south, east, and west winds. The buffalo is the land which keeps the earth steady, and tobacco and other seeds made man and woman fertile. The Winnebagos had particular notions about the spiritual world as all Indian cultures did. They believed in a large number of spirits, most of whom were seen as animals or animal-like beings capable of taking any form they wished (Washburn 1975:52). They respected the rattlesnake, wolf, bear, turtle, and other animals (Fulton 1882:156), and, like many Midwestern tribes, told tales of hairy elephants (Howard 1965:78).

The Winnebagos possessed beliefs very similar to the Dakota, Ponca, and Central Algonquian tribes (Hodge 1910:960). They possessed two primary important tribal ceremonies, the Medicine Dance (also Mankani), and the Winter Feast or War-bundle Feast (also Wagigo). The Medicine Dance was performed in the summer to prolong life and to instill certain virtues. It’s ceremony is similar to the Algonquian "Midewiwin", to the Dakota "Mystery Dance", and to the Omaha "Pebble Ceremony" (Hodge 1910:960).

The Winter, or War-bundle Feast, the only distinct clan ceremony among the Winnebago, was performed in the winter to give their people power in war by pulling on "all the supernatural deities known to them" (Hodge 1910:960). There were twelve war rituals performed at the feast, a ritual for each clan of the Winnebago tribe. Each clan possessed a separate war bundle, each containing different contents. The ceremony was traditionally practiced to celebrate war victories and to increase war powers, but the Winnebagos developed it into a general ceremony of thanksgiving to the earth and sky spirits (Radin 1970:379). Traditionally, a male member from each of the clans possessed the sacred clan bundle which was passed down through the generations.
Other ceremonies among the Winnebagos include the Buffalo Dance, which was a spiritual calling for the buffalos in the spring, the Herucka, a ceremony very similar to the Omaha Grass dance, the Afraid-to-eat-Greens ceremony, and the peyote ceremony. Peyotism was apparently a recent phenomenon among the Winnebago, being practiced among modern cults found among the Winnebagos (Radin 1970:340). Supposedly, either the Otos or the Winnebagos were responsible for introducing peyotism to the Omaha Reservation circa 1907 (Arth 1956). Other ceremonial dances included the Snake, Scalp, Grizzly-bear, Sore-eye, Ghost, farewell, Hokixere, and captive’s death dance (Hodge 1910:960; Radin 1970:331-339).

Shamanistic and medicinal practices included medicines and ceremonies. Two general magical ceremonies practiced among the Winnebagos were the Warukana, to know something by exerting one’s powers, and the wanantcere, to hypnotize in the distance (Radin 1970:206). Traditional medicines were generally used to ward off animal spirits in men. Fasting was also practiced for medicinal purposes, as well as for receiving spiritual visions.

For the Winnebagos, the "Trickster is both culture-hero and trickster, benefactor and buffoon, god and man...Trickster is seen as the creator of the world and bringer of culture" (Washburn 1975:59). Other mythological figures include the Manuna (also earth-maker), the Bladder, the Turtle, He-who-wears-heads-as-earrings, and the Hare (Hodge 1910:960). Their spiritual beliefs were so important to their way of life that they blame their cultural disintegration on the loss of many of them as a direct result of acculturation and assimilation (Washburn 1975).

The Winnebago enjoyed games and amusements. Among them were men’s lacrosse, women’s lacrosse, and ceremonial lacrosse (Lowie 1963:225), football, hit-the-tree game, the kicking game, the moccasin game, the dice game, cup-and-ball game, and tree game (Radin 1970:72-75).

The Winnebago connection to the NIMI region

It was the 1862 Sioux outbreak that forced the Winnebagos from Minnesota to a newly established Santee and Winnebago reservation at Usher’s Landing on the Missouri River in South Dakota, some eighty miles above Fort Randall:

The Santee Sioux and the Winnebagos, who had had no hand in the outbreak of 1862, were, in 1863 exiled to a forbidding reservation at Crow Creek on the Missouri River eighty miles above Fort Randall. Inadequate supplies and crop failures led to actual starvation in 1864. (Washburn 1975:203-204)

Because they experienced continued hardships, many sought refuge
on the Omaha Reservation in northeastern Nebraska (Jackson 1964:234). With the 1865 Treaty, the Winnebagos ceded land in Dakota Territory at Usher's Landing in exchange for the some 100,000 acres of reservation land in Nebraska, land that had been recently ceded by the Omaha Tribe for that purpose (Jackson 1964:237; Coffey 1984). The treaty included saw and grist mills, fencing, plowed ground for each band of the tribe, a supply of seed, implements, horses and cows, and $2,000 worth of guns (Hautzinger n.d.). After their move, they continued to experience hardships and, thus, many left to seek wage labor, or to reunite with those Winnebagos who were still living in Wisconsin.

Then, "In the winter of 1874 the Wisconsin "strays" were moved down to the Nebraska Reservation. They were discontented, however, and in less than a year over half of them had journeyed back to their ancestral and aboriginal homelands in Wisconsin where they remain today (Jackson 1964:244).

The Nebraska Winnebagos experienced population decline up until 1878, when they held new tribal elections and all but one chief was replaced, predominantly by more traditional chiefs who fostered a return to the old Winnebago traditions encompassing medicines and ceremonies. By the end of the decade, the Nebraska Winnebagos lived in over a hundred frame and brick, two-story houses, and virtually every family held the patent on their allotment. Agricultural production ranged from twenty to forty thousand bushels of crops annually. In 1879, the Winnebago and Omaha agencies were consolidated...despite the fact that the tribes spoke different languages and had not been on friendly terms for some time. (Hautzinger n.d.:12)

The 1990 Census reported the following: Out of the 2,341 people reported to be living on the Nebraska Winnebago Reservation, the majority were living in Thurston County. Of those, 1,151 were American Indians, the majority of males being between the ages of 1-14, and 22-54, and the majority of females being between the ages of 1-13, and 22-49. The reservation acreage was reported at 27,538 acres, of which 4,241 acres were tribal land. Of those employed, most were in manufacturing.

Today, the present Winnebago Reservation in Wisconsin consists of portions of 10 counties in the southern part of the state. They had, in the late nineteenth century, a population of less than 400. Today, there is an estimated 2,000 Winnebagos living in Wisconsin, both on and off the reservation. They have however, a radically changed life style, one that is "gravitated toward the resort area of Wisconsin Dells, where supplemental income can be gained by selling baskets and other crafts to tourists and participating in "ceremonials" staged for the
vacationers" (Kehoe 1992:325). Established bingo halls have also radically changed their lives.

References Cited

Arth, Malcolm J.

Champagne, Duane

Coffey, Wallace E.
1984 The History and Legal Status of Nebraska Indian Tribes. Nebraska Indian Commission, Lincoln.

Fulton, A.R.

Hautzinger, Rebecca
n.d. The Winnebago Tribe in Nebraska, 1863-1879. Unpublished manuscript prepared for the Department of Geography, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Hodge, Frederick Webb, editor

Howard, James H.

Jackson, Helen

Kehoe, Alice B.

Lowie, Robert H.
Olson, Carol J.

Radin, Paul


Royce, Charles C.

Swanton, John R.

Underhill, Ruth Murray

Washburn, Wilcomb E.
The Winnebago, or Hochungra, were traditionally a Woodlands people, with ancestral ties to the Green Bay and Lake Winnebago region of east central Wisconsin. They shared a common Siouan language with the Iowa, Oto and Missouri tribes. Neighboring Algonquin tribes influenced Winnebago material and artistic culture. Beginning with the Prairie du Chien Treaty in 1825, the Winnebago experienced a series of cessions and removals which culminated in the creation of a reservation in northeastern Nebraska in 1865. This continual displacement splintered the Winebago tribe, there always being some who refused to leave their homes, or who returned to Wisconsin in efforts to reclaim their aboriginal lands. The annual reports of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, along with the attached agency reports, provide a firsthand view of the hardships and adjustments the Nebraska Winnebagos endured while establishing a permanent home for themselves. The annual reports are especially critical because most of the Winnebago problems were a direct result of both the neglect and interference of the commissioners and agents.

When the sioux Uprising of 1862 broke out in south central Minnesota, the Winnebago were living nearby on a reservation along the Blue Earth River. Following the violence, Minnesota settlers demanded that all Indians be removed from Minnesota, and while it was known that the Winnebagos had not been involved, Congress and the Office of Indian Affairs worked quickly to comply with public opinion. On February 21, 1863, Congress ordered the removal of the Winnebagos to a tract to be located somewhere beyond state boundaries, within one hundred miles of Ft. Randall, in Dakota Territory. They were to be moved peaceably, if at all, and some of the more assimilated Winnebagos of mixed-blood were allowed to remain in Minnesota on their allotments. The cost for the removal, estimated at $50,000, was to be absorbed by the Winnebagos through the sale of their reservation at Blue Earth.

The responsibility for establishing the combined Santee and Winnebago reservation fell to Superintendent Clark Thompson. Commissioner William P. Dole instructed Thompson to acquire everything he deemed necessary to construct a permanent agency, including houses for the Indians, with the stipulation that he observe "the most rigid economy," and accomplish his job quickly. After he made arrangements for supplies, labor and livestock,
Thompson went in May to the Ft. Randall area to choose a location. He decided on a site twenty miles above Crow Creek on the Missouri River at Usher's Landing, which he reported contained "the best timber and bottom land...above Fort Randall. It has good soil, good timber and plenty of water." When Winnebago chief Baptiste LaSallieur learned of this choice of a home for his people, he remarked: "It is a damn cold country—no wood; damn bad country for Indians." Brigadier General Alfred Sully, familiar with the area, questioned Thompson's choice in letters to the Secretary of the Interior and the War Department:

"In the selection of their new locality...I do not think good judgment has been used. The land is poor; a low sandy soil. I don't think you can depend on a crop of corn, even once in five years as it seldom rains here in the summer."

The agent for the Winnebagos, Saint A. D. Balcombe, received notice to begin removal in early April, 1863. The Winnebagos, unhappy but resigned to the move, made their way to Fort Snelling at Mankato. They were each allowed to take only a hundred pounds of personal goods with them. Everything else, including firearms, was boxed and labeled, with the promise that it would be returned to them once they arrived at Usher's Landing. Balcombe and certain military officers successfully argued against returning the guns to their owners. On May 27, 1863, just three months after Congress passed the removal act, over 1,900 Winnebagos were transported to Usher's Landing on poorly accommodated steamboats.

The Crow Creek agency was poorly prepared for the arrival of the Winnebagos. Thompson faced difficulties in obtaining the necessary equipment, food, livestock and personnel in the short time and at low prices allowed him by the Indian Office. The only completed construction was a stockade. The reservation farmer managed to break a hundred acres of land for each of the two tribes, but severe drought made the plowing difficult. It soon became apparent that the crops would not survive the summer heat. Only a small force of forty soldiers protected the reservation from neighboring bands of hostile Dakota Sioux. The Winnebagos began arriving on June 8, 1863, followed by Balcombe on June 23. Thompson reported that the Winnebagos appeared happy and well fed, with surplus provisions to sell, which prompted him to immediately put them on rations, and confine them to the reservation.

Drought conditions, as expected, destroyed the crops that first year. The Winnebagos found hunting virtually impossible. Game was scarce, they were surrounded by hostile bands, and had no weapons for hunting or protection. Food supplies became dangerously low, and were of such poor quality that many who ate them became sick and died. Chief Little Hill later told a
congressional investigator of the hardships they endured:

...Before Clark Thompson...left us, he had a cottonwood
trough made and put some beef in it, and sometimes a whole
barrel of flour and a piece of pork, and let it stand a whole
night; and the next morning after cooking it, would give us
some of it to eat. We tried to use it, but many of us got
sick on it and died. They also put in the unwashed
intestines of the beeves...Some of our old women and children
got sick on it and died..." 

In the autumn, Baptiste presented Thompson with a petition
signed by the chiefs and head men, telling of their desire to go
live with their "good friends," the Omahas. By September, over
1,350 people escaped Usher’s Landing, leaving in small groups by
canoe. Some continued downriver to the Omaha reservation,
where they were welcomed by the Omaha tribe even though the Omaha
agent, Orasmus H. Irish, was unprepared to care for them. Many
spent a desperate winter near Ft. Randall, several hundred dying
of starvation and exposure. A few chose to join the Iowa
tribe, others slipped back to Wisconsin and forty-six men enlisted
in a Nebraska cavalry regiment.

Irish notified the Commissioner about the Winnebagos as early
as October, 1863, at which time the Commissioner expressed
astonishment at the news. Balcombe had not notified his
superiors that the Winnebagos were leaving Crow Creek, and had
done nothing to stop them. He later blamed the crop failure for
the exodus, and cited the lack of sufficient military support to
keep them on the reservation. The Commissioner, nonetheless,
ordered Balcombe to restrain "his Indians."

On April 1, 1864, Robert W. Furnas replaced Irish as the
Omaha agent. Furnas reported over six hundred Winnebagos at the
agency at that time, and they continued to arrive at regular
intervals, another 1,254 coming by November. At the same time,
nearly the entire tribe of the Poncas came to the reservation in a
destitute condition, having been without an agent for some time.
The Omaha leaders, led by Joseph La Flesche, became alarmed at the
growing numbers, and issued a list of eight by-laws that they
expected the refugees to follow, including such things as no
alcohol or gambling. Furnas and the Omahas set aside a hundred
acres for the Winnebagos to farm near the mouth of Black Bird
Creek at the Missouri River. They raised a crop described simply
as "fair", which was supplemented by half rations of flour, beef
and salt. Many Winnebagos went looking for work as laborers for
white farmers, a custom that expanded over the years, regardless
of how much farming was done.

Balcombe spent the winter of 1864-65 in Sioux City, still
collecting his salary as Winnebago agent. Meanwhile, the
Winnebagos continued to go without clothing or permanent shelter. Money had been sent to Balcombe to provide clothing and blankets, but never reached the tribe. Commissioner William P. Dole authorized $3,000 in emergency funds for Furnas to use toward purchasing blankets and cloth. Dole recommended that all three tribes, numbering over 3,000, be combined under one agency. He found the tribes to be on friendly terms, the reservation roomy enough, and considered it economically sound to pay just one agent instead of three. The Omahas appeared willing to sell some of their land for the use by the other tribes.

On March 8, 1865, the Winnebago leaders in Nebraska concluded a treaty for the purchase of 97,497 acres from the Omaha tribe for $50,000, to use for a reservation. Consisting of a strip about seven miles wide and twenty-four miles long, and carved from the northern third of the Omahas' reservation, the Winnebagoes' new home was well watered and forested, with the Missouri River flowing along its eastern edge. The treaty included the government's agreement to provide saw and grist mills, to fence and plow a hundred acres for each band of the tribe, to supply them with seed, implements, horses and cows, as well as $2,000 worth of guns.

Saint A.D. Balcombe finally rejoined his charges on their new reservation on May 26, twenty months after he had last seen them at Crow Creek. In August, a new Superintendent, E.B. Taylor, visited the reservation. He met with Furnas, Balcombe and the Winnebago chiefs, led by Young Prophet. The tribe expressed their displeasure with the treatment they had received from Balcombe and asked for his dismissal. They considered him an "unfaithful officer," who cared nothing about their welfare and was "only intent on making money for himself at the expense of the tribe."

Taylor reported that Balcombe answered many of their charges satisfactorily, but recommended his dismissal because of the tribe's widespread unhappiness.

Taylor assured the Winnebagos that as soon as Congress ratified the new treaty it was the government's intent to fulfill all its obligations, the tribe's response being that they desired the purchase be ratified as soon as possible. Taylor eagerly predicted that if the treaty were approved and the proper improvements made, the Winnebago would be self-sufficient within eighteen months. The initial optimism on the part of the tribe and its supervisors fell steadily as Congress delayed the ratification until February, 1866. The Winnebagos faced continuing hardships, unable to farm the new land, or to obtain the promised food, clothing and supplies. Many continued to leave the reservation in search of wage labor, or to head back to the Winnebagos living in Wisconsin.
Charles Mathewson replaced Balcombe as agent to the Winnebagos early in 1866. He reported finding the tribe in a sad condition, with virtually nothing having been provided to them in the way of homes and equipment since they left Minnesota three years earlier. Many were still sick and dying from exposure and malnutrition. He estimated their population at 1,750, a difficult figure to arrive at given the constant movement to and from the reservation. A hundred of that number included men who had recently returned from service in the Union Army.

In May, the Winnebago finally took possession of their reservation and planted three hundred acres, on which Mathewson reported yields of twenty thousand bushels of corn. According to their agent, once they were on their own reservation, the Winnebagos' primary concerns were a school for their children, allotments like they had known in Minnesota, and useful employment. By 1867, the Winnebagos farmed five hundred acres, plus three hundred acres of gardens, with the agency farm consisting of another four hundred acres. This constituted a substantial increase over the number of acres plowed in previous years. Together the farms produced 15,000 bushels of corn and 10,000 bushels of wheat.

Mathewson's yearly reports remained optimistic, citing increases in yields, improvements in the general conditions on the reservation, and decreases in sickness and deaths. Despite his optimism, Winnebago population figures continued to fall, even when taking into account intermittent arrivals from Wisconsin. By 1869, only twenty-three homes were built, primarily for the chiefs. After the initial increase in the amount of acres broken, the figure dropped off dramatically in 1869. In that year, the Winnebago plowed only three hundred acres, compared to six hundred the year before. The agency farm was non-existent that year. Little information about such problems appeared in Mathewson's reports.

More evidence of dissension among the Winnebagos appeared in 1868, when the agent for the Omahas reported that the Winnebagos had been stealing horses from the Omahas. These thefts were most often blamed on Wisconsin Winnebagos who were leaving the Nebraska reservation. To gain money for the trip home, they stole the horses on their way off the reservation, then sold them to certain white men in Iowa, for well below the horses' value. In July, Nebraska Winnebago leaders, at the request of Superintendent H.B. Denman, drew up a legal code and established a paid police force of seven Winnebago men.

The Winnebago tribe experienced yet another change in agents in 1869, when Howard White replaced Mathewson. White immediately dispelled his predecessor's optimistic reports. White found the tribe "sadly diseased," with a population drop of 179 from the
previous year. All except about fifty people were living in
the timbered bluffs and ravines of the Missouri River, within a
four square mile area, for protection and shelter. The three
hundred acres that had been farmed produced only 6,000 bushels of
corn and 200 bushels of wheat.

Howard White was destined to become a long term agent for the
Winnebagoes, serving all but two years well into the 1870s. He
followed strongly assimilationist policies that proved to be
divisive within the tribe. At the same time, during this period,
the Winnebago population stabilized somewhat and they enjoyed a
high level of agricultural success while much of Nebraska was
plagued with drought and locusts. White actively hundred and
twenty allotments were distributed, which became known as the
"Leming Allotments." By 1873, under the supervision of agency
farmer Alexander Payer, a Winnebago, fifteen hundred acres were
under cultivation. A total of 110 frame and log houses had been
built, with White choosing the most "industrious" and "civilized"
to receive their homes first.

When White first took over his duties, he became aware of
growing dissension among the older, traditional chiefs, the young
men and mixed-bloods. He capitalized on this division by
appointing twelve new chiefs, who in turn chose their own police
force. White then instituted tribal elections as a means to
"pave the way to citizenship," and to "break up the old tribal
relations." Superintendent Barclay White wrote of Agent Howard
White's efforts, "The Winnebagoes are a striking example of what
can be accomplished...in the way of civilizing and christianizing
Indians when a proper influence is exerted over the tribe..."

A nagging issue that had concerned the Winnebagoes since they
had left Crow Creek came to the forefront in the early 1870s.
That issue was the status of the Wisconsin Winnebagoes. While the
Nebraska Winnebagoes had struggled to establish themselves on their
reservation, the Wisconsin Winnebagoes still had no permanent
home. Some officials supported the idea of uniting the two
factions in Nebraska, while others, specifically Agent White,
opposed the consolidation. White found the Wisconsin Winnebagoes
to be a bad influence on his Nebraska Indians, "far below them in
point of moral and civilization." The government requested
that the Wisconsin Winnebagoes either move to Indian Territory or
join their relatives in Nebraska, but when tribal leaders balked,
the government turned to the military. Between December 20, 1873
and early January, 1874, soldiers tracked down nine hundred
Winnebagoes and shipped them all to the reservation in Nebraska.

In a memorial to Congress, the Nebraska chiefs expressed
their willingness to welcome their brothers, but were concerned
about the additional burden, and asked Congress to double the
funds available to the tribe. Another of their concerns was
where on the reservation the additional people would live. The existing timberland had already been allotted, so the Nebraska Winnebagos inquired into purchasing more land from the Omaha. The Omaha opposed having the Wisconsin group living nearby, but on June 22, 1874, another 12,340 acres were purchased from them for $82,000.

The Wisconsin Winnebagos remained restless and dissatisfied in Nebraska. Most refused to accept their issues from the government, believing they had been promised more than they were receiving. By 1874, only two hundred remained, many of the others having returned once again to Wisconsin.

The removal of the Wisconsin Winnebagos to Nebraska proved to be disruptive, as Howard White had predicted. That upheaval, combined with other occurrences, caused the tribe to look again to traditional chiefs for leadership. White left the agency for two years in 1874 and 1875, replaced by Taylor Bradley. During Bradley's tenure, a measles outbreak claimed the lives of many, especially among children. As many as ten children died in a two-week span. The exodus of most of the Wisconsin Winnebagos was reflected in a sharp drop in population figures in 1874, but the decline continued well up to 1878. In the tribal election following Bradley's arrival, all but one chief was replaced, predominantly by more traditional chiefs. They tended to foster a return to the old medicines and ceremonies, and withdrew their support for the reservation schools, making it almost impossible to maintain attendance.

Howard White resumed his post, and his policies, in 1876. By the end of the decade, the Nebraska Winnebagos lived in over a hundred frame and brick, two-story houses, and virtually every family held the patent on their allotment. Agricultural production ranged from twenty to forty thousand bushels of crops annually. In 1879, the Winnebago and Omaha agencies were consolidated under White's supervision, despite the fact that the tribes spoke different languages and had not been on friendly terms for some time.

Assimilationist policies like those employed by White became the foundation of hardships and problems faced by the Winnebagos well into the twentieth century. For the time being, however, the Nebraska Winnebagos achieved a degree of stability and established a home for themselves, when just sixteen years earlier they had faced devastation.
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CHAPTER 13

PAWNEES

By Michelle Moray

History of Anthropological Research

The Pawnees are one of the better known native peoples of the Plains, and considerable ethnographic data are available on them. However, much of the literature is biased towards descriptions of ceremonial life and cosmology (Chamberlain 1982; Dorsey 1906; Fletcher 1902, 1904; O’Brien 1986; Weltfish 1965) and therefore lacks attention to many other aspects of ethnographic detail. In addition, much of the information tends to focus on the culture of only one of the four Pawnee bands, the Skidis, but under the generic name for the entire tribe, "Pawnee." Blaine (1980:x) suggests that this is the result of the heavy reliance of early ethnographers on a single informant, James R. Murie, a Skidi Pawnee band member and ethnologist. Murie’s descriptions of Skidi life were often generalized to include all four Pawnee bands (Skidi, Chaui, Kitkahahki, Pitahawirata), resulting in potential misconceptions.

While the definitive history of the Pawnees was produced by George Hyde in 1951, the accuracy of his treatment has received considerable criticism (Blaine 1980; White 1983). Murie wrote several articles detailing Skidi ceremonial life and social organization based on his firsthand knowledge and research (Murie 1914; 1915; 1981). Gene Weltfish’s fieldwork among the Pawnees during the 1920s and 1930s resulted in a substantial contribution to the understanding of Pawnee life (Weltfish 1965). In addition, the earlier works of Grinnell (1889) and Dorsey (1904, 1906) provide valuable cultural context. Dunbar (1880a, 1880b) provides emphasis on the "South Bands" in his ethnologies. Excellent ethnohistorical accounts of Pawnee subsistence (Holder 1970; Osborn 1983), trade (Wishart 1979b), warfare (Secoy 1953), and dispossession (Wishart 1979a, 1985) are available. Waldo R. Wedel (1936, 1979a, 1979b, 1986) has published extensively on Pawnee archeology and is widely considered an authority. More recent contributions include works by White (1983) examining Pawnee subsistence, environment, and social change, and Blaine’s (1990) account of the nineteenth-century removal of the Pawnees to Indian Territory. Blaine (1980) provides a recent comprehensive overview of anthropological literature pertaining to the Pawnees.

Ethnonymy
According to Grinnell (1889), the Pawnees called themselves Chahiksichahiks, "men of men," but Hyde (1951) reports that the Pawnees deny that this was their name. Another idea is that the name "Pawnee" originated from the word pariki, meaning "a horn," possibly referring to a time when they wore their hair in a hair-lock, stiffened with paint and fat and made to stand erect and curved like a horn (Hodge 1912). However, according to Hyde (1951:13), this was merely conjecture put forth by John Dunbar which developed into the standard explanation for origin of the Pawnee name. Regardless of its origin, the name Pawnee seems to have only been used by the Pawnees' northern and eastern neighbors in the seventeenth century, and later the name was picked up by French traders who called them Paní (Hyde 1951:23).

The Skidi Pawnees, who always remained furthest west and north of the other three bands, are spoken of as the North Band, and the Kitkahahkis, Chauis, and Pitahawiratas collectively as the South Bands. Translations of the three South Band names, as reported by Grinnell (1889:216), are as follow: Kitkahahki—"on the hill;" Chaui—"in the middle;" and Pitahawirata—"down the stream" or "east," possibly specifying the general location of the bands in their Nebraska territory. The English names of the four bands of the Pawnees are Wolf (Skidi), Grand (Chaui), Republican (Kitkahahki), and Tapaje (Pitahawirata) (Hyde 1951; Grinnell 1889).

Cultural and Linguistic Affiliation

The Pawnees belong to the Caddoan language family as do the Arikaras and Wichitas. The Pawnees have been characterized as the most numerous and powerful of the Caddoan tribes (North 1961). The Pawnee confederacy was composed of four bands having somewhat different origins: the Skidis (or North Band), who claimed original kinship with the Arikaras; and the South Bands (Chaui, Kitkahahki, and Pitahawirata) who reportedly migrated north with the Wichitas (Blaine 1990; Hodge 1912; Hyde 1951). Both divisions agree that the Skidis were present in Nebraska long before the South Bands arrived in the area. The separation was long enough (possibly up to a century) to result in dialectical differences between the two groups (Blaine 1980, 1990; Hyde 1951).

Origin and Migration Traditions & First Euroamerican Contacts

Pawnee migration traditions suggest that the South Bands migrated onto the Central Plains sometime during the seventeenth or early eighteenth centuries. They did not migrate in a single body, but in smaller groups over long periods of time, which would be consistent with the contention that the Skidis were earlier arrivals than the South Bands (Blaine 1980, 1990; Hyde 1951; Hodge 1912). Archeological evidence supports the idea that the Pawnees, or perhaps just the Skidis, can be traced back to a
government sent military and peace commissioners to the Pawnees (Blaine 1980; Hyde 1951). Roper (1989) relates that although Lewis and Clark did not visit the Pawnees, they did give a description of the four bands and their location (Lewis & Clark 1893). Other explorers visiting Pawnee villages mentioned by Roper (1989) are Pedro Vial in 1804, 1805, and 1806 (Loomis & Nasatir 1967), Major George Sibley in 1811 (Sibley 1927), and Major Steven H. Long in 1819 (James 1823). Travellers like John Irving visited the Pawnees in 1833 (Irving 1835). Missionaries began arriving in 1834, who, like J.B. Dunbar, recorded and contributed significant information on the Pawnees (Roper 1989).

Roper (1989:23) points out, however, that no specific date can be given for the beginning of the historic period of Pawnee history. Early accounts of contact with the Pawnees are either vague or second-hand descriptions.

**Demography**

In an 1880 census, the Pawnees reported at an earlier period in their history they had 5,000 people in each band, making a total of 20,000 individuals (Grinnell 1889:236). This figure is also supported in descriptions from French traders who frequented Skidi villages along the Loup Fork in the period 1715-1725 (Hyde 1951:49). Various estimates of Pawnee population indicate a population of between 10,000-12,000 people. However, these figures are generally for the approximate time of the 1831-32 smallpox epidemic in which the Pawnees lost half of their population. Wishart (1985:163) argues that the Pawnee population was as large as 25,000 before the disastrous smallpox epidemic. A larger population size would more accurately explain the ability of the Pawnees to control such an extensive territory in Nebraska and northern Kansas (Wishart 1985:163).

**Tribal Territory/Geography**

During their years in Nebraska and Kansas, the Pawnees made use of a large area extending from the Niobrara River in northern Nebraska southward into Kansas along the Cimarron River, and from the Missouri River in the east westward "rather indefinitely" toward the Rocky Mountains in Colorado (North 1961). However, the core occupancy area lay around the Platte and Loup rivers in Nebraska (Blaine 1990; Hyde 1951). Wishart (1979a:386) describes the Pawnee hunting territory as extending from the lower reaches of the Niobrara to the saline plains of the Kansas-Oklahoma border, with the main hunting areas at the valleys of the upper Republican, Arkansas, and Smoky Hill rivers. Blakeslee and O'Shea (1983:97), in their report of an archeological survey of Lewis and Clark Lake in northern Nebraska and southern South Dakota, report that the Pawnees "traditionally claimed the southern bank of the project area" (i.e., the right bank of the Missouri River), primarily using the area for hunting expeditions and
According to Hyde (1951), archeological evidence dates Pawnee villages on the Loup Fork sometime in the early sixteenth century. Hyde also reports several Pawnee village sites in Nebraska, including a Chai village site near a place called Lone Tree (presently Central City), and another located at the present site of Linwood in Butler County. Two Skidi sites on the north bank of the Loup Fork near the present town of Fullerton are also documented (Hyde 1951:74). Wedel (1939:29) describes an archeological site south of the Platte near Linwood, where a Pawnee village encompassed nearly forty acres and featured a large enclosure, ninety feet in diameter, near the center of the village which archeologists believe may have been an open-air council ground or the remains of a huge, grass-thatched ceremonial lodge.

While the core area along the Platte and Loup rivers was exclusive to the Pawnees, according to Wishart (1979a:386) their hunting territory was challenged by the Dakotas, Cheyennes, and Arapahoes from the west and north, and by the Omahas, Kansas, and Osages from the east and south.

**Subsistence and Division of Labor**

The territory inhabited by the Pawnees encompassed three very different ecosystems consisting of tall-grass prairies, river valleys, and mixed-grass plains. In this diverse setting they practiced horticulture, hunting, and the gathering of wild resources. Women and children were responsible for the horticultural fieldwork, which involved the cultivation of maize, beans, squash, and pumpkins. The Pawnees maintained a large variety of these crops including seven varieties of pumpkins and squash, eight varieties of beans, and ten or more of maize (White 1983). Maize was referred to as atira, "mother," and was considered sacred, playing an essential role in both Pawnee subsistence and ceremonial life (Chamberlain 1982:249).

According to Will and Hyde (1917), the Pawnees practiced more ceremonial observances relating to maize and its cultivation than any other tribe in the area. The gathering of wild plants occupied a prominent role in Pawnee life, and although they did not yield more food value than the cultivated crops or hunted game, they did serve to complement both in the Pawnee diet (White 1983). A diversity of wild plants, such as milkweed, mushrooms, wild cumcumber, Indian potatoes (probably the most important), along with other seeds, tubers, and fruits were gathered (White 1983). Wild plants were not only important for subsistence, but they also played a prominent role in the ceremonial and medicinal aspects of Pawnee life (Holder 1970; White 1983).

Pawnee men were responsible for hunting game, which also played a sacred role in Pawnee ceremonial life (Chamberlain 1982;
Holder 1970; White 1983). In addition to hunting bison, their primary game, they also hunted deer, elk, beaver, and small mammals including raccoons, otters, and skunks (White 1983). White (1983) provides a detailed description of the Pawnee annual subsistence cycle, which he calls a "definite seasonal cycle." During April and May, crops were planted in fields adjacent to semipermanent villages and were subsequently hoed two times in the month of June, first early in the month and a second, later time before they left for the village's communal bison hunt. July and August were spent on the plains hunting bison. In September, they returned to their villages to begin harvesting. Typically around November, they left on a second communal migration to hunt bison. After obtaining a sufficient supply of meat to store for the winter, they camped along creek bottoms until March when they journeyed back to their earthlodge villages.

Technology

Pawnee technology is very similar to that of other bison-hunting, horticultural Plains tribes of the protohistoric and historic eras. Prehistorically and in the early historic period, ceramics were manufactured from clay. Pawnee ceramic types were distinct from other cultural groups, but similar to the pottery created by their linguistic kinfolk, the Arikaras (Grange 1968). In the historic period, ceramics were largely replaced by more durable metal Euroamerican trade goods (e.g., iron and brass kettles) obtained through the fur trade. The advent of the fur trade also brought about technological shifts related to hunting; the horse and gun replaced pedestrian hunting with the bow and arrow. Bison remained one of the most important sources of raw materials (hides, horns, sinew, and meat) for household and subsistence-related needs. However, with the material affluence derived from the fur trade, many "traditional" technologies were eventually rendered obsolete. For example, steel axes and knives reduced the need to fashion similar implements from stone, bone, or wood. Many traditional technologies and crafts persisted, necessitated by the unpredictability of gaining access to particular goods.

Diversions included the Buffalo Stick (hoop) Game, which expressed the relationship between the Pawnees and the buffalo, and the Basket Dice Game in which the moon symbolized a basket used by the mythological figure, Tirawahat ("father" or "god"), to send the stars to earth so that they could give knowledge to the people (Blaine 1990; Chamberlain 1982). The Hand Game was a gambling game, usually played by younger men (chiefs and priests did not play), in which two sides played against each other; one side held and hid sticks in their hands, while the other side guessed which hands held the sticks (Lesser 1933).

Settlement
The Pawnees lived in two types of dwellings depending on the time of year: earth lodges and tipis. During the planting and harvesting season they lived in semipermanent earthlodge villages. The lodges were circular in plan view and were made from a framework of timber posts supporting a covering of sod (Chamberlain 1982; Grinnell 1889). The lodges were symbolically constructed to represent a universe within a universe, with the circular floor representing the earth, the dome-shaped roof symbolizing the sky, and the entrance facing the rising sun (Chamberlain 1982:155).

Archeological evidence indicates that Pawnee lodges had circular floor plans from 25 to 50 feet in diameter with up to a foot of top soil excavated to form the floor (Wedel 1986:160). Earthlodge construction was primarily the responsibility of the Pawnee women, and it was the woman to whom the house belonged (Wedel 1986).

Pawnee villages were located in the river valleys of the Loup, Platte, and Republican rivers in the present-day states of Nebraska and Kansas. Villages were usually built at the edge of the terraces overlooking the river and its floodplain (Roper 1989; White 1983). Village sizes in the nineteenth century ranged from about 40 lodges with 830 people to about 180 lodges with 3,500 people (Blakeslee and O'Shea 1983). Between 20 to 50 people usually occupied a lodge (Wedel 1979). Beyond the villages, on the river bottoms, the Pawnees planted their fields. Dunbar (1880[a or b?]) estimates a crop acreage of 1-3 acres per family, with reports of crop harvests usually not exceeding 25 to 30 bushels per acre (Wedel 1986).

When the Pawnees migrated to the plains to hunt bison, they resided in skin tipis. The tipi was made of dressed buffalo skins sewn together and placed over a framework of 12 to 20 poles set on the ground in a circle 12 to 17 feet in diameter (Dunbar 1880b; Grinnell 1889; Roper 1989). According to Roper (1989), after leaving their villages to hunt, the Pawnees would travel rapidly until they reached their hunting grounds, slowing only when they encountered bison. Then the group would spend the following weeks or even months in active hunting, conducting mass kills using the surround. Camps were occupied for up to weeks at a time, and temporary winter villages have been reported by Allis (1918:698) to have been occupied for as long as 56 days.

Travel and Transportation

Before the introduction of the horse, the Pawnees travelled by foot and the only domestic animal they possessed was the dog, which served as a pack animal and occasionally as a source of meat (White 1983). When the Pawnees departed on a hunt, the dogs carried their necessities, each dog carrying a load between 35 and 50 pounds (Winship 1896:570-571). The Pawnees most likely
acquired the horse sometime in the late seventeenth to early eighteenth centuries, after which time the dog remained a secondary pack animal only (Blaine 1980; White 1983). The horse was quickly assimilated and became a fundamental part of Pawnee life. Osborn (1983:579) estimates that Pawnee horse herds ranged in size from 7,865 to 10,530 animals under suitable conditions. Horses served a dual role, as they were used as a "beast of burden" during long journeys in search of bison and also ridden for the chase once the bison were located (Roper 1989:1). Horses were considered personal property and were not only used for the hunt, but were given as gifts to priests and chiefs, and for bride price (White 1983:180).

Horse stealing was a culturally accepted means of obtaining status and wealth (Blaine 1990). Consequently, horses changed hands frequently and were often lost shortly after they were acquired. Tribes like the Comanches to the south of the Pawnees, were targeted for horse raids, but the Pawnee villagers often fell victim to raids of the more numerous nomadic Teton Dakotas from the north (Blaine 1990; Hyde 1951). Frequent raiding by the Teton Dakotas left the Pawnees impoverished and vulnerable to subsequent attacks and long, cold winters without adequate stores of meat and maize. The most infamous of the Teton attacks occurred at "Massacre Canyon" in southwest Nebraska on August 5, 1873, when an overwhelming number of Brules and Oglalas came upon a group of Pawnee hunters and their families. Over 100 Pawnees were killed, wounded, raped, and mutilated (Blaine 1990:91). This event ultimately contributed to the demoralization of the Pawnees, facilitating their acquiescence to move to Indian Territory.

Social Structure

White (1983) describes Pawnee social structure as being organized horizontally, or ranked, with wealth flowing upwards to the elite families of the chiefs and priests. Below this group was a somewhat larger group of families from which the braves were chosen, and below these were the families of the commoners which made up the majority of the village.

It was believed that the inhabitants of each village were theoretically kin as each village traced its descent back through the female line to a single ancestor (White 1983:175). The Pawnees practiced matrilineal decent and matrilocal residency and members were organized into large extended families. A man married into a family; if the marriage broke up, he returned to live in the lodge of his mother or a sister. A senior woman was the center of the Pawnee family and a lodge consisted of that woman, her husband, her unmarried children, her married daughters and their husbands, sometimes her married sons, her grandchildren and more distant kin (White 1983:175). According to White (1983), the mother-child relationship was the foundation of the
whole kinship system.

According to Murdock (1967:14), polygyny (particularly sororal) was commonly practiced among the Pawnees. However, co-wives did not occupy the same household. Endogamy was practiced within villages with the matrilineal kin group's core membership usually confined to a single community (Murdock 1967:22). Marriage between first cousins was prohibited, although second cousin marriage was permitted (Murdock 1967:25).

**Economic Structure**

White (1983) also gives a picture of Pawnee economic structure which was dependent on the upward flow of goods, followed by redistribution. Within each village, goods were channelled upwards to those who controlled and possessed knowledge of the sacred bundles (see "Religion" below). Gifts were given to priests and chiefs in exchange for this knowledge. However, as this wealth flowed upward in the society it "paused only briefly at the top" before it was redistributed among the villagers (White 1983:176). This act served to insure the chiefs' and priests' influence over the people, as "greed would have violated the very code that assured [them] of [their] power" (White 1983:176). Therefore, the survival and prosperity of the village and the lives of the Pawnee people were intertwined as the chiefs depended on the giving of the people, and in return the people depended on redistribution by the chiefs (White 1983).

The Pawnees traded with the Arikaras, Mandans, and Hidatsas on the Upper Missouri, but the cardinal trading direction was to the south where the villages of the Wichitas and other Caddoan people were located (Wishart 1979:386). Wishart (1979a) reports that trading activities typically took place in winter and summer when small groups separated from the communal bison hunt. Participation in the fur trade significantly altered the traditional economy of the Pawnees (Wishart 1979a).

**Political Organization**

According to Wishart (1979a:383), each band was an autonomous unit, but was bound together by the proximity of its members and a common world view. Also according to Wishart (1979a), bonds between the groups tightened only after pressures of contact, war, and disease had decreased Pawnee population. As villages were consolidated and bands were forced to merge, the Pawnees began to perceive themselves as one people rather than four separate bodies (Wishart 1979a:383).

The "Pawnee Confederacy" was organized into village-groups. The Confederacy was united by a council which was composed of head chiefs from the four councils of the Skidis, Chausis, Kitkahahkis, and Pitahawiratas. Each band council was made up of
chiefs from the villages within that band, e.g., the Skidi band council was made up of chiefs from each Skidi village. Villages also had their own councils composed of chiefs and leading men from the village. The title of "chief" was hereditary, but characteristics such as bravery, wisdom, and personal popularity were important factors in obtaining influence and authority (Grinnell 1889; White 1983). Pawnee chiefs inherited their status from their fathers, and bundles were passed down through the male line with the priests serving a long apprenticeship to another priest (usually a kinsman). White (1983) makes a distinction between the actual kin group (matrilineal descent), and the fictional kin group. This can be seen in the language used in a council meeting where the chiefs were referred to as a-ti-us, "father," and the people as their "children."

Religion

Pawnee religion was closely associated with the perceptions of the universe and cosmic forces. The Pawnee term Tirawahut has often been translated as "heaven," "god," or "father," but a broader meaning encompasses the universe and everything within it (Blaine 1990; Chamberlain 1982; Hyde 1951). The Skidi Pawnees believed that they had originated from the sky, and that the stars were either gods or people who had once lived on earth and had been changed into stars at death (Chamberlain 1982:43). The most important stars were the Morning Star and Evening Star which were believed to be responsible for creating the first human being (Chamberlain 1982).

The sacred bundles of the Pawnee tribe played a vital role in their religion and ceremonies. The bundles were received through visions from particular stars, and each represented a certain star and had its own ritual, taboos, and sacrifices (Chamberlain 1982). The bundles were the very backbone of Pawnee life and served as the basis for production and social relations within the villages (Holder 1970; Will and Hyde 1917). According to Holder (1970:43), "the continuing life of the village was guaranteed by powers within the bundle..." The bundles consisted of hide envelopes containing various physical symbols which were removed and used in different ceremonies. The ceremonies were richly symbolic, began each year around the time of the spring equinox with the Thunder (also referred to as the creation or renewal) ceremony, and continued into autumn, being associated with such activities as planting, hunting, and harvesting (Chamberlain 1982; North 1961).

Removal to Indian Territory in 1874

After the Louisiana Purchase in the early nineteenth century when contact between the Pawnees and white settlers increased, the Pawnees began to be perceived as a menace as they passed through newly formed counties on their way to their treaty-
guaranteed hunting grounds. In the Treaty of Fort Atkinson of 1825, the Pawnees agreed not to attack white settlers and to conduct trade only with the United States. In return the Pawnees were promised protection: "the United States agrees to receive the Pawnee tribe of Indians into their friendship, and under their protection..." During this time, the Pawnees were under continual attacks by the Teton Dakotas, and they also faced hostility from white settlers who increasingly encroached upon their lands. The United States failed to keep its promise of protection; as a result, the Pawnees suffered greatly from outside assault.

In the Treaty of 1833, the Pawnees ceded lands south of the Platte River in return for $1,600 in goods, and $4,600 in annuities each year for twelve years thereafter (North 1961). The last of the Pawnees’ lands were ceded in the Treaty of Table Creek in 1857, and the Pawnees were put on a reservation of 285,440 acres along the Loup Fork 30 miles from east to west and 15 miles from north to south, including lands on both banks of the river (in what is now Nance County, Nebraska) (Blaine 1990). The tribe was to receive $40,000 a year for five years, and after that period of time, $30,000 a year in perpetuity (Hyde 1951; North 1961).

After the Pawnees were confined to a reservation, Federal control began to alter their traditional ways, as Indian agents took over decision making for the tribe, undermining the authority of the tribal leaders (Blaine 1990). Confinement to the reservation prevented the Pawnees from making their traditional semi-annual migrations to their hunting grounds. They could no longer visit ancestral graves near abandoned villages, or take the Sacred Pipe to visit other tribes in order to establish and maintain bonds between tribes (Blaine 1990:25).

According to Blaine (1990:93), the government ignored its obligation to protect the Pawnees from Teton Dakota attacks because they feared it would antagonize the Tetons and increase retaliation. The Tetons were more numerous and dangerous than the Pawnees, who were now a sedentary reservation tribe, so the government confined the Pawnees to their reservation in order to decrease military involvement in intertribal hostilities. As the Pawnees were not able to pursue their attackers and retaliate against them, they were left virtually defenseless. A Pawnee term for the Lakota bands, which reflected their hostile relationship, was Tsu-ra-rat, or Throat Cutters (Blaine 1990:101).

During their last years in Nebraska the Pawnees resided on a reservation which represented only a small portion of the vast country they had once claimed and used. As their subsistence base failed and their poverty increased, they became dependent on the annuities which they received for their land cessions (White...
1983). The Pawnees called these last days the we-tuks years, or the frightful years, when life under federal control was constrained and difficult, and hunger and outsiders' hostility filled their days (Blaine 1990:xii). Pressure for removal began in 1867, and by 1870, new federal legislation cleared the way for Nebraska congressional representatives to abolish Pawnee title to their remaining territory in Nebraska (Blaine 1990; Hyde 1951).

Between the years of 1830-1875, the Pawnee population decreased from an estimated 10,000-12,000 individuals to a mere 2,276 as a result of epidemic disease, malnutrition, and Teton depredations (Blaine 1990:100). Faced with these overwhelming circumstances, the tribe became factionalized over the question of whether to leave their Nebraska homeland for Indian Territory, or to remain. Those who favored removal spoke of the conditions they faced if they remained in Nebraska--enemy attacks, continual hunger, and harassment and encroachment by settlers. They saw removal as the only long-term solution their problems.

Finally in 1874, the removal of the Pawnee tribe began. The Pawnees were led to believe that their new reservation would be located near their Wichita friends and relatives in Indian Territory, and that they would be able to hunt bison again, but this proved not so. Their reservation was far from the Wichitas, and the bison were too scarce to rely on as a source of food. Several accounts are given that indicate the reasons for the Pawnees' acceptance of removal (Svingen 1992). Wishart (1979a) believes the Pawnees agreed to move to Indian Territory as a way to preserve their cultural traditions. White (1983) argues that factors such as social, demographic, and ecological difficulties persuaded them to leave. Blaine focuses on the problems of starvation, reservation confinement, and harassment from white settlers: "perhaps the government did not force the Pawnee to leave, but it programmed the outcome by allowing devastating conditions to exist" (Blaine 1990:233).

Their Indian Territory reservation was established by Congress on April 10th, 1876 (Blaine 1990), and contained 283,019.98 acres of land. The boundaries lay south along the Red Fork or Cimarron River, with the northern edge marked by the Arkansas River and the Kansas border (Blaine 1990; Hyde 1951). The Pawnees arrived on their Oklahoma reservation suffering from chills and fever; their condition worsened after they found that no arrangements had been made to provide aid for food and shelter (Hyde 151:261). In 1879, five years after arriving in Indian Territory, their population dropped to 1,440 people (Hyde 1951, North 1961). In 1882, rations were suddenly stopped in an attempt to introduce the Pawnees to cattle raising; as a result, nearly all of the stock were killed and eaten by the starving people (Hyde 1951). According to Hyde (1951), between the years 1874 and 1890, rations were stopped and resumed repeatedly, setting up a drastically fluctuating economic system. In 1905,
Pawnee population was reported to be as low as 646 (Hyde 1951; North 1961). These numbers reflect the continued, weakening effects of lack of food, clothing, and proper shelter.

The Pawnees' condition did not improve until 1933, when the Roosevelt administration began to provide funding for their assistance (Hyde 1951). After years of deteriorating living conditions, the Pawnee tribe has revitalized. Today, the tribe has a tribally-ratified constitution and is organized under the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act of 1936. In agreement with their constitution of 1938, the tribe is governed by a business council, the Pawnee Business Committee, consisting of a president, secretary-treasurer, and five council members, all of whom are elected to a two-year term (Klein 1990; Confederation of American Indians 1986).

Recently in 1990, the Pawnees won a long-standing dispute with the Nebraska State Historical Society for the return of over 200 Pawnee human skeletal remains and associated funerary objects, which the Society possessed (Echo-Hawk 1989). The Pawnee skeletal remains represent spiritual and historical symbols to the Pawnee people (Riding In 1992), and the excavation of the Pawnee graves was viewed by them as not only shocking, but caused emotional trauma and spiritual distress as well (Echo-Hawk 1989). The well-publicized dispute led to the passage of the Unmarked Human Burial Sites and Skeletal Remains Protection Act by the Nebraska Unicameral in 1989 (Peregoy 1992). Congress passed the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act shortly after, in 1990 (Svingen 1992). On September 10, 1990, the Pawnee people reclaimed the remains of more than four hundred of their ancestors from the Nebraska State Historical Society and transported them to Genoa, Nebraska for reburial (Svingen 1992).
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CHAPTER 14
ARIKARAS
By Michele Voeltz

Introduction

The Arikaras are an American Indian tribe whose ancestral homeland is the Missouri River valley in North and South Dakota. They were one of three semisedentary, horticultural, village tribes that inhabited the valley at the time of first contact with Europeans, which probably occurred at some undocumented date in the first half of the eighteenth century. Today, their descendants live on the Fort Berthold reservation in west-central North Dakota, where they have amalgamated with the descendants of two other Missouri River village tribes, the Siouan-speaking Mandans and Hidatsas. Together, the three combined peoples are called the Three Affiliated Tribes.

The Arikaras spoke a language belonging to the Caddoan language family, and they are the northernmost of the Caddoan-speaking tribes (Wedel 1955:77), which include the Pawnees of Nebraska, the Wichitas of Kansas, the Caddos of Arkansas and Missouri, and a few lesser-known and largely extinct tribes of the Southern Plains region of the United States. Arikara traditions suggest that they originally migrated from the south or east (Dorsey 1904:12-40). Their closest linguistic and cultural relatives are the Skidi band of Pawnees: "Virtually every writer who has dealt with these tribes states that at one time they were in close contact with, if not identical to, each other" (Wood 1955:27). Wedel (1955:77), relying on an Omaha legend stating that the Omahas found the Arikaras in northeastern Nebraska and subsequently drove them northward, suggests that the Skidi-Arikara split took place south or southeast of the Niobrara River. A Pawnee tradition says that they drove the Arikaras from a common settlement on the Platte River (Wood 1955:27). In addition to sharing similar languages and a reputed common origin in prehistoric times, the Arikaras and the Pawnees interacted with one another during historical times through occasional temporary visits. Some of the Arikaras, for example, are reported to have taken up residence among the Pawnees, probably along the Loup or Platte rivers in Nebraska, in 1795 (Wood 1955:28), but such visits did not typically last long.

Culture

The name Arikara means "horns" or "elk", probably referring to an ancient method of hairdressing in which two pieces of bone
stood up from the head (Swanton 1952:273). The Arikaras’ culture resembled the Skidis’ in that both lived in earth lodges, grew crops of corn, beans, and squash, and hunted bison and other game (Wood 1955:27). Agriculture provided nearly half of the food supply, and agricultural products were important in trade (MacGowan 1942:94). They traded corn to nomadic groups for buffalo robes, skins and meat; and to Europeans for cloth, cooking utensils, guns, and other industrially-manufactured goods (Hodge 1912:85). Swanton suggests that the Arikaras first introduced other native groups on the Upper Missouri to agriculture (1952:275). The Omaha legend of meeting with the Arikaras in Nebraska credits them with teaching the Omahas to grow maize (Ludwickson et al. 1981:33; Fletcher and La Flesche 1992), although this story does not correspond with archeological evidence (Wood 1955:28).

Descent among the Arikaras was matrilineal:

Material considerations...suggest that villages consisted of matri-centered groups sharing common economic and ritual responsibilities with a circumscribed organization probably-based on residence and descent. (Hoffman 1977:22)

Hoffman describes each Arikara village as "a confederacy...of linked matriclans" (Hoffman 1977:26). Within recorded historic time, epidemics and wars apparently caused clans to break down and villages to coalesce for defense (Ludwickson et al. 1981:33). Tabeau recorded the presence of several dialects and competing chiefs within single villages, suggesting that they had formerly belonged to separate village groups (Tabeau 1939:124-7). Lewis and Clark recorded that the Arikaras were a "remnant" of ten powerful Pawnee tribes (Hodge 1912:86); while not entirely accurate, this statement may suggest that the Arikara villages dwindled in number through time.

According to Dorsey, the ceremonies of the Arikaras were similar to those of the Skidis, except for a creation story which differed from other Caddoan stories (1904:6). There was a ceremonial lodge in each village. Sacred ears of corn were preserved, along with skins of sacred birds and seven gourd rattles which symbolized the movements of the seasons (Hodge 1912:85). "Quasi-religious" gatherings were held in which conjuring tricks were performed (Hodge 1912:86).

History

The earliest map depiction of the Arikaras may be the label "PANA" that appears on the Marquette map of 1673-1674 (Tucker 1942:Plate V). However, the "Pana" are not shown along any waterway, though their proximity to the Missouri River may be inferred from the nearby label for the Omahas ("MAHA"), who are believed to have lived in the southwestern Minnesota-northwestern

When the Arikaras first appear for certain in historical documents, they are clearly located in central South Dakota. The earliest map depiction of them, on the French 1718 Delisle map, shows four villages of "Aricara" along the next northerly tributary above the Big Sioux River, probably the James River (Hartley 1983:1-49), and some distance (perhaps 100 miles, according to Wood) from the Missouri. Forty villages of "Panis," a probable name for the Arikaras, are also shown on the Missouri to the west, in a location that closely approximates their historic homeland in central South Dakota (Wedel 1955:77; Wood 1955:33). The information contained on this map may have come from the French officer, Etienne de Véniard, sieur de Bourmont, who in 1714 traveled up the Missouri as far as the mouth of the Platte River and may have heard of the Arikaras living farther to the north (Wedel 1955:77; Norall 1988:25), or it may have been based on an earlier 1701 Delisle map that showed four villages of "Panigoucha" in a similar location (Wood 1955:33-34). Bourmont’s travel journal, his "Exact Description of Louisiana," mentions 42 Arikara villages located on the Missouri above either the Niobrara or the White rivers (Wedel 1955:77; Norall 1988:109-110). Bourmont’s description of the villages as being on the Niobrara River may have been an error (Hartley 1983:1-49). Another French document, from 1723, describes the Arikaras as being located 10 leagues from the Omahas, presumably further up the Missouri (Wedel 1955:77-78). The first recorded probable contact between EuroAmericans and the Arikaras occurred in 1743, when two of the sons of Pierre Gaultier de Varennes, sieur de la Vérendrye, visited a village of a people they called the Gens de la Petite Cerise, or "People of the Little Cherry" (Wedel 1955:78; Smith 1980:112-113). The Gens de la Petite Cerise have been identified as Arikaras (Smith 1980:121, 142-143). The location of the Arikara village at the time of the visit by the La Vérendryes is rather precisely known, as a lead tablet left by the brothers was found in 1913 near the town of Fort Pierre, South Dakota (Smith 1980:123-127). Smallpox subsequently forced them upriver to the mouth of the Cheyenne (Hartley 1983:1-50).

In 1795 Trudeau found the Arikaras on the right bank of the Missouri three miles below the mouth of the Cheyenne, having been "reduced by smallpox from 32 villages and 'four thousand warriors'...to two villages with about five hundred fighting men" (Wedel 1955:79). From there they moved upriver to the Mandans' area near the site of Fort Clark, North Dakota (Wedel 1955:79). When Lewis and Clark visited the Arikaras in 1804 they had moved downriver and were living between the Grand and Cannonball Rivers (Swanton 1952:274).

In 1823, while living in two villages on the Missouri a short distance above the mouth of the Grand River in north-
central South Dakota, the Arikaras attacked a north-bound party
of trappers, killing a number of them. The U.S. Army retaliated
with a punitive expedition which shelled the villages, forcing
the Arikaras to temporarily abandon their homes on the Missouri.
For about 15 years afterward, the Arikaras appear to have led a
restless and roving life, much of it away from the Missouri
River. The tribe—or portions of it—was variously reported in
the 1820s as relocating close to the Mandans in west-central
North Dakota (1823); killing several white trappers in the Platte
River valley (1824); and as again living at villages near the
mouth of the Grand River (1825-1832). About 100 Arikaras were
also reported to be encamped along the Arkansas River in eastern
Colorado in 1825 (Wood 1955:29; Wedel 1955:80), possibly the same
party that reputedly killed the white trappers on the Platte the
previous year.

Because of fear of Sioux attacks, expectation of punishment
from the United States, crop failure due to drought conditions,
and shortage of bison in their homeland (Wedel 1955:81), the
Arikaras moved south and between 1833 and 1835 they lived as
refugees among their Skidi Pawnee kinsmen on the Loup River,
possibly at the Palmer site in present-day Howard County,
Nebraska (Wood 1955:29-30). Though living as neighbors, tensions
occurred between the Arikaras and the Pawnees in Nebraska,
resulting in a decision by the Arikaras to return north; these
troubles are described in a recently published Arikara oral
tradition (Parks 1991, 3:363-365). After leaving the Pawnees,
the Arikaras are reported at various times in 1836 and 1837 as
being in the Black Hills, on the Little Missouri River, and in
the Turtle Mountains of northern North Dakota (Wood 1955:33).
During the winter of 1837-1838, they moved into the abandoned
Mandan village adjacent to Fort Clark in west-central North
Dakota, where they remained until 1861 (Wood 1993a:544). In
1862, they joined the Mandans and Hidatsas at Fort Berthold in
western North Dakota (Wedel 1955:81). A reservation for the
three tribes (now known as the Three Affiliated Tribes) at Fort
Berthold was set apart in 1880. The 1887 Dawes Act provided for
general allotment of reservation land, and the Arikaras became
United States citizens in 1900 (Hodge 1912:84).

Connection with NIMI

Several pieces of evidence link the Arikaras to the study
area. There is archeological evidence that the ancestors of the
Arikaras may have lived along the Missouri River portion of NIMI—
—particularly in Nebraska—in late prehistoric times. Ludwickson
et al. (1981:161-166) have identified the prehistoric St. Helena
Phase as part of the Basal Variant of the Coalescent Tradition,
dating between approximately AD 1250 and 1400. Numerous St.
Helena sites are present as small hamlets along the Missouri and
its tributary streams in Dixon and Cedar counties, Nebraska, with
a St. Helena component represented at the multi-component Gavins
Point site in South Dakota and a St. Helena site on Bazile Creek in Knox County, Nebraska, about eight to 10 miles from its mouth (Blakeslee 1988:1-7). The prehistoric Initial Coalescent Variant developed from the Basal Variant and to have lasted from about AD 1300 to 1550 (Ludwickson et al. 1981:166). The Initial Coalescent is believed to be ancestral to the people known historically as Arikaras (Lehmer 1971; Ludwickson et al. 1981:35). Initial Coalescent sites are found primarily in central South Dakota, but one large (ca. 300 acres) Initial Coalescent village, the Lynch site, is known to exist near the town of Lynch in Boyd County, Nebraska (Witty 1962; National Register of Historic Places nomination form).

On the historic time level, however, evidence for the presence of Arikara settlements within the NIMI area is not strong. Fletcher and La Fleshe (1992:75) mention Omaha and Ponca stories indicating that the Omahas discovered the Arikaras living on the west side of the Missouri River in northeastern Nebraska and subsequently drove them northward. Ludwickson et al. (1981:33) state that the 1673-1674 Marquette map locates them close to the Missouri River near the South Dakota/Nebraska/Iowa border region, but a specific Arikara presence within NIMI cannot be inferred. The 1718 Delisle map places them on the James River, which flows into the Missouri within NIMI; however, the Arikara villages appear to be well outside of the NIMI area (Wood 1955:35).

At least one historic-period archeological site close to NIMI contains pottery called Stanley Ware, a type attributed to the Arikaras: the Ponca Fort (25KX1), a fortified village site in Knox County (Wood 1955:36; 1993b:27-33). However, there is strong ethnohistorical evidence that the Ponca Fort site was a village of the Poncas (Wood 1993b:79-101). The Stanley Ware sherds found during excavations at the village are believed to have been made by Arikara women who married into the Poncas. This interpretation is bolstered by the discovery of two human skeletons at the site that appear to be females of Arikara affinity (Wood 1993b:68, 105). The Omaha legend cited above would place the Arikaras in the area, but there is no archeological evidence supporting it (Wood 1955:28).

Hartley, in his summary of the Arikaras' presence in the Norden Reservoir area, state that "enough historical data exist to suggest at least some utilization of the [Niobrara] area in the proto-historic and early historic period" (Hartley 1983:page 1-49). Early Ponca traditions relate stories of Ponca/Arikara hunting trips, which might have occurred along the Niobrara (Hartley 1983:page 1-50). In addition, the Arikaras may have passed through the area on their way to the Skidi Pawnee in 1833 (Hartley 1983:page 1-50).

In sum, current interpretations of archeological evidence


CHAPTER 15
MANDANS
By Michele Voeltz

Introduction

The Mandans belong to the Siouan linguistic family. Together with their close neighbors and linguistic kinsmen, the Hidatsas, and the Caddoan-speaking Arikaras, they are one of the three semisedentary, horticultural village peoples who lived along the upper Missouri River valley in historic times. Their villages were long a center of trade with nomadic Indian groups of the Northern Plains. Their role as traders and their location on a great riverine artery of travel early attracted the interest of Euroamericans, and they were one of the first native peoples in the Northern Plains of the United States to be contacted by whites. Many Euroamericans visited their villages, including men of literary and artistic accomplishment, and the Mandans are one of the best-known native cultures of the Plains region as a result.

When first encountered by Euroamericans, the Mandans were living along the Missouri River in present-day North Dakota. However, their traditions speak of having moved to the Great Plains from the Eastern Woodlands, where they presumably separated from the Proto-Siouan linguistic family at an early date (Wood 1967:3). Archeological evidence suggests that they first arrived in the Missouri River valley between 1200 and 1300 A.D., or possibly earlier. Mandan traditions say that they reached the Missouri near the mouth of the White River, and settled in several places within South Dakota before finally moving to North Dakota (Swanton 1952:277). The descendants of the Mandans are now part of the Three Affiliated Tribes on the Fort Berthold Reservation in western North Dakota.

History

The French explorer and officer, the Sieur de la Vérendrye, found the Mandans living in several villages (approximately six) near the Missouri and the Heart Rivers in 1738 (Smith 1980:48-66, Stewart 1974:287-90). La Vérendrye’s visit to the Mandans was the first recorded direct contact with them by Euroamericans. After 1772, according to Mandan traditions, a smallpox epidemic and attacks from the Teton Sioux forced them to move north, settling near the mouth of the Knife River by 1787 (Stewart 1974:29). In 1804 Lewis and Clark found two Mandan villages on the Missouri, a short distance downstream from the mouth of the
Knife River, with three Hidatsa villages nearby (Lehmer 1977:107). In 1837 a smallpox epidemic decimated the remainder of the population, causing a 70% average mortality rate among the Mandans, Arikaras, and Hidatsas, with the Mandans being the heaviest sufferers (Lehmer 1977:107).

Between 1845 and 1858 the Mandans moved further north along the Missouri with the Hidatsas (Hodge 1912:198), and by 1862 the Mandans, Hidatsas, and Arikaras lived in a single village, called Like-a-Fishhook. In 1868 the United States established Fort Stevenson 18 miles below the village, and the first Indian agency for the combined Mandans-Hidatsas-Arikaras at Fort Berthold (Bruner 1961:190).

The 1851 Treaty of Fort Laramie set the boundaries for the northwest tribes, including those at Fort Berthold; however, no lands were included east of the Missouri River, where today most of the Fort Berthold Reservation lies (Gilman and Schneider 1987:272). An executive order of April 12, 1870, established a 7,800,000-acre reservation for the Mandans, Hidatsas, and Arikaras in North Dakota and Montana, along the Missouri and Little Missouri Rivers, but the reservation boundaries were subsequently changed, with the result that the present boundaries—encompassing only about the third the size of the original reservation—were established in 1891 (Gilman and Schneider 1987:272-273). As a result of the General Allotment Act of 1887 (also known as the Dawes Act), Fort Berthold Reservation lands began to be formally allotted in 1894, thus moving the people of the three tribes onto individually-owned plots of land and ending a millenium-old village way of life in the Northern Plains (Hodge 1912:798; Gilman and Schneider 1987:338-339).

Culture and Lifeway

When the Mandans first arrived in the Missouri River valley, they were "a Siouan-speaking, semisedentary village tribe which resided...in fortified circular earth lodge villages" (Wood 1967:9). By the time the equestrian nomads began moving into the area, the Mandans were well settled in semisedentary villages. They received the products of the nomadic life through trade, but never adopted the Plains horse-centered nomadic lifestyle (Bruner 1961:204-5).

In historic times, three major dialectic groups were detectable among the Mandans, perhaps suggesting that several distinct groups had joined to create the Mandans, comprised of Nuptadi, Nuitadi, and Awagixa subgroups (Bowers 1950:25). A unified Mandan tribe may have been a late development. From 1250-1500 proto-Mandans occupied a large area within North and South Dakota, "organized in terms of small village communitites with a relatively low level of sociopolitical integration"
The Mandans cultivated maize, beans, gourds, and sunflowers (Hodge 1912:798). They depended mainly on buffalo for meat, hunting them near the villages and gathering drowned buffalos after the spring breakup of the river ice (Will and Spinden 1906:120-1). The Mandans also hunted antelope, deer, elk, waterfowl, grouse, and a variety of small game; and sometimes made use of fish and shellfish. In addition, they gathered roots and berries (Bruner 1961:194). A division of labor between men and women existed in which women were responsible for horticulture and domestic work, while men hunted, fought wars, were responsible for ceremonial activity, made weapons, planted tobacco, and helped harvest crops (Bruner 1961:219).

In technology, La Vérendrye was "struck by their [the Mandans'] superior skill" and their accuracy as traders with the Assiniboins (Will and Spinden 1906:128; Smith 1980:56). They made their tools from stone, bone, horn, flint, shell, or wood; they made pottery, bows and arrows, and knives and spears. They also possessed catlinite pipes, wicker, pottery, and ornamented robes and headdresses (Bruner 1961:194, 202).

The Mandans' contact with other groups occurred mainly through trade, trading garden surpluses for products of the nomadic life. They associated most closely with the Hidatsas, their combined villages constituting one of the primary native trading centers on the Upper Missouri, although their languages were mutually unintelligible (Ewers 1968:15). From the mid-eighteenth and into the nineteenth centuries, the Mandans also traded with nearby Indian and European groups (Bruner 1961:197; Ewers 1968:15-18; Wood and Thiessen 1985:4, 5). Their chief enemies were the Dakotas, Cheyennes, and sometimes the Arikaras (Will and Spinden 1906:122). Even when at war with a group, however, peaceful trade relations could take place through the device of adopting men from the other tribe as fictive sons of Mandans. Creation of these fictive kinship ties allowed peaceful trade to be conducted. Some Mandans also spoke many languages, facilitating trade with many groups (Bruner 1961:197).

Edward M. Bruner remarked that "the social world of the Mandan was a kinship world in which every individual was related to every other" (Bruner 1961:222). Thirteen matrilineal, exogamous clans existed, divided into two moieties (Bruner 1961:222). The divisions appear to be named after the former villages (Swanton 1952:277). Within the matrilineal clans, the women owned household and garden equipment, garden products, the game killed by men, dogs, mares, and colts. Men owned weapons, stallions, and geldings. Agricultural land, the house, and the sacred bundles belonged to the clan. Daughters inherited the land and house from mothers, while sons inherited sacred bundles from their mother's brothers (Bruner 1961:219-20).
Society was stratified based on the relative ceremonial importance of the clan bundles (Bowers 1950:31). The bundle-owners within the clans comprised each village’s headmen, and one war chief and one peace chief were chosen from them (Bowers 1950:33-6). Tribal bundles were also the basis of ceremonial life. Each village had identical bundles, so that each village was an autonomous ceremonial unit (Bruner 1961:224). The turtle drums, considered the most sacred objects, symbolized unity among all the Mandans (Bowers 1950:36). Individuals could use the vision quest to acquire personal sacred bundles (Bruner 1961:223).

Mandan society was also divided into age-graded groups. George F. Will and Herbert J. Spinden (1906:130-131) name six men’s groups, while Edward M. Bruner (1961:225) says there were four women’s groups. A group of people of the proper age collectively "purchased" the group by buying its songs, symbols, and rituals from the former members. A fictitious kinship existed between the societies (Bruner 1961:225).

The Mandans held ceremonies according to a lunar calendar, while individuals could hold ceremonies at any time (Bruner 1961:224). The most important ceremony was the annual Okipa, described by George Catlin (Ewers 1967). The Okipa "was a dramatization of the creation of the earth, its people, plants, and animals, together with the struggles the Mandan endured to attain their present position." The ceremony used an ancient Nuptadi dialect, which only the ceremony’s officers understood (Bowers 1950:111). The Okipa was meant to bring tribal well-being and buffalo fertility (Ewers 1967:39).

Since the severe decline in the Mandans’ population in late historic times, "the culture has changed, the language has changed, and as a nation the Mandans are practically extinct" (Will and Spinden 1906:101). However, the Mandans made a deliberate attempt to keep their culture alive by adopting men into the tribe. They did not stop practicing the Okipa until 1889, and in 1953 Bruner found some individuals who still spoke the Mandan language (Bruner 1961:188).

Connection to the NIMI Region

In their review of ethnographic information pertaining to the 1978-designated Missouri National Recreational River, Ludwickson, Blakeslee, and O’Shea (1981:36-39) discuss the possibility of the prehistoric presence of the Mandans in the NIMI area. The prehistoric Mandans were culturally a part of an archeological culture known as the Middle Missouri Tradition (Wood 1967:113-14), early variants of which once existed in the NIMI area. However, the Middle Missouri Tradition is believed to have originated from a number of archeological complexes in the northwest Iowa, southwest Minnesota, eastern South Dakota region...
perhaps as much as a millennium ago. A noted scholar of Mandan
archoeology and culture history, W. Raymond Wood (1967), has
suggested that the historic Mandan tribe evolved from the
prehistoric Extended Middle Missouri Variant, but does not
believe there is sufficient evidence to link the historic Mandans
with the Initial Middle Missour Variant, a complex that is at
least as old as the Extended Variant and possibly earlier. If
early complexes believed to be ancestral to the Middle Missouri
Tradition, such as the Mill Creek culture, evolved specifically
into the Initial Variant, as has been suggested (see Toom 1992
for a review of this matter), then there is little reason to
believe that proto-Mandans were present in the NIMI study area
prehistorically. Ludwickson et al. (1981:39) conclude their
discussion of Mandan connections with NIMI by stating that "no
clear conclusions can be drawn regarding the relationship of the
historic Mandan to the prehistoric archaeological assemblages in
the project domain." The Mandans certainly did not live in the
NIMI study area in historic times, and there is no unequivocal
evidence that their forebears were present there prehistorically.
The Mandans' tradition of residence at the mouth of the White
River identifies their nearest (but still distant) historic
location to the NIMI study area (Hewes 1948:50).
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CHAPTER 16

CHEYENNES

By Michelle L. Watson

Introduction

The first reference to the Cheyennes appears on a map by Louis Joliet and Jean-Baptiste Louis Franquelin, which appears to have been made before 1673 (Jablow 1994). On the map they are identified as Chaïena. This term has no apparent connection with the French word Chien, meaning "dog," which has been sometimes erroneously supposed (Hodge 1907:251).

It has been suggested that the Cheyennes, under the name of Chaï, circa 1680, visited La Salle's fort on the Illinois River near the present-day site of Peoria, Illinois, to invite the French to visit their country. However, La Salle does not identify the native group that called these Cheyennes the Chaï, as at that time the Cheyennes called themselves Tsistsistas (Jablow 1994).

Driven to the south and west during the seventeenth century, from their origins in the eastern woodlands of the Great Lakes and Hudson Bay area (Grinnell 1972, 1), the Cheyennes settled for a time on the Red River in North Dakota, and eventually reached the region near the head of the Cheyenne River in the Black Hills of South Dakota circa 1700 (Jablow 1994), where Lewis and Clark supposedly first made contact with them in 1804 (Gussow 1974).

According to Wood (1971), "A few whites had fleeting contact with them before 1800, but they left discouragingly fragmentary and conflicting references...there are no accounts...written by traders or others who actually lived among them, or who knew their ways or their history" (Wood 1971:51). Post 1800, however, there is much documentation on the Cheyennes (Hoebel 1977:28).

Anthropological Research

Some of the earliest published comprehensive sources on the Cheyennes were those of George Bird Grinnell. In 1923 his two-volume study, The Cheyenne Indians: Their History and Ways of Life, was published. Since that time, the Cheyennes have been one of the best documented and thoroughly studied Plains Indians groups (Hoebel 1977). The earliest sources of information include numerous journals of early traders and explorers, most of which are not directly cited in this chapter as the Cheyennes had...

### Cultural and Linguistic Affiliations

The Cheyennes are part of the Algonquian family of languages shared among the Algonquins, Arapahos, Cree, Chippewas (Ojibwas), Blackfeet, Ottawas, Sacs and Foxes, Potawatomis, Mohegans, Delawares, Shawnees, Sutaio, and others (Powell 1980). The close historic alliance between the Sutaio, also spelled (Suhtai, Sotaeo, Sutai, Sutasina, Sutayo, Suti), and the Cheyennes, or Tsistsistas, suggests that the two were related bands, each speaking different, but intelligible dialects of the Algonquian language. Native oral tradition suggests that the Sutaio were historically at war with the Cheyennes. The two, however, formed an alliance sometime after 1850 and the Sutaio were gradually and completely absorbed into Cheyenne culture (Hodge 1907:660). The exact origin of the Sutaio remains unknown, as does the meaning of their name (Grinnell 1972, 1).

The name Cheyennes is derived from the Sioux name Sha-hi’yena, Shai-ena, or (Teton) Shai-ela, meaning "people of alien speech." The Cheyennes, however, called themselves Tsistsistas (Jablow 1994). Another spelling is Dz’tiistas, roughly meaning "people alike" or "our people" (Hodge 1907:250). For a more detailed discussion of how the Cheyennes named themselves, and were named by others, see Hodge (1907), Swanton (1952:278), and Grinnell (1966; 1972, 1).

### Historic Occupations

Over a period of some three hundred years, the Cheyennes experienced distinct transitions in their modes of subsistence as they ventured westward from their original homeland in the woodlands of Minnesota (Jablow 1994). After leaving the woodlands, they ventured across the prairies and high plains beyond the Missouri River, and were finally located on reservation lands, the northern Cheyennes in Montana, and the southern Cheyennes in Oklahoma (Grinnell 1972, 1).

Native oral tradition and the written record suggest that the Cheyennes originated in an area of Minnesota bounded by the Mississippi, Minnesota, and upper Red rivers (Swanton 1952:260), or possibly further to the east (Grinnell 1972, 1). By the latter quarter of the seventeenth century they were located in western Wisconsin and southeastern Minnesota where they established semi-sedentary, horticultural villages (Wood 1971). A short time later, Sioux oral tradition locates them near the
Minnesota and the Yellow Medicine rivers in southwestern Minnesota (Powell 1980), where "they began to adopt a...type of existence based on equestrian buffalo hunting and trading in the Great Plains" (Wood 1971:51). According to Gussow (1974), citing from Grinnell (1923), "Following their transition from a semi-horticultural to an equestrian nomadic life...they continued to plant some vegetable food, along with tobacco, until as late as 1865" (Gussow 1974:37).

Moving further westward, by the beginning of the eighteenth century they were located on the Cheyenne and Missouri rivers in North Dakota (Hartley 1983). According to Wood (1971), the Cheyennes transformed more rapidly from their woodland origins to being Plains dwellers than any other Native American Indian group who came to be known as "Plains Indians" (Wood 1971:51).

The Cheyennes made their first treaty with the United States Government in 1825 at the mouth of Bad River near present-day Pierre, South Dakota. This treaty resulted in a split:

...a large part of the tribe decided to move down and make permanent headquarters on the Arkansas, while the rest continued to rove about the headwaters of North Platte and Yellowstone rs. This separation was made permanent by the treaty of Fr Laramie in 1851, the two sections being now known respectively as Southern and Northern Cheyenne, but the distinction is purely geographic, although it has served to hasten the destruction of their former compact tribal organization. (Hodge 1907:252)

The two continued to maintain family ties but remained hundreds of miles apart (Svingen 1993).

The Cheyennes occupied the high plains west and southwest of the Missouri River until they completely entered reservation life in the late nineteenth century. The southern Cheyennes were located on the Arapaho and Cheyenne Reservation in Oklahoma and the northern Cheyennes located on the Tongue River Reservation in Montana. In 1910 the Cheyennes numbered 3,055, and in 1930 they numbered 2,695 (Lowie 1963:12). The total for northern Cheyennes in 1985 was 5,042, and the southern Cheyenne population for the same year was 5,729 (Moore 1987:324). The World Book Encyclopedia (1994) gives numbers of 2,700 for the northern Cheyennes of Montana, and 2,200 for the southern Cheyennes of Oklahoma (Fetzer 1994).

Aboriginal Culture, Subsistence, and Social Organization

While the Cheyennes occupied fixed villages in Minnesota and on the Missouri River, they were agriculturalists who made pottery. On the Plains, however, their subsistence economy
became transformed; they hunted bison and moved about, rather than settling in fixed villages and practicing agriculture.

Women continued to gather roots and vegetables utilizing a digging stick called a "dibble." There were two kinds of dibles, one was used to push under desired roots, and the other had sharp curved ends like a crowbar which could be used to dig roots out of the ground (Hoebel 1960).

The horse was very important for subsistence and trade. The Cheyennes occasionally ventured into the Spanish settlements of Mexico and the southwest to acquire horses, or they raided them from or traded with other tribes such as the Pawnees and the Comanches (Jablow 1994).

Before the split of the Cheyennes into the northern and the southern branches, they governed themselves under the old system of "Council of Forty-Four," made up of four principal elected chiefs from any of the bands, and some four elected leaders from each of the bands (Hodge 1907; Gussow 1974). There were also six military societies (Fox Soldiers, Elk Soldiers, Shield Soldiers, Bowstring Soldiers, Dog Men, and Northern Crazy Dogs), to which membership was voluntary and ungraded (i.e., the societies were open to men of all ages). These societies administered law among their people (Llewellyn and Hoebel 1967).

The social organization of the Cheyennes began at the family level. They practiced patrilineal descent and matrilocal postmarital residence patterns, polygamy being allowed (Hodge 1907; Gussow 1974). The families were grouped into bands of extended family members with no formal chief, but rather informal leaders. It is not known how many bands among the Cheyennes historically existed, but it is estimated at ten (Gussow 1974). The primary societies of the Cheyennes were six military societies that cross-cut band affiliation to organize and regulate important male activities such as the bison hunt, protection, and war (Gussow 1974). For more information on Cheyenne kinship patterns see Eggan (1967).

For descriptions of sacred Cheyenne ceremonies see Powell (1969), and for descriptions of the ceremonial sun dance among the Cheyennes see Dorsey (1905), and Timber and Liberty (1972). For descriptions of Cheyenne music see Densmore (1936).

The Cheyenne connection to the NIMI region

"The Cheyennes had no direct relationship to north-central Nebraska during the early part of the nineteenth century" (Hartley 1983:54-55). According to Howard (1965), "In 1859 the Ponca attempted to make their customary spring and summer hunt, but encountered a combined party of Brulé, Oglala, and Cheyennes at the headwaters of the Elkhorn River" (Howard 1965:31). Their attack was supposedly induced by a recent treaty with the U.S.
government by the Ponca tribe.

Thus, the Cheyennes probably only utilized the river valleys of north central and northeastern Nebraska for either shelter or temporary subsistence, sometimes warring with other groups over limited resources.
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Finally the division between Northern and Southern Arapahos became permanent, although they maintain group solidarity.

The 1851 Treaty of Fort Laramie assigned to the Arapahos and Cheyennes the area from the North Platte River to the Arkansas, and east of the Rocky Mountains through Colorado into western Kansas, including parts of Nebraska and Wyoming; an area of 122,000 square miles. The treaty was soon broken, however, as the 1858 Pike's Peak gold rush drew whites into the area on trails that cut through Indian territory (Bass 1966:xiii). The 1860s were years of calamity for the Northern Arapahos, and in 1868 they were offered a place with the Southern Arapahos, but refused. Finally in 1877, 938 Arapahos, of whom only 198 were men, moved to the southeast portion of the Shoshone Wind River Reservation (Elkin 1963:229). The reservation "lies in the heart of an attractive and rich country to the east of the Continental Divide in western Wyoming (Elkin 1963:230).

In 1867 the Treaty of Medicine Lodge placed the Southern Arapahos on a reservation with the Cheyennes (Swanton 1952:385). The reservation lies between the Canadian and Red Rivers in Oklahoma. In 1887 the General Allotment Act allotted quarter-sections to remaining members of the tribe, and 4.5 million acres were bought for $1.25 per acre and opened to white settlers (Bass 1966:xv). Today, the Southern Arapahos are known as the Cheyenne-Arapaho Business Committee of Concho, Oklahoma; and the Northern Arapahos are the Arapahoe Business Council of Fort Washakie, Wyoming.

Culture and Lifeway

The Arapahos' tradition says that while in Minnesota, they lived in settled communities and practiced both agriculture and hunting (Elkin 1963:207). After moving onto the plains, the Arapahos lost "all trace of a previous culture with the exception of their religion," adopting instead a typical plains economy and culture (Trenholm 1970:13). Before the advent of the horse, the Arapahos killed buffalo by stampeding them over cliffs and gathered vegetables and wild fruits, drying them for the winter. Transportation of goods was by dog-drawn travois or by the strength of women and girls (Trenhom 1970:12).

After their introduction, horses became the center of the economy, acquired through warfare and taming. Buffalo was the mainstay, while elk, antelope, and deer were of secondary importance (Elkin 1963:208). An economic division of labor existed in which men hunted game, took care of horses, and made saddles, weapons, and ceremonial objects; while women took care of domestic duties and manufactures, gathered roots and berries, cooked, worked hides, constructed tipis, and made clothing and leather products (Elkin 1963:208-9).
The Arapahos’ most sacred object is the Flat-Pipe, the Earthmaker or Creator (Trenhom 1970:3). According to Henry Elkin, the Arapahos say that "without the pipe there would be no Arapaho," and "it is the pipe that holds us together." If the pipe were not properly cared for the well-being of the tribe would suffer" (Elkin 1963:217).

Next in importance to the pipe is the sacred Wheel (Hehotti), decorated in typical Plains style with the colors of the Sundance and the thunderbird (Trenholm 1970:55-6). The Northern Arapahos, considered the "nucleus or mother tribe," hold the sacred tribal articles (Hodge 1912:72).

Before the Arapahos separated into northern and southern branches, they were divided into four bands: Long Leg or Antelope (from which the principal chief was chosen), Greasy Face, Quick-To-Anger, and Beaver. Membership was determined by birth but was flexible, as people could move in with friends or relatives of another band (Trenholm 1970:52). The band names frequently changed, however (Gussow 1974:20). Eight age-graded associations also existed. Membership in the two oldest societies required supernatural power as well as the requisite age. The societies provided a chieftainship structure: chiefs were drawn from each group, while four tribal chiefs were at the top of the scale (Gussow 1974:21).

For ceremonial purposes, the Arapahos formed a camp circle, each band comprising a segment with an opening to the east. Inside the circle a tipi housed the Flat-Pipe (Trenholm 1970:54). Inside the circle, the Arapahos held the principal ceremony of the sun dance, the bayaaawu, or lodge-dance ceremonies, and the men’s and women’s societies’ dances (Elkin 1963:217). The Arapahos also participated in the ghost dance religion (Hodge 1912:73). The vision quest was sometimes used, but was far less important to the Arapahos than to other Plains groups (Elkin 1963:218). The Arapahos had no coming of age or puberty ceremonies, other than birth and naming feasts (Trenholm 1970:59; Eggan 1955:62-3).

Marriage occurred by the honorable method of purchase, or by elopement. The woman’s brother or mother’s brother negotiated for marriage, while the woman had the power to refuse a suitor but usually didn’t (Eggan 1955:59-61). Residence was matrilocal and polygyny was practiced (Eggan 1955:61).

Connection to the NIMI Region

There is little information concerning the Arapaho presence in the NIMI area. First, there is the Arapaho tradition that they moved from Minnesota southwest across the Missouri River
Ralph J. Hartley summarizes the Arapaho presence in the area:

The Arapahoe and Crow, while living in and around the Black Hills may also have had limited contact with the Niobrara area. In 1804 Lewis and Clark were told the Arapahoe roamed from the headwaters of the north and Middle Loup to the Black Hills...They were taking a small part in trade on the Upper Missouri with the Cheyenne in 1803-05. (Hartley 1983:1-54)

They also note that a Cheyenne party along with the Teton Sioux and "a few Arapahoe" attacked a Ponca party near the headwaters of the Elkhorn River in 1858 (Hartley 1983:1-55), showing that parties including the Arapahoe were near the NIMI area at that time. There are no documented or traditionally-known Arapaho village sites in the NIMI study area.

References Cited

Bass, Althea

Eggan, Fred

Elkin, Henry

Gussow, Zachary

Hartley, Ralph J.
1983 Ethnohistorical Background for the Proposed Norden Reservoir Area, North Central Nebraska. In Division of Archeological Research, Department of Anthropology, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Technical Report No. 82-07.

Hodge, Frederick Webb

Kroeber, Alfred L.
1902 *The Arapaho*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. [Can you cite the original publication of this? Check the American Museum of Natural History Anthropological Papers in the MWAC or UNL libraries.]

1952 Swanton, John R. 

1970 Trenholm, Virginia Cole
Contact and Anthropological Research

Early contact with the Comanches is revealed through early travelers' journals and native oral tradition. The Shoshoni-Comanche supposedly originated in an area of southern and western Nevada. By 1500, they had reached Wyoming, and by 1700, using horses obtained by the Spanish of New Mexico, they had reached the far north Plains of Saskatchewan. It is after 1700 that they made their presence in the Black Hills and the westernmost portion of Nebraska (Hewes 1948:54).

The name "Comanche" first appeared shortly after 1700 in Spanish records from New Mexico (Jones 1972:5). It is reported that it was the Utes who introduced the Comanches to the Spanish in the Southwest-Plains border region. In 1724, a group called the "Pduca," were visited by sieur de Bourgemont at their village in present central Kansas, some thirty miles southwest of Salina Kansas. According to Secoy (1951), this "Padouca Nation" visited by Bourgemont in Kansas were "almost certainly Comanche" (Secoy 1951:538), despite the fact that throughout his Padouca Expedition, he referred to them as the Plains Apaches (Norall 1988). According to Secoy (1951), it had been the French traders and explorers, and the Louisiana colonials who had given these Indians the name Plains Apaches (Secoy 1951:527). Noyes (1993) adds,

Before 1750 the Caddoan tribes living on the eastern fringe of the southern plains, and the French traders among them, referred to the Plains apaches as the "Padouca." After the middle eighteenth century, when Comanches had replaced Apaches on the plains, the Caddoans and French applied the name to the Kiowa Apaches, a small tribe of Athapascans closely associated with the Kiowas, and also known as "gattakas." To complicate matters further, some Anglo-Americans after about 1800 began calling the Comanches "Padoucas." As a result certain American historians seem to have assumed, understandably, that the Comanches were identical with those original "Padoucas" who had dominated the southern plains from well before the time of Coronado's expedition. (Noyes 1993:xvi)
Administratively speaking, Comanche-U.S. government relations began in 1872 through the Kiowa Agency (Foster 1991). It wasn't until 1933, however, that the first extensive, systematic ethnographic studies were conducted on the Comanches. This research was conducted under the auspices of an Ethnological Field Study Group of the Santa Fe Laboratory of Anthropology. Notable contributions were made by members Ralph Linton and E. Adamson Hoebel (Jones 1972). From this research, the book titled The Comanches: Lords of the South Plains was published in 1952 under the authorship of Ernest Wallace and E. Adamson Hoebel. It continues to serve as a primary source of information about the Comanches. The most recent history of the Comanches, and a most scholarly piece of work, is a 1993 book by Stanley Noyes, titled Los Comanches: The Horse People, 1751-1845.

Cultural and Linguistic Affiliations

Both linguistically and culturally, the Comanches originated from Numic-speaking populations, often broadly referred to as Shoshonean culture. The Comanche Indians derive from the Uto-Aztecan language family which is divided into three branches: Shoshonean, Sonoran, and Nahua. The Shoshonean branch is further divided into three linguistic subdivisions, one of which is the Shoshone-Comanche-Koso (Panamint) and includes the Comanches, among others. Linguistically, the Comanche and Shoshone languages are mutually intelligible, "both tribes speaking practically the same dialect" (Hodge 1912:327).

In naming, the Comanches call themselves "numina", meaning "The People" (Foster 1991:58). The word "Comanche" was a name applied by the Utes to many Plains Indian groups including the Arapahos, Cheyennes, and Kiowas, but it was the Spanish who are credited as being the only consistent users of the Shoshonean term "Comanche" throughout the 1700s. Thus, it is inferred that it was the Spaniards of New Mexico who gave them the name (Opler 1943; Wallace and Hoebel 1952). The name "Comanche" may be translated as "enemy," "my adversary," and "anyone who wants to fight me all the time." The designation for Comanche Indians in the sign language "is a backward, wriggling motion of the index finger, signifying a snake...indicating the silent stealth of that tribe" (Newcomb 1961:155). For a look at Comanche synonymy see (Swanton 1952:312-313).

Historically, they have also been named "Padouca," but there is controversy as to who the "Padouca" really were (Grinnell 1920). Depending upon who was writing about the "Padouca," in what geographical region they were writing, and in what specific historical time period they were writing, the name has variously referred to the Comanches, Plains Apaches, and Kiowa-Apaches. One investigator who has systematically reviewed the usages of the term "Padouca" concludes:
The name "Paduca" does not appear in the original uninfluenced Spanish sources at all... It appears in the French colonial sources prior to 1750, applied to the Apache and after 1750, applied to the Comanche... The 19th century Americans did not use it in a consistent fashion; but varied its meaning depending on the specific sources of information by which the individual writers happened to be influenced. (Secoy 1951:540)

According to Secoy (1951), the "Padouca Nation" visited by Bourgemont in Kansas in 1724 were "almost certainly Comanche" (Secoy 1951:538), despite the fact that throughout his Padouca Expedition, he referred to them as the Plains Apaches (Norall 1988). Secoy (1951), however, is criticized by W.R. Wedel (1959) for ethnohistorical inadequacies (Wedel and DeMallie 1980:120).

Historic Occupations

Based on early travel journals, the Comanches occupied a vast area of land in the southern Plains (Wallace and Hoebel 1952). The Comanches probably originated in the vicinity of southwestern Montana and northwestern Wyoming (Hultkrantz 1968:60; Jones 1972:6). Migrating southward, they expanded onto the Plains circa 1725, and by the early nineteenth century they had moved into areas of present-day southeastern Colorado, southwestern Kansas, central and western Oklahoma, and northern Texas (Jones 1972). According to Foster (1991), however, the Comanches originated in the Great Basin area of present-day Nevada, Utah, and Idaho, moving later onto the Plains of present-day Wyoming and Montana, and eventually moved into areas of present-day Colorado and New Mexico (Foster 1991). Their origin cannot be pinpointed, but there is consensus in the oral and written traditions that the Comanches migrated southward onto the southern Plains after their split from the Shoshones.

It can only be inferred when and why the Comanches split from the Shoshones. Some Comanche oral traditions suggest that this split occurred on Fountain Creek north of Pueblo, Colorado, when unreconcilable disputes between them could not be resolved (Wallace and Hoebel 1952).

Other oral traditions suggest that the advance of and incursion by other American Indian groups into the Plains persuaded the Comanches to proceed elsewhere into areas where they could continue to practice their traditional modes of existence. A significant component of their pre-reservation Plains economy was the horse (Foster 1991). It allowed them to more efficiently continue their buffalo-based economy on the open southern Plains, where "the Comanches...were dependent almost entirely on the buffalo herds for a livelihood" (Wallace and Hoebel 1952:21).
Thus, during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, oral and written traditions, as well as the archaeological record, locate the Comanches throughout the southern Plains, including a brief presence in Nebraska. By 1836, the Comanches claimed and occupied a vast area of land in the southern Plains bounded on the north by the Arkansas River. The establishment of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache reservations in Indian Territory (present-day Oklahoma) in 1867, however, imposed a sedentary lifestyle on these previously nomadic peoples. Some bands did settle, while others continued to roam throughout the southern Plains until 1875 when they surrendered to the United States militia at Fort Sill near the Wichita Mountains in present-day southwestern Oklahoma (Wallace and Hoebel 1952; Foster 1991). Today the Comanches are located on a Federal Indian Reservation due west of Lawton, Oklahoma.

Aboriginal Culture

(Social, Political and Economic Organization)

The Comanches were organized into what may be explained as five differing levels of social units: family, band, division, focused-activity group, and the entire Comanche community (Foster 1991:58-59). Family units, comprised of extended family relatives residing in the same camp, grouped into patrilocal band units, each under a specific leader. Bands who exploited the same territory were then grouped together into division units. These various smaller social units occasionally amalgamated into larger units to conduct specific activities such as the buffalo hunt. Finally, the largest social unit, the entire Comanche community, shares a common bond of identity and affinity (Foster 1991).

The various bands found no political significance in the use of the terms "tribe," "clan," or "military society." Each band did, however, have a peace chief, "although this position was not formalized" (Bailey 1980:156). Sociologically, however, they held a common bond of identity and affinity. "The first time the bands with all their men, women, and children came together was in the dying moments of the old, free culture at the time of the first Comanche Sun Dance in 1874" (Wallace and Hoebel 1952:22). According to Eggan (1966), the Comanches, as well as other Plains tribes, had political organization that reflected the habits of the bison. They could not be politically or socially too large, as it was necessary for them to be disbursed across the grass lands in smaller bands in order to make the best use of the bison, upon which they were dependent (Eggan 1966).

Each band was comprised of one or several extended family groupings, each operating autonomously, except in time of a focused group activity such as bison hunting. Traditionally they had a patriarchal social organization, and allowed for
unrestricted movement in and out of the various bands. Marriages
often occurred within bands, occasionally occurring between them
to expand alliances. Post-marital residence was patrilocal.

Five age-grades were recognized among the Comanches: baby,
child, adolescent, adult, and elder. Politically, each band had
a chief, several peace chiefs, and an advisory council of elders.
Culturally, the various bands could be slightly distinguished by
variations in habits, customs, and institutions.

The Comanches are considered typical Plains Indians
categorized by the "horse-buffalo-tipi complex." Some oral
traditions, like those of the Poncas, even credit the Comanches
for introducing the horse to the Plains (Wallace and Hoebel
1952).

Subsistence activities centered primarily around large game
such as buffalo, bear, and elk. A variety of plants were also
gathered: fruits, vegetables, berries, cacti, and roots. Their
diet also consisted of curdled milk "taken from the stomachs of
suckling fawns and buffalo calves" (Noyes 1993:263).

It is not known how many different Comanche bands existed
historically. According to Hodge (1912), there have been twelve
recognized bands or divisions, all but five being virtually
extinct (Hodge 1912:328). According to some anthropologists,
however, there were thirteen (Lowie 1963:92). Regardless of how
many bands actually existed historically, "during the nineteenth
century there were five outstanding divisions, the others being
small or transitory groupings" (Wallace and Hoebel 1952:25).

Their population in the mid-nineteenth century was estimated
at some 20,000 (Wallace and Hoebel 1952). The 1990 Census
estimated the Comanche population at 11,322. There are only some
twenty other American Indian groups that exceed the Comanche
population today.

The Comanche connection to the NIMI region

According to Wallace and Hoebel (1952), the Comanche band
that is known to have been in Nebraska was the "Yap-eaters,"
termed so because of their diet of Yap, a potato-like root.
Other researchers spell this "yampa" (Hultkrantz 1968:54).

As the band closest to the Shoshones, and as the band
that clung to Shoshone food-getting habits, digging for
roots, they were probably the last of the Comanche
bands to break off. (Wallace and Hoebel 1952:27)

Comanche oral tradition suggests that this band located in the
Rocky Mountains circa 1700, and made raids far north into
present-day Kansas and Nebraska. As interpreted from the
ethnographic literature and the archaeological record, "When they lived in the forks of the Dismal River and in Nebraska, they engaged in incessant warfare with the Pawnees, their neighbors on the east" (Wallace and Hoebel 1952:285). They also engaged in warfare with the Ponca (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911). These Comanches, however, who were present within or near NIMI circa 1790, were referred to as the Apaches or the Padouca, and not as the Comanches.

According to Schlesier (1972), the Apaches were present at the Ponca Fort within NIMI in the latter eighteenth century:

...in the 1790’s the Ponca fought no less than four times with them over the possession of Nanza, the Ponca Fort...an historic Ponca earth lodge village on the Missouri River in northeastern Nebraska...which the Apache attempted to take over four times during the absence of the Ponca. (Schlesier 1972:107)

According to Howard (1970), however, these Plains Indians were the "Padouca" who were warring with the Ponca over possession of the Fort, and not the Apaches. Secoy (1951) somewhat supports this conclusion when he stated that the Plains Apaches were out of the region by 1750 (Secoy 1951:538), and thus, the Ponca could not have been warring with them in the 1790s in the region. In fact,

The Dorsey map...does not show the Ponca Fort, but at two locations on the middle Fork of the Loup there are names referring to..."Padouca earth fort"...Fletcher and La Flesche give "Where the Padouca built breastworks" as the Omaha name for the Dismal River. (Howard 1970:126)

Wood (1993), suggests the Ponca were defending the Fort from the Comanches, and makes no mention of either the "Padouca" or the Apaches (Wood 1993:102).

According to Fletcher and La Flesche (1911), Ponca oral tradition refers to numerous meetings with the "Padouca" on the Plains in the latter eighteenth century:

...near the Missouri river...on one of their hunts they encountered the Padouca. (Fletcher and La Flesche 1911:79)

According to O’Shea and Ludwickson (1992), the Omahas as well were engaged in war in the 1770s and 1780s with a tribe named the "Padoucas" in the region. They conclude, however,

...By this date, the name Padouca certainly referred to Comanches, although earlier it referred to Plains
According to Gunnerson (1960; 1968), the Comanches were indeed present in the central Plains circa 1728 and later, along with the Plains Apaches, each living separately and exhibiting hostilities toward one another. His use of the term "Padouca" does not refer to the Comanches nor the Plains Apaches (Gunnerson 1960; 1968).

Finally, if the use of the terms Plains Apache, Apache, Kiowa Apache, and "Padouca," in the ethnographic literature and native oral traditions, could have in fact referred to the Comanches post 1750, as inferred by Secoy (1951), O'Shea and Ludwickson (1992), Noyes (1993), and others, there is much evidence to suggest that the Comanches were present throughout the Plains and within and near NIMI in the latter eighteenth century.

The Comanches had an estimated population of 7,000 in 1690, 1,171 in 1910, and 7,393 in 1978 (Parks, Liberty, and Ferenci 1980:295). Today, the Comanches are located on a Federal Indian Reservation due west of Lawton, Oklahoma.

References Cited


Hewes, Gordon

Hodge, Frederick Webb

Howard, James H.

Hultkrantz, Åke

Jones, David E.

Lowie, Robert H.

Newcomb, W.W.

Norall, Frank

Noyes, Stanley

Opler, Marvin K.

O'Shea, John M. and John Ludwickson

Parks, Douglas R., Margot Liberty, and Andrea Ferenci
1980 "Peoples of the Plains" in Anthropology on the Great Plains
University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

Schlesier, Karl H.

Secoy, Frank R.

Swanton, John R.

Wallace, Ernest and E. Adamson Hoebel

Wedel, Mildred Mott and Raymond J. DeMallie

Wood, Raymond W.
CHAPTER 19

THE PLAINS APACHES

By Michelle L. Watson

Introduction and Historic Occupations

The Plains Apaches, also called "Apache Vaqueros" or "Eastern" Apaches, inhabited an area of several hundred miles east and north of Spanish New Mexico (Mayhall 1962:5). They are first mentioned by "Onate in 1598, although Coronado, in 1541, met the Querechos (the Vaqueros of Benavides, and probably the Jicarillas and Mescaleros of modern times) on the plains of E. N. Mex. and W. Tex.; but there is no evidence that the Apache reached so far W. as Arizona until after the middle of the 16th century" (Hodge 1907:63). The Plains Apaches then appear in the journals of La Salle in 1682 when he was exploring the Mississippi River. He was informed of tribes that lived far to the west and recorded them as the Gattackas and the Padoucas.

According to Hartley (1983), "The Plains Apache inhabited portions of the Nebraska Sandhills from approximately A.D. 1675 to 1741" (Hartley 1983:51). They were located at the headwaters of the Loup River system and along the Dismal River (Gunnerson 1960), and are considered numerically "the strongest of the Plains Athapaskans who ranged from eastern New Mexico through eastern Colorado, Wyoming and southwestern South Dakota down into western Nebraska" (Hartley 1983:51). To see their general locations circa 1700 see the maps of Terrell (1975:16-17), and Schlesier 1972:103). It is believed that by 1750 the Plains Apaches no longer occupied any part of the central Plains, as they had been replaced by the Comanches (Secoy 1951).

It is believed, based upon the archaeological record, linguistic studies, and other evidence, that the Plains Apaches were Athapaskan hunting bands who moved onto the open Plains of the Canadian province of Alberta from origins in Alaska (Kehoe 1992). Some of these Athapaskan tribes and bands continued their southward migration along the high plains somewhere east of the Rocky Mountains into Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, new Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas and elsewhere (Terrell 1975:13; Lockwood 1987).

Other interpretations, however, suggest that the Apaches drifted north from eastern New Mexico and far west Texas (Hewes 1948:56). "The fact is, no scholar has been able to trace satisfactorily the exact origins of this spectacular people or to
The "Navajos were those Apaches who befriended the Pueblos, and with whom the Pueblo refugees found safety after the 1680 Pueblo Rebellion" (Hester 1971; Kehoe 1992:147). These Navajos were eventually absorbed into Pueblo culture, taking up an agrarian based economy that was supplemented by shepherding and raiding. They did not call themselves "Navajo," but rather they called themselves Dine, which means something equivalent to "people." "This word, in various forms, is used as a tribal name by nearly every people of the Athapaskan stock" (Hodge 1907:41). Accordingly to Terrell (1975), it was the Spanish who called these Dine the Apaches, because of their linguistic and cultural affinity to the Inde, who were Apaches. In 1907, some fifty-one Navajo clans had been identified, some being already extinct (Hodge 1907). To meet the requirements of this present study, it will not be necessary to discuss the Navajos further.

The second Athapaskan tribe that has been identified as having inhabited the central and southern Plains are the Apaches. Of the some twenty-two Apache tribes and bands that have been identified across the northern, central and southern Plains, only two have been identified with western and southern Nebraska, the Gattackas and the Padoucas (Terrell 1975:13).

The Apaches did not call themselves Apaches, but rather they called themselves (N'de, Tinde, and Inde), all which mean something equivalent to "the people." The name Apache originated from Apachu, signifying "enemy," and has historically been applied to many tribes of the Athapaskan linguistic family, as well as to some unrelated tribes such as the Apache Mohave and the Apache Yuma, members of the Yuma linguistic family (Hodge 1907:63; 1910:1010). The name Apache was used by the Zuni to refer to the Navajo, "who were designated "Apaches de Nabaju" by the early Spaniards of New Mexico" (Hodge 1907:63). Historically, the Spanish have identified the Plains Apaches by the name "Llanero" which means "people of the plains," a term used apparently to distinguish the Apaches from the Navajos.

According to Hodge (1907), the Kiowa Apaches have been mistakenly referred to as Plains Apaches, arising from the fact of their Athapaskan affinity (Hodge 1907). He concluded that they were a small detached Athapaskan band of the Apaches of Arizona who had no political connection with the Apache proper, and are closely related to the Kiowa in everything but language. The Kiowa Apaches have been associated with the Kiowa from the earliest traditional period, and formed a component part of the Kiowa tribal circle (Hodge 1907:701).

The Kiowa Apaches identified themselves as Lipans and went by the name Naichan (also Naizhan) (Terrell 1975). Their identity as the Gattacka comes from their being called the "Gattacka" by the Pawnees at the time La Salle was journeying throughout the Plains circa 1682 (Hodge 1907:701), and by the
French and the Caddoans after the mid eighteenth century when the
Comanches had replaced Apaches on the Plains (Noyes 1993).

According to Hartley (1983), the Gattackas (also Dismal River
proper, and "Northern Aspect of Plains Apaches"), with the
Kiowas, occupied Nebraska territory north of the Padoucas several
decades prior to 1750 (Hartley 1983). The two groups supposedly
joined as allies and became known as the Kiowa-Apaches after
their numbers were greatly diminished (Secoy 1951:541; Schlesier
1972; Terrell 1975:18). If this is the case, that the Plains
Apaches and the Kiowa Apaches did join as allies, there is much
evidence to suggest that the Kiowa-Apaches were present in the
NIMI study area prior to 1800 (Hartley 1983:54). Thus, having
implications for the presence of the Plains Apaches within and
near the NIMI study area. See Mooney (1979:245) for a Kiowa
Apache synonymy.

Historically, the French have identified the Apaches by the
name "Padouca" (Hartley 1983:51). There is much controversy,
however, as to who the "Padouca" (also Paduca and Padonka) really
were (Grinnell 1920). The name has been variously applied to the
Plains Apaches, the Kiowa-Apaches, and the Comanches (Secoy
1951:541; Noyes 1993:xvi) (a discussion of the Comanche-Padouca
connection can be found in the specific chapter on the
Comanches).

The French apparently applied the name "Padouca" to the
Plains Apaches prior to 1750, a name applied to the Sand Hills
Plains Apaches by the Ponca and the Omaha (Schlesier 1972:107;
Hartley 1983). It first appears on a Franquelin map of Louisiana
of 1684: "...there is a "Riviere des Parouke" which seems likely
to be a variant of "Padouca"" (Secoy 1951:525). The Padoucas are
also identified on an early map of J.O. Dorsey's (n.d.): At two
locations on the Middle Loup River in north central Nebraska,
they are referred to as "Padonka" (also Padouca). Secoy (1951),
concluded that the name "Padouca" applied to the Apaches prior to
1750 and to the Comanches after 1750, and that the nineteenth
century Americans never used the term in a consistent fashion
(Secoy 1951:541). A further discussion of the Apache, Gattacka
(Cataka), and Padouca distinctions can be found in Anonymous
(1974). Archaeological evidence does suggest that Athapaskan Plains
Apaches (being also referred to as the Gattackas and the
Pacoucas) carried the culture of the Dismal River Aspect
throughout an area that encompasses part of present-day
southwestern South Dakota and western Nebraska (Schlesier
1972:101), thus, having implications for their presence within
the NIMI study area.

Aboriginal Culture and Subsistence

The Sandhills Plains Apaches participated in subsistence
strategies that were centered around hunting and gathering, as well as farming (Schlesier 1972; Gunnerson 1968). "Plains Apaches ranged widely according to the season on hunting, gathering, raiding, and trading expeditions" (Gunnerson and Gunnerson 1971:7). The bison was very important to the Apaches as their main source of food, clothing, and shelter. When it was exterminated they turned to deer, antelope, elk, rabbit, dog, and birds. Women dug roots and gathered berries, which were placed in wooden, horn, or hide receptacles (McAllister 1935).

The Apaches lived in thatch huts sometimes called wickiups which were "easily erected by the women and were well adapted to their arid environment and constant shifting" (Hodge 1907:66). Women engaged in highly skilled basketry making and mask painting for ritual dances. They also prepared their girls for the Nai’ës ceremony, where the girl was transformed into a woman at first menses (Kehoe 1992:148).

The Apaches were divided into many clans which took their names from their natural surroundings of their localities. They were not totemic and never took their names from animals (Hodge 1907:66).

The Apache connection to the NIMI region

It was between 1675 and 1741, that the Plains Apaches inhabited portions of the Nebraska Sandhills. Being identified on a map of J.O. Dorsey’s (n.d.), they were located at the headwaters of the Loup River system and along the Dismal River (Gunnerson 1960), and referred to as "Padonka" or Padouca. According to Secoy (1951), the Apaches were present on the central and southern Plains until circa 1720 when the Comanches took full possession (Secoy 1951:538). According to Hartley (1983), if the Plains Apaches and the Kiowa Apaches did in fact join as allies under the name Kiowa-Apaches in the eighteenth century, after their numbers were greatly diminished, there is much evidence to suggest that the Plains Apaches (being referred to as the Kiowa-Apaches, Gattacka, or Padouca) were present in the NIMI study area prior to 1800 (Hartley 1983). They had been identified at the headwaters of the Niobrara under the name Cataka (Gattacka), near the headwaters of the Cheyenne River, near a lake at Schlagel Creek in Cherry County, Nebraska, and elsewhere in South Dakota and Nebraska (Hartley 1983:53-54). They are considered "numerically the strongest of the Plains Athapaskans who ranged across the central and southern Plains (Hartley 1983:51).

It also remains somewhat disputed as to which American Indians were warring with the Ponca over possession of the Nanza, the Ponca Fort on the Missouri River in northeastern Nebraska in the latter eighteenth century. According to Schlesier (1972), it was the Plains Apaches who were warring with the Poncas.
(Schlesier 1972:107). Other evidence, however, suggests that it could not have been the Apaches as their presence in the NIMI study area occurred prior to the 1780s and the 1790s, a time when the Comanches had full possession of the central Plains (Howard 1970:126; Wood 1993:102; Secoy 1951; Noyes 1993). According to Hartley (1983), as interpreted from Abel (1921), "In 1796 Trudeau reported...remnants of the northern Plains Apache...located on the banks of the North Platte River" (Hartley 1983:53), suggesting their move out of the Sandhills of Nebraska to the south by the latter eighteenth century.

The establishment of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache reservations in 1867 in present-day Oklahoma imposed a sedentary lifestyle on these previously nomadic peoples. Today, some Apaches are located on the Kiowa, Apache, and Fort Still Apache Federal Indian Reservations in Oklahoma. However, "Of some forty thousand Apaches in the 1980s, over half did not live on Apache reservations" (Kehoe 1992:149), but have become assimilated into American society where traditional Apache values and beliefs are no longer practiced.
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CHAPTER 20

GERMANS

By Michelle Watson

Introduction

The latter half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries witnessed a massive immigration into the United States of ethnic Germans from a number of European nations. These immigrants were motivated by religious, political and economic reasons. Study of German immigration as a single, unified phenomenon is difficult for several reasons. First, German immigration to the United States occurred over a broad period of time, during which the intensity of the influx varied considerably. Second, many German immigrants who emigrated from nations other than Germany (e.g., Austria, Switzerland, Poland, Russia) were not ethnically identified as "German" in their new homelands, thus resulting in inaccuracies in the reporting and the recording of census data (Rife 1980). Third, there exists a lack of uniformity of information, style, and format in the different United States census reports and publications (Hawgood 1970:59). And fourth, many Germans did not document their ethnic background and historical heritage as well as perhaps the Germans from Russia, who have a well constructed and documented history of their heritage both in Europe and in the United States (Frederick C. Luebke, Department of History, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, personal communication, 1993). In order to create a clear and precise picture of the diverse German settlements within or near NIMI, a precinct-by-precinct census analysis would need to be performed, an undertaking beyond the scope of the present study.

Nevertheless, thousands of Germans immigrated to the United States between the mid-seventeenth century and World War I (Hawgood 1970; Berthoff 1971:47), constituting the second largest immigrant population in the United States (second only to the English) (Hawgood 1970:59; U.S. Department of the Interior [USDI] 1993:104). The phenomenon of "mass migration" from Germany to the United States began in 1846 (Furer 1973:33). Over 70 percent of Germany's total emigration to the United States occurred between the 1840s and 1889 (Hawgood 1970:57-58). Among these immigrants were Germans of numerous faiths: Quakers or Amish, Mennonites, Hutterites, Catholics, Lutherans, Schwenkfelders, and Baptists or Dunkards (from the German eintunken, "to dunk or immerse") (Rippley 1976). Schwenkfelders were a communal Germanic people who followed the religious teachings of Karl von
Schwenkfeld. Schwenkfelders from Silesia settled in Pennsylvania in 1734, but their religion disappeared in the early twentieth century.

There were at least five major causes of massive German immigration prior to the twentieth century, which dispersed Germans from their central European homeland to other nations of Europe and eventually to America: 1) the Protestant Reformation (circa 1519-1619); 2) the Thirty Years War (1618-1648); 3) the Seven Year's War (1756-1763); 4) the Napoleonic Wars (post 1783); and 5) the 1848 revolutions in Vienna, Milan, Rome, Berlin, and Warsaw.

The reasons for emigration from eighteenth-century Germany were primarily religious, whereas the primary reasons for emigration from Germany after 1850 were economic and agricultural (Rippl 1976:29). Patterns of inheritance in Germany had dwindled farms to small plots, making the support of a family difficult as crop failures, largely due to potato famines, spread throughout Europe. In response to increasing pressures for emigration from Europe, the governments of various German states, working with the United States government, set up commissions to work directly with immigration agents in the Plains states, where land for the largely agrarian immigrants abounded (Rippl 1976).

Emigration was further facilitated after these agreements by 1) advances in the technology of travel to and within the United States; 2) laws like those enacted by the New York State Legislature in 1847 that protected the lives and property of immigrants (Kucera 1967); 3) the Homestead Act of 1862 that offered abundant, affordable, arable land (Berthoff 1971:306); 4) incentives for settlement offered by railroad companies, banks, travel agencies, and state-operated immigration bureaus (Rippl 1976:72-73); and 5) promotional efforts put forth by the first established bureau of immigration in Dakota Territory (Richter 1980:189). The publication of immigrants' guides, such as Outlines of the History of the Territory of Dakota and Emigrant's Guide to the Free Lands of the Northwest, also helped spur German immigration into the Plains (Hammer 1980:298).

German immigration to North America began well before the American Revolution. The first German immigrants to what is now the United States settled with Dutch immigrants in the colony of New Amsterdam, subsequently named New York (Rippl 1976:24). Germantown, Pennsylvania, however, became the first completely German colony in the United States when a religious group of pietists (Quakers and Mennonites) emigrated from Krefeld, Germany, and settled in Germantown in 1683 (Dyck 1967; Rife 1980:1-2). Thousands of Germans immigrants followed for more than two centuries as political, economic, and religious turmoil mounted in Europe and Russia, and the frontier in the United States expanded westward offering what these immigrants desired
most (i.e., abundant and affordable land, opportunity, and
freedom) (Rippley 1976).

In tracing German immigration throughout the United States,
one might distinguish Germans from Germany, Germans from various
other countries of Europe, Germans from Russia, and Germans from
the United States (i.e., those descended from German-born
immigrants in the eastern states), although these distinctions
are not always easily made. Further division can be made by
religious affiliation. Germans in general constitute the largest
ethnic population in both South Dakota and Nebraska in the late­
nineteenth century (USDI 1993:104).

Germans from Russia

Among the first Germans to immigrate in large, cohesive
groups, and establish themselves within NIMI, were Germans from
Russia (Ostergren 1983:69). These immigrants referred to
themselves as either unser leute ("our people"), or Russlaendcr
("people of Russia") (Pfeiffer 1970). They were those Germans
who had lived in the steppes of Russia (primarily the Black Sea
and Volga regions of the Ukraine) for several generations
beginning in 1763, and who began immigrating to South Dakota in
1873 when their special status in Russia was no longer permitted.
It is estimated that some 120,000 Germans from Russia immigrated
Of these, about 20,000 were Mennonites and Hutterites who
immigrated in the last three decades of the nineteenth century,
largely to the plains and prairies of South Dakota, Kansas, North
Dakota, Minnesota, and Canada (Rippley 1976). The Hutterites and
the Mennonites were not the only German groups to immigrate from
the Russian Ukraine; there were large groups of Protestant and
Catholic Black Sea and Volga Germans who made settlements in
Nebraska and South Dakota as well.

History

Thousands of Germans emigrated to Russia between 1764 and
1767 and established several hundred German agricultural villages
along the banks of the Volga River, the Black Sea, and elsewhere
(Giesinger 1974). These German immigrants became colonizers with
special rights and privileges granted them under the Manifesto of
1763 (Koch 1977:12-17), instituted by Tsarina Catherine the
Great, and the Colonization Law of 1764 (Dyck 1967; Unruh
1972:11-12; Giesinger 1974). While in the Ukraine, all Germans,
including the Mennonites and the Hutterites, were granted
complete religious freedom, tax exemptions, free trade practice,
control of educational practices, exemption from military duty,
and were provided land to cultivate (Stumpp 1978). They thus
prospered and regained much of their material wealth and personal
privileges lost through economic hardship and persecution in
their homeland.
Over the course of the ensuing years, many more migrations of Germans to Russia followed. Their journey and stay in Russia, however, were not without pain and hardship. Ships wrecked on the Baltic Sea, wagons broke down overland, and immigrants found inadequate provisions and shelter upon arrival. The first winters took a deadly toll and they suffered further under attacks by nomadic Mongol tribes in the east (Giesinger 1974). In 1796, however, they were provided better care, provisions, and protection under Tsar Paul I, son of Catherine the Great, thus becoming very successful agriculturalists once again (Giesinger 1974). Through it all they retained much of their ethnic sense of identity as Germans.

However, even with renewed prosperity in Russia, the centuries of impoverishment, struggle, and persecution in Europe led them to take advantage of the opening up of the United States for immigration (Dyck 1967:145). The new policy of forced "Russification," instituted in 1871 and including all of Russia, required military conscription which prompted the emigration of many, beginning in 1873. Volga Germans and Black Sea Germans (particularly the pacifist Mennonites and Hutterites) began to emigrate, some going to South America and Canada. The largest number went to the United States, where they settled primarily in Kansas, Nebraska, and South Dakota (Dyck 1967), in distinct, isolated, homogeneous, religious communities in order to continue their agrarian style of living. Through their religious beliefs and practices they preserved their cultural heritage and values (Richter 1991:155).

Protestant Black Sea Germans

The first Germans from Russia to arrive in 1873 were Protestant Black Sea Germans who settled southeast of the present-day town of Scotland in Bon Homme County, South Dakota. This was known as the "Odessa settlement" because these immigrants were from the large harbor and merchant city of Odessa on the Black Sea in Russia (Sallet 1974:23). The first Odessa church was built in 1876. Prior to the establishment of this church, these immigrants gathered in homes to conduct Sunday services. Other settlements sprang up around the "Odessa Settlement," with names familiar to the newcomers: Worms was west of the Odessa settlement, Petersburg was northwest of Worms, and Friedenstal was north of Petersburg (Bischoff 1981:189).

Continued immigration expanded their settlements to include the towns of Menno and Freeman in 1874. Other settlements included Danzig near Avon, one in the vicinity of Tripp (established 1877), a settlement southwest of Parkston (also founded in 1877), a settlement north of Delmont (1880), and Fairfax in Gregory County (1890), each being settled by Germans from different areas of the Black Sea region (Pfeiffer 1970; Sallet 1974). Within the space of only a few years, Germans from
Russia took up virtually all of the homestead lands in Yankton and Bon Homme counties (Sallet 1974:24). After the Rosebud Indian Reservation lands were opened for settlement, immigrants established settlements at Herrick, Gregory, Dallas, and Carlock in Gregory County after 1905.

The first settlements in Nebraska by Protestant Black Sea Germans were in the southern part of the state. However, in 1892, they made settlements near Butte and Naper in Boyd County (Sallet 1974:29).

Additionally, Germans from Russia, along with English, Danish Germans, and Czechs, settled in an area known as "Sunshine Bottoms," also in Boyd County, between 1890-1893, when treaties with the Ponca and Sioux Indians opened up land for Anglo-European settlement:

A group of these "Odessa Germans" crossed the Missouri into Boyd County and settled close together at the base of and atop the bluffs adjacent to Sunshine Bottom... representing a majority of settlers along the Bottom itself. (Murphy n.d.:3)

The Germans from Russia established themselves in a specific area known as "Poor Man’s Bottom" within the general Sunshine Bottoms settlement. It was in this area that the first post office, named Walther, was established and a sod parsonage as well. The post office was named after Ferdinand Walther, an Evangelical Lutheran pastor who also made trips to Butte, German-town, Fairfax, Bonesteel, and Basin to conduct services (Murphy n.d.; Butte Diamond Jubilee Committee 1965:17). Later, additional churches were erected, as well as a school, stores, etc.

Sunshine Bottom was also an important shipping point for steamboat traffic:

The Sunshine Bottom was proximal to the Missouri River and became important as a local shipping center until steamboats were replaced by railroads in the early 1900’s. Tower, Nebraska...and Anderson’s Landing (on Sunshine Bottom) were important locations at the turn of the century, but have since disappeared. (D.R. Henning 1975:2)

Tower, located eight miles north of Lynch, was so named because of an iron post marking "the northeast boundary of the old Fort Randall Military Reserve. Anderson’s Landing...was comprised of a wood store, shipping pens for livestock and a small granary" (D.R. Henning 1975:12). Neither Tower nor Anderson’s Landing exist today (D.R. Henning 1975:12).

The last German colonists left the Sunshine Bottom settlement in 1907 primarily as a result of drought, floods, locoweed problems, population density, and religious
heterogeneity (Murphy n.d.:13). Though the community was relatively short-lived, the social life at "Sunshine Bottoms" was diverse, including dances, debates, chautauquas, medicine shows, work bees, luncheons, education, and games.

The cultural influence of these Germans from Russia was evidenced in the architecture that persisted in this settlement until it was abandoned. This influence persists even today, as several structures extant in the Sunshine Bottom area are unique relics of the former German settlement (Murphy n.d.; Steve Holen, University of Nebraska State Museum, personal communication, 1994). Evidence of historic structures and other sites that remain from the Sunshine Bottom community include chalkstone houses, sod houses, dugouts, stables, a wood granary, cemeteries, churches, and marked and unmarked graves, all of which date to the period between 1890 and 1905 (O’Shea 1975; D.D. Henning 1975). Inventoried in 1975 during planning for a proposed Nebraska Public Power District pumped power storage project (O’Shea 1975; D.D. Henning 1975), many of these structures and features were noted as being in poor condition, abandoned, subject to eventual inundation by reservoirs, or deteriorating from natural causes. Some of them, however, were found to be in good condition and were still being utilized for agricultural storage purposes, while others had been moved out of the Sunshine Bottom area and preserved elsewhere.

Catholic Black Sea Germans

Some of the first Catholic Black Sea Germans to arrive within the NIMI region settled with Protestant Black Sea Germans already established in the area (Sallet 1974:35). Several families settled in Yankton in 1875, later moving to Freeman, South Dakota, while other groups arrived in 1882 and settled in Scotland, South Dakota. Over a period of time, however, they became less comfortable with their neighboring Protestant Black Sea Germans and consequently moved into northern South Dakota and North Dakota.

No Catholic Black Sea German settlements were located in Nebraska near NIMI.

Protestant Volga Germans

The evangelical Volga Germans who settled in Nebraska were located primarily in the southern and eastern parts of the state. A few of these colonists, however, settled at Valentine in 1892 (Sallet 1974:44). There is no documentation that Protestant Volga Germans settled within NIMI on the South Dakota side.

Catholic Volga Germans

There were apparently no settlements made by Catholic Volga
Germans within the NIMI region (Sallet 1974).

Mennonite Germans from Russia

The Mennonite Germans from Russia who emigrated to Nebraska settled primarily in the southeastern part of the state (e.g., York and Hamilton counties) (Toews 1975:137), while Mennonite newcomers to South Dakota in the 1870s and 1880s settled primarily in Turner and Hutchinson counties, approximately 30 miles from the town of Yankton (Toews 1975:141). The Mennonites, thus, are generally not located close to NIMI. There is, however, a Mennonite church, the Friedensberg Bible Church, located in Avon, Bon Homme County (Janet Shoemaker, Mennonite Historical Library, Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana, personal communication, 1993).

Hutterite Germans from Russia

The Hutterites, however, have a marked historical and contemporary presence within the NIMI study region. Hutterites settle in communal agrarian colonies. The first Hutterite colony in the United States, the Bon Homme Colony in Bon Homme County, South Dakota, was established in 1874. There are presently 52 Hutterite colonies located throughout South Dakota. Five of these are within or close to NIMI (Satterlee 1993).

Mennonites and Hutterites share a common Anabaptist ancestry and differ in their basic beliefs in primarily one way (Hostetler 1963; Hofer 1974:48); the Hutterites are distinct from the Anabaptist Mennonites and the Protestant and Catholic churches in their practice of communal living (Satterlee 1993:1). The Hutterites derive their name from Jacob Hutter and the Mennonites take their name from Menno Simons, early leaders of these sects (Giesinger 1974:30; Toews 1975:10). The Mennonites, like the Hutterites, are directed by principles of nonresistance, avoidance, and nonconformity. Unlike the Hutterites, Mennonites no longer speak German (Toews 1975:323) and they seek converts through both evangelical and missionary efforts.

See the "Hutterites" section of this report for a fuller description of Hutterite history and lifeways.

Summary

Overall, the religious convictions of German immigrants were of primary importance in retaining and preserving their ethnic heritage, language, values, and sense of group identity. Their settlements in the Ukraine were geographically, linguistically, and religiously factionalized; thus, many of their settlements in the plains states were also independent, usually isolated, and religiously homogeneous. Marriages generally did not cross religious lines, even between communities of the same practicing
faith, which caused animosity among them (Welsch 1976:197-198; Richter 1980). Within the NIMI region today the Hutterites, who live in religiously homogeneous colonies, are most representative of this phenomenon (Jim Satterlee, South Dakota State University, personal communication, 1993). Nevertheless, in the words of Robert C. Ostergren (1983:71):

More than any other group, the German-Russians successfully transplanted the culture, social organization, and agricultural practices they had known in the homeland.

In regard to their clothing, they were known for their Russian lamb coats and their warm hats which were drawn over their ears (Bischoff 1981:193).

Architecturally, these immigrants became skilled at utilizing resources indigenous to the lands they inhabited. On the Plains, they erected buildings out of sod, stone, clay, and Basta bricks, utilizing whatever resources were at hand. The Basta bricks were unique, being made of a composite of water, straw, clay and manure. They were pressed out of wooden molds and served as very sturdy and durable building materials (Upton 1986:130). In addition, aspects of German (Catholic) architecture can be seen in the wrought-iron grave crosses which stand today in some cemeteries, "an artistic symbol of faith" (Richter 1991:167).

These agriculturalists brought with them many diverse skills, ideas, and concepts relating to all areas of life, thus immediately contributing to commerce, industry, and especially agriculture on the Plains. As agriculturalists, the Germans from Russia prospered faster than any other ethnic group in the area. They were extremely well adapted to the harsh climatic conditions and environment of the Ukraine, and thus adapted very well to similar terrain and environments in South Dakota and Nebraska (Sallet 1974:6, 79). Their reputation as highly skilled agriculturalists led them to receive favored attention from Dakota Territory officials (Rippley 1976:91). They are well known for their contribution of Turkey Red Hard Wheat to American agriculture (Olson 1955:206):

By 1892, Eureka, South Dakota, which was the terminal of the Milwaukee Road, was the largest primary wheat-shipping point in the world. (Richter 1980:191)

Other Germans

Some other identified German settlements within or near NIMI are Laurel and Menominee in Cedar County, and Wausa and Bloomfield in Knox County. In Menominee, the St. Boniface Catholic Church, a property listed on the National Register of Historic Places, functioned as "a spiritual, social, and cultural
The strength of their religious convictions can also be seen in their educational systems and in their mutual aid and benevolent societies. These organizations were not simply German, they were German Catholic, German Lutheran, German atheist, etc. Thus, as LaVern J. Rippley (1976:16) summarizes, "the main thrust of German-language education came from those whose primary concern was the preservation of the faith, not of German culture for its own sake."

Some of the most active German societies were the Turner societies (Turner Vereine). A Turner Hall was built in Yankton in 1879 and served as a meeting place for generations thereafter. Another hall built by Germans was the Germania House which served as a meeting place for both Germans and Germans from Russia alike. Members of these organizations advocated antinativism, anticlericalism, and opposition to Prohibition, in addition to promoting or sponsoring events in the realms of religion, education (primarily German-language schools), music, theater, singing, gymnastics, and other activities. It was primarily through these societies that they retained their customs and traditions.

The German-language press also played a very important part in not only promoting German tradition, but also in helping the Germans assimilate into "American" culture. In 1860 there were already 265 German-language newspapers in the United States (Rippley 1976). By 1890 the German-language press had reached its peak with some 800 publications, three-quarters of all the foreign newspapers published in the U.S. By 1904, however, the number had dropped to 600, and by 1930 there were only 172. By 1950 there were only 61 German-language newspapers still being published in the United States (Furer 1973:64, 68, 75, 80). For a comprehensive listing of German newspapers published in the United States between 1732 and 1955, consult Arndt and Olson (1961).
One German-language newspaper, the *Dakota Freie Presse*, was maintained by both Volga and Black Sea Germans and was first published in Yankton in 1873. It failed, however, under anti-German sentiment circa 1920 (Rath 1977:335). This newspaper was circulated not only among Russian-Germans in the United States but also among Volga and Black Sea Germans in Russia (Ripley 1976:179). Its decline after 1900, as well as the general decline in the use of the German language and the promotion of German cultural heritage was due largely to anti-German sentiment, particularly during World War I.

As early as 1900, the German language was relatively little used as a vehicle of instruction in schools and by 1918, when the United States was at war with Germany, the use of German in the educational institutions plummeted virtually to zero: "only the community-conscious sectarians such as the Hutterites have succeeded in maintaining German schools, and then only because German is a tenet of their faith" (Ripley 1976:123, 127). The prior neutral stand taken by most German-Americans had finally changed; they were forced to assimilate into American culture:

...one out of every ten bills introduced into the Nebraska Legislature during January, 1919, reflected the German-language concern. (Ripley 1976:124)

Societies like the Steuben Society were organized by German-Americans to entice the German-American element in the United States into more quickly "Americanizing." They did this to avoid a repetition of the atrocities that resulted from anti-German sentiment of World War I (Furer 1973:73). Thus, their assimilation had been completed by the mid-twentieth century.

Today, however, bilingual schools are once again prevalent. The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 recognized the right of children whose native language is not English to an education, while ensuring a revival in the teaching of foreign languages, including German (Ripley 1976:128). In addition, German ethnic festivals can be observed in many communities across Nebraska and South Dakota, which reinforce the ethnic German identity and heritage of such communities (Frederick Luebke, Department of History, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, personal communication, 1993).
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GERMANS FROM RUSSIA
CHAPTER 21

HUTTERITES

By Michelle Watson

Introduction

The Hutterites immigrated to the United States fleeing religious persecution and seeking a communal life directed by principles of nonresistance, avoidance, and nonconformity. The first Hutterian colony established in the United States was the Bon Homme Colony in Yankton County, South Dakota, in 1874. From that single colony, 52 Hutterite colonies have developed in South Dakota and there are many more elsewhere in the Northern Plains and Canada (Satterlee 1993:Maps 1 and 2).

Among the Anabaptist groups that emerged from the Protestant Reformation in Europe during the sixteenth century, the Hutterites are unique because of their communal lifeways (Satterlee 1993:1). They are distinct from other evangelical churches and from other ethnic settlements primarily because of their communal lifestyle. They believe in community of goods, and hold all property in common; they do not take oaths; they do not take or hold public office; and they baptize only upon adult profession of faith, rather than at birth. Isolated from their non-Hutterian neighbors by choice and by language (German), the Hutterites are by no means an unsophisticated people:

The communes are, for the most part, agricultural enterprises, highly advanced technologically and highly isolated socially. Spread for the most part throughout north-central United States and the west-central provinces of Canada, the communes seek no converts. High birth rates alone provide the impetus to expand colony numbers. This expansion creates hard feelings among some outsiders. Neighboring farmers often see the growth in colony numbers as a threat to their own agricultural existence, as price and scarcity of available land become even more critical issues in agriculture. Others have typecast Hutterites as foreign speaking and have accused them of plotting to take over agriculture through their expansionist activities. (Satterlee 1993:1-2)

These expansionist activities are a deliberate way for the Hutterite Brethren to create a tightly knit, cohesive, and closely controlled colony environment, and to control population
pressures on the land. In fact, "if each Hutterite family were
to have as much land (if they did in fact hold family plots) as
any other farm colony, most colonies would have to have at least
three times as much land as they now own" (Blakeslee and O'Shea
1983:136). Because they hold all property in common they require
much less land than their neighbors to sustain themselves and
still have a surplus of produce and livestock to sell.

Colonies are generally small in size, and splinter into
daughter colonies when a maximum population size is reached
approximately every 14 years. When a "daughter" colony is
established, the "mother" colony provides the machinery, physical
plants, housing, and livestock needed by the new colony
(Satterlee 1993:5, 15).

This tendency to expand and create other colonies has often
created friction and ill will on the part of their non-Hutterian
neighbors, resulting in legal attempts to limit their expansion
(i.e., proposals to establish minimal distances between colonies,
and attempts to take away their corporate status, set maximum
sizes for colonies, establish governmental boards to review
applications for expansion, etc.) The result of these has been
the dispersion of newly-formed colonies over a much larger
geographic area extending from the James River throughout eastern
South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, western Minnesota, and other
areas of the Northern Plains (Satterlee 1993:15).

The Hutterites are not very well known to most non-
Hutterites. In relation to the other ethnic groups in and
adjacent to the Niobrara/Missouri National Scenic Riverways,
there is less literature available on Hutterite social
organization, and much of what is available is somewhat dated.

The only study that focuses exclusively on a Hutterite
colony located within NIMI is contained within the first volume
of The Gorge of the Missouri: An Archaeological Survey of Lewis
and Clark Lake, Nebraska and South Dakota, by Donald J. Blakeslee
and John O'Shea (1983; see especially pages 124-137). The most
recent study available on the Hutterite Brethren that includes
information on Brethren membership and colony distribution
worldwide is The Hutterites: A Study in Cultural Diversity by
Dr. James Satterlee (1993). The following additional sources all
contain sociological, economic, historical, and some
anthropological data on Hutterites in South Dakota: The
Hutterites: A Study in Social Cohesion by Lee Emerson Deets
(1975); The Hutterites in North America by John A. Hostetler and
Gertrude Enders Huntington (1967); Comunitarian Societies by John
A. Hostetler (1974); Hutterite Life by John A. Hostetler (1983);
Perceptions of the South Dakota Hutterites in the 1980's by Rod
A. Janzen (1984); The Hutterites: South Dakota's Communal
Farmers by Marvin P. Riley and James R. Stewart (1966); South
Dakota's Hutterite Colonies 1874-1969 by Marvin P. Riley and
Hutterite doctrine evolved through more than four centuries of struggle and reform, and Hutterite history was influenced by diverse spiritual, social, economic, and political forces.

As mentioned previously, the Hutterites, also known as the Hutterite Brethren, originated as one of a number of religious sects seeking reform from Catholicism during the Protestant Reformation in sixteenth-century Europe. In general, the Anabaptists—of which Hutterites are one variety—advocate communal possession of property, separation of church and state, and adult baptism, believing that infant baptism is not scripturally warranted (Webster 1976:75).

Today, there are three surviving Anabaptist groups, the Hutterites, the Mennonites, and the Swiss Anabaptists, the latter of which includes the Old Order Amish (Hostetler 1963). Of the three, Hutterites "differ from Amish and Mennonite groups by their practice of communal ownership of property and communal living" (Hostetler 1983:12). In addition, the Hutterites still speak German, different dialects being spoken in the different colonies, though English is used outside the colony during trade exchange or business. They have retained their German language partly as a religious symbol, and partly as insulation against their external environment. Hutterites are numerous and socially conservative:

The Hutterite communities of the United States and Canada are today the oldest, the largest, and by far the most significant examples of Christian communalism. They are living demonstrations also of an extremely conservative and orthodox (not fundamentalist) type of Christianity that in our day is extremely rare. Their turbulent history provides abundant proof of the possible tenacity of total creed, of the efficiency of a non-competitive economy, of the strength and durability of a classless society, and of the effectiveness of careful and prolonged indoctrinations. (Conkin 1964:vii)
There were several Anabaptist movements in sixteenth-century Europe, which generally are regarded as originating in Zurich in 1523. One such movement, an offshoot of the Swiss Brethren, came to be known as the Hutterian Brethren. From the start, early Hutterites communally shared property, a practice which characterizes Hutterian doctrine to this day. The first colony or communal household (Bruderhof), including the first communal church (Gemein), was founded in Austerlitz in 1528, which is considered by many Hutterites to be the founding date of their sect. Under the leadership of Jacob Wiedeman, approximately 190 conservative, refugee Anabaptists fled from Nickolsburg to Austerlitz, Moravia, where they gathered their worldly goods in common, thus beginning the practice of Hutterian communalism (Hostetler and Huntington 1967:2).

The Hutterites are named after Jacob Hutter from Tyrol, who had a major role in organizing the sect. He joined the community at Austerlitz where he served as their leader until 1536 when he was burned at the stake in Innsbruck, Austria, for heresy. While Jacob Wiedeman is generally recognized as the founder and organizer of the Hutterites, it was Hutter who intensified the discipline of communal living.

In 1528, the first Hutterite community was established in Moravia, southeast of Brunn (now Brno), an historical region of the former Czechoslovakia, where they were tolerated for approximately a century (Deets 1975). The Hutterite colonists were considered by the Moravian nobles to be industrious and valuable tenants and were thus protected by them from attacks by the Catholic Church. However, news of their prosperity as farmers and craftsmen spread quickly throughout the regions they inhabited, often resulting in raids, robbery, torture, execution, captivity, and other forms of harassment despite the protective efforts of the nobility. The Moravian nobles lost much of their power in 1620 and by 1622 the remaining Hutterites were expelled from Moravia (Hostetler and Huntington 1967:2-3).

For over a century the Hutterites wandered throughout the area that now comprises the nation of Hungary, although Hutterite communities in these areas continued to suffer religious and economic persecution. Because of the Hutterites' reputation for industry and productivity, several families of Hutterites were invited by Russian Count Romanzov in 1770 to establish settlements in the northern Ukraine of Russia. Russian Empress Catherine the Great in 1763 issued a manifesto which served as the basis for colonizing many underdeveloped regions of the Russian Empire (Unruh 1972:11-12; Stumpp 1978:15), which further supported the Hutterites' settling in the Ukraine.

In the Ukraine, all Germans, including the Hutterites, were granted complete religious freedom, tax exemptions, free trade practice, control of education practices, exemption from military
duty, and were provided land to cultivate. After years of continual hardships, craftsmen who had lost their holdings reacquired some of their material wealth and personal privileges while in the Ukraine, where they thrived for nearly a century. Despite this relative prosperity under the Tsars, many Hutterites were wary of eventually losing their property once again, only this time to Russia, and thus refused to hold property in common with others: "As a result, communal ownership was abandoned for forty years (1819-1859) and revived again after 1859" (Hostetler and Huntington 1967:3).

The Hutterites had, once again, become successful in reinstating their communal way of life when the Russian government declared (circa 1870) that skilled farmers and craftsmen were no longer needed by Russia and that privileges previously accorded to groups like the Hutterites, such as exemption from military service, would be withdrawn. In addition, the Russian serfs who lived near the Hutterites were themselves less skilled agriculturalists and thus were jealous at the Hutterites' prosperity. The successor to Catherine the Great, Tsar Alexander II, in 1871 set in motion a sweeping new program to "Russianize" the entire Russian Empire, including the Hutterites (Riley and Johnson 1970:8; Unruh 1972:14; Jones 1976).

The Hutterites correctly saw this forced assimilation into Russian society as a threat to their religious principles and way of life. Consequently, they chose to emigrate to Canada and North America, beginning about 1871 (Riley and Stewart 1966). One of the factors prominently responsible for this emigration was an 1872 requirement, under the universal military training act, for Russian subjects to serve in the military (Hostetler and Huntington 1967:3). As pacifists, Hutterites refused to participate in war or violence of any kind. Alternative service in forestry or medical work was permitted, but the Hutterites were suspicious that this would also lead to unwanted changes in their lifestyle (Dyck 1967:155).

As a result, Hutterite delegates were chosen to venture to the frontiers of America in 1873 to seek free or cheap land on which to establish a new colony free from the oppressive regimes of the Old World (Unruh 1972:16). The delegates were sent to America with instructions to seek the following:

1. Religious freedom and exemption from military service.

2. Land of good quality, in quantity sufficient to meet their needs, at moderate prices and easy terms.

3. The right to live in closed communities, have their own form of government, and be able to use the German language as they had been permitted to use it in Russia.
4. An advance of sufficient money to cover transportation expenses from Russia to America.

According to Hofer and Walter (1974:49), "these requests might seem excessive by today's standards but the western states and railroad companies were anxious to receive industrious settlers." The Hutterites were welcomed by land development interests in the western United States because of their reputation in Europe as highly skilled farmers and craftsmen.

The delegates located land in southern Dakota Territory, which was environmentally similar to the areas which the Hutterites had inhabited in Russia (Hofer and Walter 1974:49). The first immigrant Hutterites arrived in Lincoln, Nebraska, in 1874. While staying in temporary quarters in Lincoln, awaiting their move to South Dakota, an epidemic broke out, resulting in several deaths among the party. Later that year they moved to Yankton where they purchased about 2,500 acres of farm land from Walter A. Burleigh, which thus became the first Hutterite colony in the United States, the Bon Homme Colony in Bon Homme County, South Dakota (Peters 1965:41-42).

Between 1874 and 1877, successive parties of newly-arrived Hutterites, totalling about 800 people, founded three colonies in present-day South Dakota. In addition to the first colony, the Bon Homme Colony in Bon Homme County, a colony at Wolf Creek, 12 miles west of Freeman, was established under the leadership of Darius Walter, and the Old Elmsprings Colony was established northeast of Parkston by Jacob Wipf (Hostetler and Huntington 1967:3; Riley and Johnson 1970:8-9).

Some of the newly-arrived Hutterite families—about half—preferred privately-owned property and settled on family farms near the communal colonies (Hostetler and Huntington 1967:3). The Hutterites call these people Prairieleut or the "prairie people," who, instead of living in the traditional communal way, chose to live and work independently of one another, affiliating with other nearby religious groups such as the Mennonites.

Hutterites distinguish three separate groups or "peoples" (Leut) among themselves (Hostetler and Huntington 1967:3). Two of the groups took their names from their first leaders in the United States. They are the Schmiedeleut (after a minister named Schmied-Michel who was a blacksmith by trade) who settled Bon Homme Colony, and the Dariusleut (named after their minister, Darius) who settled Wolf Creek Colony. The third groups, the Lehrerleut, took their name, "teacher's people," from their leader's (Jacob Wipf) profession as a teacher; they settled the Old Elmsprings Colony. The three groups are largely similar, but also differ in several important respects:

The three share a common body of doctrine, language, and
social patterns, but each has its own senior elder and 
ordnungen (discipline). Each Leut has its own periodic 
preacher assembly that ordains leaders and modifies or 
changes the discipline, and each is unified by the preferred 
endogamous marriage pattern. The Leut is the largest unit 
within which there is both a means and a moral obligation to 
settle disputes. (Hostetler and Huntington 1967:3)

There is currently a fourth group of Hutterites organized in 
New York and Pennsylvania under the name of Arnold Leut. The 
Arnold Leut differ substantially from the Hutterites of the 
Plains region. They are not agriculturalists, they are more 
liberal in relationship to the Hutterites in the West, and most 
of their membership is comprised of non-Hutterite converts rather 
than individuals raised in the Hutterite doctrine from birth, 
leaving their future success undeterminable (Jim Satterlee, South 
Dakota State University, personal communication, 1993).

Between 1879 and 1913, there was a marked expansion in the 
number of Hutterite colonies throughout South Dakota; population 
pressures impelled expansion (Blakeslee and O'Shea 1983:127)

After 1913, strong sentiment against the Hutterites because 
of their teutonic origin and because of their refusal to 
participate in World War I led to an exodus of all colonies, with 
exception of Bon Homme, to Canada beginning in 1918. In 1935, 
the South Dakota legislature passed the Communal Corporation Act 
which created a more favorable atmosphere for the Hutterites, and 
many of the colonies returned to South Dakota and reincorporated 
under that law (Riley and Johnson 1970:9-10). Today there are 52 
colonies in South Dakota, each averaging approximately 4,731 
acres of land (Satterlee 1993:14). All of them are descended 
from the original Bon Homme colony (Blakeslee and O'Shea 
1983:130). Within or close to the NIMI area are the following 
colonies (see Satterlee 1993:5-6):

Bon Homme County: Bon Homme

Charles Mix County: Lakeview
Cedar Grove
Platte

Yankton County: Jamesville

Bon Homme, the first and oldest Hutterite colony in the 
United States, was established in 1874 18 miles west of Yankton, 
South Dakota, on land purchased from the Burleigh family. Their 
purchase of the Burleigh Ranch included a house and a store which 
were built in 1864 and 1865 by the Burleigh family. The Bon 
Homme Colony contains structures that date from pre-1913 and two 
of its original buildings are still used as residences (U.S. 
Department of the Interior [USDI] 1981; Blakeslee and O'Shea
The first North American Hutterite cemetery was also established at Bon Homme in 1875. Because of their egalitarian beliefs, many graves are unmarked and all marked graves have simple concrete stones (USDI 1981:section 7, page 4).

Social Organization and Lifeway

Communism, pacifism, and avoidance are the Hutterites' three central doctrines of living. These three doctrines permeate the social fabric of Hutterite existence:

Socially, the Hutterian households have found a "body politic" within communal living, which provides for their needs under the guidance of religious principles of education, management of production, consumption, trade and social welfare, and including medical care and protection of aged. (Correll 1931:xi)

Their traditions and beliefs (i.e., nonresistance, avoidance, and nonconformity) are concepts as well as rules of conduct for life wherein their Christian religious beliefs encompass their whole behavior (Kaufman 1979).

Consequently, as Hostetler (1983:29) has summarized, "No days of the week or tasks are purely secular in Hutterite life."

Hutterite social structure and economic structure are based on the colony as a unit, and not on individual family units (Luebke 1980:94). Church service and Sunday school encompass the extent of formal organizations in Hutterite life because, as Conkin (1964) has pointed out, "the words...community and church are inseparable and almost synonymous" in the eyes of Hutterites.

A carefully regulated routine of activities provides a form of "controlled acculturation" tending to preserve Hutterite culture from change and provide colony members with a continuous sense of security (Peter 1987; see also Mattison 1956):

...certain things are done daily, weekly, and throughout the year at fixed times. Bells even ring to inform a person of work breaks, curfews for the children and mealtime. This is a controlled atmosphere with an accompanying sense of security and order. (Janzen 1984:14)

This regulated environment does not allow individual ownership of worldly possessions or enjoyment of amusements counter to Hutterite doctrine:

Dance, theater, cards, smoking, motion pictures, television,
and radio are generally off-limits. (Satterlee 1993:6-7)

Defiance of colony rules results in strict discipline requiring the deviates to admit their sins before all colony members and/or serve a probationary period. Continued defiance can result in complete ostracizing of the defiant by all members of the colony (Satterlee 1993:7).

Horsch (1931) details more information on the faith and principles of the Hutterian Brethren.

Economy

As rural enclaves, the Hutterite colonies practice semi-closed agrarian economies and engage successfully in farming. Traditionally, the Hutterites have maintained farms, dairies, vineyards, wineries, mills, sawmills, etc. Nowadays, little has changed except the tools and techniques employed in their agricultural endeavors. They keep abreast of and employ the newest developments in agricultural technology (Satterlee 1993).

Historically, as the agricultural frontier developed, crop diversification took place. One new crop adopted widely in the West was Hard Red Winter Turkey Wheat, introduced by the Mennonites and the Hutterites who emigrated from the steppes of Russia in the 1870s. A strain of this was the Marquis variety, popular during the 1870s and 1880s because it resisted drought and rust. As corn yields and livestock prices rapidly decreased in the 1890s, strains of the Hard Red Winter Turkey Wheat and other hardy varieties like Centurk and Cheyenne were widely adopted, much credit for this being due to immigrant Mennonites and Hutterites (John Schmidt, Department of Agronomy, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, personal communication 1993; Olson 1955:206; Schell 1961:336). Thus, with their new settlements in America, and with a blending of old and new agricultural technology and rich, available land, Hutterites became and still are today among the most successful agriculturalists specializing in grain production (Hostetler 1983).

Bon Homme Colony, being an agricultural endeavor, purchases water for residential use from the rural water system and irrigation water from nearby Lewis and Clark Lake (Blakeslee and O'Shea 1983:129; Jim Satterlee, South Dakota State University, personal communication, 1993).

Traditional Hutterite crafts included bookbinding, cutlery, masonry, leather working, watchmaking, broom making, weaving, ceramics, etc. Some of these crafts are still performed today by elders who are freed from their daily work positions in the colonies and are free to choose how they will spend their time (Satterlee 1993).
Governance

The Hutterite colonies in South Dakota first incorporated under the laws of that state in 1905, previously having owned land as an organized religious group but without formal recognition of corporate status. Statutes of incorporation grant property rights to the corporation as a whole, rather than to the individuals comprising the corporation. Consequently, all earnings, service, and labor of individuals belong to the corporation, a concept very much in keeping with the Hutterian notion of communal possession of goods. Corporate status protects individuals from legal reprisals or disputes from both outside and within the community. Corporate status does not, however, exempt the Hutterites from paying taxes (Blakeslee nd O'Shea 1983:128).

The Hutterian Brethren Church is organized nationally under the Articles of Association. Four "conferences"—Darius Leut, Lehrer Leut, Schmeiden Leut, and Arnold Leut—encompass the 365 colonies in North America. Each conference is directed by an executive committee, and a Board of Managers is organized from the membership of each of the four conferences:

The Church and Conference Boards exercise control over Church dogma and discipline, while each colony has complete control over its own secular affairs. (Satterlee 1993:5)

Within each colony, basic decisions are made by an elected Council of Elders, the colony minister, and department heads (Satterlee 1993:5-7).

Order and authority in Hutterite society is patriarchal; voting power resides with the patriarchy, composed of elected officials chosen from the elderly membership of each colony. The preacher is the spiritual and moral leader, the Wirt or boss is the financial secretary, and the field manager directs all farm and labor operations. Other elected positions are managers for the cattle, poultry, and hogs, and supervisors over the shoe making, blacksmithing, and cabinet making. Elected positions of head cook, head seamstress, kindergarten teacher, and midwife belong to women (Hostetler 1983). Within the Bruderhof or colony, members' skills are recognized and positions are assigned based on abilities.

Hutterian Age-Groups and Education

The Hutterite individual life span is patterned into age categories which effectively provide education and support for each stage of life: nursery age, kindergarten age, school age, youth, baptismal age and adulthood, marriage age and life, and elderdom (Hostetler 1974:42; 1983:25; Satterlee 1993).
There are four levels of education in Hutterite Society: kindergarten, German school, Sunday School, and English school, all of which emphasize the Hutterian faith (Bennett 1967; Satterlee 1993:12).

The youngest spend the day in nurseries typically under the care of an elder female member of the colony. Between the ages of 2-1/2 and 5, children attend kindergarten where they begin to learn traditional Hutterite songs, folk games, and proverbs; nursery rhyme books are provided as a supplement. During kindergarten, "cooperative relations are emphasized and competitive relations are severely suppressed" (Deets 1975:42-43).

Between ages 6 and 15 children attend English school and German school. In English school they are taught reading, writing, arithmetic, and social studies using state-approved texts. In German School they are taught the German language and the religious tenets of the Hutterite Brethren. Sunday school, for ages 6-20, prepares young people for baptism (Satterlee 1993:14).

After age 15 and prior to baptism, individuals are referred to as youth and enter a transitional period where work details are few, and institutionalized education is considered completed. During this time, some youth leave the colony to experiment with life outside the colony, but most "return to enter the next stage in the family life cycle--baptism and full adult acceptance and participation" (Satterlee 1993:11). Marriage and admission into the Hutterite church do not occur until they have professed the Hutterite faith and are baptized (at age 19-20 for girls, 20-26 for boys) (Satterlee 1993:11).

Each colony provides a school house and teachers are typically brought in from outside the colony. Because education has traditionally ended at age 15 or grade eight for Hutterites, they cannot qualify for state certification as teachers. In South Dakota today, however, four colonies have their own certified Hutterite "English" teachers who have, through self-instruction and attendance at a local Mennonite college, passed certification requirements (Satterlee 1993:13).

The elders within the colonies may retire when they so choose, at which time they do as they choose. Many of them serve on the Council of Elders while either working part-time in the fields or gardens, helping in the nursery, or taking up hobbies such as sewing, or broom-making. They are not required to perform any tasks (Jim Satterlee, South Dakota State University, personal communication, 1993).

Within Hutterite Society these age-grades can easily be identified. For example, after marriage, males grow beards.
Women wear head kerchiefs and bulging skirts of different colors to portray their marital status.

Marriage

Marriage is permitted with the explicit consent of the parents and the colony church (Hostetler 1983). The minister within each colony maintains kinship charts to alleviate confusion over marriage partner selection. Endogamy, or marriage within one's own Leut, or "people," is preferred (Hostetler and Huntington 1967:3) and post-marital residence is patrilocal, i.e., in the residence of the husband's parents. Marriages are conducted only on certain Sundays (Satterlee 1993:11). Formal dissolution of marriages is rare or non-existent.

Death and Vital Statistics

For Hutterites, death is not a grieving experience, but rather a celebration of birth to eternal life and a reward for a life filled with tribulation and pain (Stephenson 1992; Satterlee 1993:12).

The Hutterite colonies have maintained high birth rates and low death rates resulting in continued population increases with the men generally living longer than the women (Satterlee 1993:12). Early 1920s data reveal birth rates to have been 44 per 1,000 population and death rates 8 per 1,000 at that time (Deets 1975:13-14). Hutterite families are generally large. Average family size has ranged from 5.9 in 1931, to 10.2 in the 1960s, to 6.7 in the 1990s (Deets 1975:12; Satterlee 1993:14; Jim Satterlee, South Dakota State University, personal communication, 1993).

Medical Issues

Medically, the Hutterites are a sophisticated people (Eaton and Mayer 1954:49). They seek medical advice and services from state facilities, clinics, and hospitals. Local hospitals and clinics have replaced the traditional role of the midwife.

Birth control is a major factor affecting the demographic pattern of Hutterite Society. Birth control is considered a sin and medical advice against pregnancy is viewed with concern (Eaton and Mayer 1954).

Medical practices and attitudes toward medicine and insurance among the Hutterites are little known in general. Eaton and Weil (1955) provide somewhat dated information on culture and mental disorders among the Hutterite populations (Eaton and Weil 1955).

Living Quarters
Stability characterizes the Hutterites' use of space for living purposes:

What gives a Hutterite identity is not the place he has lived, nor having lived in one or many places, but rather that in spite of geographic moves the pattern of his life has always been the same, even to the floor plan of his house and the position of his home relative to that of his neighbors. (Hostetler and Huntington 1967:21)

The families within the colonies live in separate apartments within "longhouses" or they live in newer apartment buildings. The traditional longhouse contained four apartments each with a separate entrance; each apartment has three rooms and a simple wash basin. For most colonies, wash rooms were not existent within apartments until after 1955, as few colonies had running water in their apartments. Furnishings are generally sparse. The main room (entrance room) of the apartments contains a table, straight chairs, and a cupboard for a few dishes. The bedrooms contain double beds, day beds, chests and cribs. The dining hall is separate.

Consumptuary rules are limited. Meals within the colony are prepared first for the adults and then for the children; children dine in a separate dining room. There is no talking and consumption is quick so members can get back to their activities. A typical Hutterite table offers four to five different main courses, bread, and dessert. Their diet consists primarily of vegetables, grains, meat, poultry, dumplings, and breads and pies (Jim Satterlee, South Dakota State University, personal communication, 1993).

Other buildings within a colony may include: kindergarten, school house, wash house, kitchen and bakery, root and wine cellar, shop for carpentry, bookbinding, cabinet making, broom making, and shoe and harness repair, as well as numerous barns for sheep, cattle, poultry, hogs, and horses (Hostetler 1983).

Records, Publications, and Media

Records are kept by colonies for various reasons. The chief sources of Hutterite traditions are found in two volumes of their history written on a year-by-year basis by their own recorders. These two volumes are the Grosse Geschicht-Buch or Great Chronicle and the Kleine Geschicht-Buch or Little Chronicle (Deets 1975:5). Kinship charts are kept by the ministers, as well as vital statistics. Hutterite archives also contain business records, and some individuals keep diaries and intimate correspondence. All of these records are written in German long-hand script (Deets 1975; Jim Satterlee, South Dakota State University, personal communication, 1993).
The primary printed material from outside the colonies are brochures or technical bulletins used by the patriarchy to obtain information on certain farming techniques, etc. Other "outside" literature is found only infrequently in the colonies. A colony may subscribe to a newspaper or magazine, such as The Pathfinder, but they are rarely circulated (Deets 1975). Televisions are a rarity and radio and telephones are operated only by the colony or farm manager and by the minister to obtain information on markets, weather, and other pragmatic matters (Jim Satterlee, South Dakota State University, personal communication, 1993).

One recent publication that reached the South Dakota colonies, which was published by the Arnold Leut (see below) in New York and Pennsylvania, was intended to recruit new converts to colonies in the East, which it successfully did (Jim Satterlee, South Dakota State University, personal communication, 1993). In fact, the influence of the eastern colonies, The Arnold Leut, has had very recent impact on Roland Colony in Broockings County. Four or five families in South Dakota converted to the Arnold Leut in June of 1993, resulting in Roland Colony making attempts to send their children to public schools past the eighth grade as an incentive to stop more from converting (Jim Satterlee, South Dakota State University, personal communication, 1993).

Generally, Hutterite colonies experience very little defection by their members. Of those who do defect, approximately 80 percent return. Spouses from outside the colony who marry defectors do not return with them to live the colony (Satterlee 1993:7-8).

Political Action

The Hutterites are generally passive in political matters, and seldom, if ever, participate in public elections outside their colony (Jim Satterlee, South Dakota State University, personal communication, 1993). Legal affairs are administered through a non-Hutterite attorney hired by the colony. Representatives attend public school board meetings simply to keep informed about educational developments that may affect schools within the colonies. Most colonies file individual tax returns for each member (Janzen 1984:22; Jim Satterlee, South Dakota State University, personal communication, 1993).

Clothing

Traditionally, clothing was spun either of wool or flax. Natural wood dyes were used to variously color fabrics. Today, much of the clothing is made with cloth purchased in bulk from outside the colony. Women still wear long, patterned dresses or skirts and head covers. They have long hair combed Hutterite style which they seldom cut. Men traditionally wore dark-colored wool trousers, coats, and suspenders, which are now only used for sacred events such as weddings, baptisms, and church services.
They prefer to wear pre-made denim overalls for daily labor and recreational activity. Gingerich (1978) reviews changes in Hutterite attire through time.

Management Considerations

An increase of tourism in the vicinity of Hutterite colonies—such as may result from development of the Niobrara/Missouri National Scenic Riverways—may well have an impact upon them. This impact may be especially profound at Old Bon Homme Colony, the first established and oldest Hutterite colony in the United States, as it borders Lewis and Clark Lake in Bon Homme County, South Dakota. An increase in the number of visitors to the NIMI region may conflict with the Hutterites' traditional desire for privacy and isolation from non-Hutterites.

Hutterite families tend to be relatively large, and the practice of birth control is discouraged. Consequently, the population of Hutterite colonies grows until the capacity of the colony's land to support that population is taxed. When that maximum population size is reached, generally around 150 people, a splintering or budding process occurs, whereby some of the families take up residence elsewhere and form a daughter colony. This constant process has led to the proliferation of Hutterite colonies in the Northern Plains of the United States and Canada, where about 365 colonies exist today (Satterlee:4). Although only one colony, the original Bon Homme Colony, exists today within NIMI, other colonies may form in or near NIMI in the future.

The primary concerns for the Hutterites at Bon Homme Colony today are 1) erosion along the shoreline of the lake as many colony buildings are located close to the edge of the lake, and 2) continued privacy and isolation from outsiders, as government land is only a few feet from many of the colony buildings.

Establishing contact with the colonies is difficult as the Hutterites prefer to remain isolated and are wary of anyone who is non-Hutterian, especially people with whom they have not previously established relations. Contacts may be made, however, through individuals who have worked with Hutterite communities in the past and thus have established some form of relationship with them, such as Dr. James Satterlee of the Department of Rural Sociology, South Dakota State University, Brookings. Dr. Satterlee has expressed his willingness to mediate for the National Park Service and/or provide names and addresses of key persons to contact within each of the five colonies in or adjacent to NIMI.

Conclusion

The Hutterites in South Dakota represent a utopian society
practicing a form of religious communism, living in colonies and holding all goods and property in common in accordance with a strict interpretation of early Christian teachings. Their religious beliefs can be found in the Chronicle, a written compilation of their doctrine. Their daily life centers on the church, where they attend service each morning and evening, seven days a week. For an account of a non-Hutterite’s experience living within a Hutterite colony see (Holzach 1993).

There is no land in Nebraska owned by the Hutterites today. The only known past land holding by the Hutterites in Nebraska was along the Missouri River: "In 1950 however, they sold these land holdings to a private owner leaving all of their remaining landholdings on the South Dakota side of the Missouri River" (Blakeslee and O’Shea 1983:131). The location and extent of these pre-1950 land holdings in Nebraska are unknown, but they were probably adjacent to the present-day Bon Homme Colony on the Nebraska side of the Missouri River (Donald J. Blakeslee, Wichita State University, personal communication, 1993).

The only known incident of Hutterite displacement occurred in the 1940s as a consequence of the construction of Gavin’s Point Dam:

The United States government acquired through condemnation approximately 2,500 acres of bottomland and some upland. The Bon Homme colony lost a sawmill used to produce lumber for both domestic use and for sale, and they lost an orchard, hog lots, cattle feedlots, a winter grazing pasture, and about 1,000 acres of cultivated land. There was also a mill used to stone grind grain into flour which burned down before their land dispute was settled but the stonework of the mill, which remained after the fire, was inundated by water. (Blakeslee and O’Shea 1983:131-132)

The mill had been built in 1875 with the help of two other religious groups. The Harmony Society (the Rappites) of Pennsylvania loaned $6,000 for that purpose, and the Amish of the Amana Colonies in Iowa contributed labor (Deets 1939:49; Conkin 1964:56; Blakeslee and O’Shea 1983:132). Historical photos of the mill and other buildings in the Bon Homme Colony have been published in a brief interpretive booklet on Lewis and Clark Lake (Smithsonian Institution n.d.:22-23).

Two memorials commemorate Hutterian immigration, having been dedicated by Mennonites in South Dakota. They are located north of NIMIT, near the town of Freeman in Hutchinson County, South Dakota. A memorial erected in 1974 to commemorate the centennial of Mennonite and Hutterian immigration is located along Highway 81 at the northeast edge of Freeman, and another centennial Hutterite memorial, also erected in 1974, can be viewed at the Neu Hutterthaler Church one mile west and three miles north of...
The Hutterites represent a remarkably successful agrarian adaptation to the Plains environment. Although they have been culturally conservative and stable over a period spanning more than 400 years, and have maintained a pattern of life little influenced by the world around them, they have been receptive to and taken advantage of advances in agricultural technology. As a result, they have achieved a substantial degree of prosperity while preserving an economical lifestyle (USDI 1981:section 7, page 1).

The well-organized, virtually self-sufficient, and well-disciplined Hutterites are an excellent model for providing more with less in a time when competition for resources and the move toward urbanization are on the rise:

Diversification of enterprises and self-sufficiency are the central objectives of the Hutterite economy. (Eaton 1943:223)

Finally, the capacity of the Hutterites to resist change has been extremely successful:

Without aid or relief, public or private, Hutterites in South Dakota have remained solvent taxpayers in a state in which one-third of the population has been on relief, in which seventy-five per cent of the banks have failed, and in which taxes have become delinquent on approximately one third of the taxable land. (Deets 1975:1)
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CHAPTER 22

CZECHS

By Michelle Watson

Introduction

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, thousands of Czech immigrants arrived in the Central Plains to make new lives for themselves. These Czechs primarily sought individual freedom and an opportunity to prosper economically (Garver 1980), but many also sought political and religious freedom, as their history was characterized by the continual loss and re-gaining of their cultural identity (Murphy n.d.:ii).

As the former Czechoslovakia became very densely populated, the economy weakened, land became scarce, and families could no longer support themselves. Their government was also without the means with which to help them, which resulted in mass immigration to the United States after the 1848 revolution in Prague (Solle 1993:142). This emigration from the "Czech Lands" was precipitated by relaxed emigration laws in Bohemia and Moravia in 1867 (Ron Dobry, Verdigre, Nebraska, personal communication, 1993).

The Czechs who immigrated to the United States came from that part of Europe that constitutes the modern "Czech Lands," settled first by tribes of Celtic people, (called the Boii in the first century B.C.), then Germanic, and finally Slavic tribes over the course of hundreds of years (Hrbková 1919:140; Rosický 1929).

Upon settling on the Plains of Nebraska and South Dakota, beginning in 1867, the Czechs re-created their ethnic identity while experiencing the processes of assimilation into "American" culture. Today, Czechs in the United States are experiencing yet another revival of their Czech Heritage (Murphy n.d.) which can be seen through the numerous Czech festivals held each year throughout the United States, and in the desire for a revival of Czech language in the educational systems in towns like Verdigre, Nebraska (Mila Šašková-Pierce, Department of Modern Languages, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, personal communication, 1993).

The Czech people took their name from Slavic immigrants in the sixth century who called themselves Czechs (echs) after their leader who was named ech. The term "Bohemian" is not used by Czechs in reference to themselves because it refers to an ethnic group of Celtic people. In addition, the term "Bohemian"
originated from the French word *boheme* (meaning gypsy), and mistakenly refers to Czechs as gypsies. To refer to a Czech as a "Czechoslovak" is misleading and incorrect because the Slovaks are yet another branch of Slavs (Rosický 1929:19-21).

**Czech Immigration**

The surges in Czech emigration to the United States coincided with the 1848 revolution in Prague, and continued through the end of World War I (Murphy n.d.). After 1865, a fairly constant flow of Czech immigrants settled in the rich lands of the Missouri and Niobrara River valleys until after World War I (1930); approximately 75 percent of these Czech immigrants settled in Nebraska (Svejda 1967:18). During this time, there were more first-generation Czech farmers in Nebraska than in any other state (Rosický 1929).

Czech immigration to South Dakota began in 1869 and continued until 1914, though the total scope of Czech immigration to South Dakota was relatively small in comparison to other ethnic groups.

Several factors combined to draw Czech settlers into Nebraska and South Dakota. Czech colonization clubs were organized, sparsely populated land was available, and numerous Czech publications promoted Czech immigration.

Czech colonization clubs were formed circa 1867 to prearrange settlements for new Czech immigrants that would be compatible to their homelands (Richards 1981:258). Thus, Nebraska and South Dakota were selected for settlement by Czechs. The Niobrara River valley was particularly favored because of the abundance of agriculturally rich land (Ron Dobry, Verdigre, Nebraska, personal communication, 1993).

In addition to colonization clubs, Czech newspapers like the *Pokrok Západu*, which means "progress of the west," were abundant for the purpose of providing reliable leadership and critical information about state and federal laws, politics, civics, current events, potential employment, and land availability (Hrbková 1919:152-155; Rosický 1929). The *Pokrok Západu* was first published in Omaha in 1871 and was sold in 1920 to the *Weekly Hlasatel* of Chicago, Illinois (Rosický 1929:385). In Nebraska, there were some 20 Czech newspapers published simultaneously which included both dailies and weeklies (Švejda 1967:19):

Between January 1860 and the spring of 1911, 326 Czech newspapers and journals (predominantly weeklies) were published. (Svoboda 1976:161)

It is estimated that in 1900 about 150,000 Czechs subscribed to
one Czech-language newspaper or another (Šašková-Pierce 1993:209). Today there are four Czech-language newspapers still published in the United States in Czech. They are the esko-
Slovenský Týdeník, Hlas Národa, Hospodá and the Hlassatel, all of which are published in the East and circulated nationally (Joseph Svoboda, Lincoln, Nebraska, personal communication, 1993).

In addition to newspapers, numerous booklets and pamphlets were published to encourage emigration. "How is it in America?", and the Hospodá, an agricultural journal established in 1891, were published in Omaha by Jan Rosický. Rosický assisted promotional efforts by advertising, in the Hospodá in 1904, those lands available under the new Kinkaid Act (Murphy n.d.:18-19).

Czech Settlements Near NIMI

Some of the first Czech settlers in Nebraska settled in counties other than those within the NIMI region. Between 1856 and 1916, some 5,000 Czech immigrants settled permanently in Nebraska (Svoboda 1976:153; 1993:109).

Near NIMI, however, one of the first en masse moves, occurred when more than 800 Czech settlers arrived in Knox County, Nebraska, in 1869. By 1938, Verdigre, a town in Knox County, was the center of Czech settlement in the region with some 90 percent of its inhabitants being of Czech descent (Van Hoff 1938:2). Another group made up almost entirely of "Freethinkers" settled in Pischelville (USDI 1981). Most of these expeditions were prearranged through the Czech colonization clubs in Chicago. The Niobrara colony was established in 1870. This settlement was successful until floods in 1880-1881 forced it to be moved. In 1978 the town was moved a second time due to more flooding; only remnants remained. Other towns established by Czech immigrants in Knox County include: Armstrong, Bloomfield, Creighton, Crofton, Dukeville, Jelen, Knoxville, Ruth, Sparta, Verdel, Walnut, and Wineetoon (Ku era and Nová ek 1967:106).

Additional settlements include the following towns in their respective counties: (Some of the spellings used here are different from the spellings used by Ku era and Nová ek 1967)

Boyd County: Butte, Gross, Lynch, Monowi, Naper, Spencer;
Cedar County: Coleridge, Hartington;
Cherry County: Crookston, Eli, Kilgore, Nenzel, Wood Lake;
Dixon County: Newcastle;
Rock County: Bassett;
Keya Paha County: Carns, Norden, Pekin;
Holt County: O'Neill, Atkinson, Stuart, Dorsey,
One of the first Czech colonies in South Dakota was established in 1869 just west of the territorial capital city of Yankton. By 1914 Czech settlements had expanded into western Yankton County, eastern Bon Homme County, and, later, Charles Mix and Gregory counties (USDI 1981). Other Czech settlements include i kov, Tábor, Tyndall, Lesterville, and Lakeport (Rosický 1929; Kura and Nová ek 1967). By 1930 the Czechs made up approximately 1.5 percent of the total state population, a relatively small proportion when compared to other states where Czechs settled (USDI 1981). Among these numerous Czech settlements, Lakeport and Tábor, located in Yankton and Bon Homme counties, are particularly important with respect to the Czech presence in the NIMI region.

During the summer of 1869, the vanguard of a fairly heavy Bohemian immigration arrived in the locality of Lakeport, seven miles west of Yankton along the Fort Randall military road. These settlers were identified with a colonization society formed in Chicago and eastern cities to establish Czech colonies in western states and territories. They were soon joined by compatriots who began to occupy claims from Lakeport west into Bon Homme County. The first trading center was i kov [sic], established in 1870. Tábor, established two years later, eventually became the center of the Czech settlement. (Schell 1975:116)

Tábor, South Dakota, organized in 1872, served as the center for Czech immigration and has remained an important Czech community. The residents of Tábor continue to promote Czech traditions through Czech language instruction, ethnic festivals, and sponsorship of trips to the "Czech Lands" (USDI 1981).

**Czech Societies and Fraternal Organizations**

Many fraternal, religious, and economic organizations were formed by Czech immigrants in the United States as a way of reinforcing their identity and cultural solidarity. These have been one of the primary means by which Czech language and customs have been preserved over more than a century.

The Czech immigrants who established themselves in Nebraska and South Dakota were largely agrarian. Equipped with excellent agricultural skills they had learned as peasant farmers in the "Czech lands", they flourished and became model farmers throughout Nebraska and South Dakota (Murphy n.d.:32). Even so, homesteading in the Plains provided great contrast to life in the "Czech Lands." The farmsteads in the "Czech Lands" were clustered into small villages comprised of cottages, whereas they lived on isolated family farms on the Plains (Kuták 1970:9-10). As a result, their whole concept of community changed. This
isolation and their innate skepticism of formalized religion and secret societies resulted in the organization of numerous open Czech sodalities. Some did, however, practice the formal Protestant or Catholic faiths while most professed themselves "Freethinkers" (Garver 1980), who believed in God but rejected the testimony of revelation and would not conform to formalized, authoritative religion because of the persecution they suffered in their homelands (Dubovický 1993:197-201). Two of the "freethinking" fraternal and social organizations were the esko-Slovanský Podporující Spolek (SPS) and the Západní esko Bratřská Jednotá (Z BJ) (USDI 1993). Among the other societies they organized were civic organizations, self-improvement societies, temperance unions, and reading circles, all of which worked to promote the understanding of Czechs in America, to preserve the Czech heritage, language, and traditions, and to supplement the activities of local religious organizations (Schell 1961:184).

Among the first Czech lodges to be established in the United States were the esko-Slovanský Podporující Spolek (SPS) also known as the Czech-Slovonic Protective Society, and the Západní esko Bratřská Jednotá (Z BJ), or the Western Bohemian Fraternal Union. Together, these two organizations were comprised of hundreds of lodges throughout the United States (Hrbková 1919:147; Svoboda 1976:159). The Czech-Slovonic Protective Society, a fraternal lodge, was established in St. Louis in 1854 to offer inexpensive insurance protection to its members (Láška 1978:13). This society flourished until its members in the western states were dissatisfied with the high costs due to benefits being paid to industrial workers in the east, resulting in the Western Bohemian Fraternal Association being organized in 1897 in Omaha, Nebraska (Rosický 1929:356). Today, this organization is the Western Fraternal Life Insurance Association, which offers life insurance to anyone who will pay the premiums. The Association also promotes and supports Czech festivals and events nationwide (Joseph Svoboda, Lincoln, Nebraska, personal communication, 1993). In 1876 the Czech Farmers Mutual Aid Society in Nebraska was formed to provide insurance against damage to crops. The first and only society of its kind in the state of Nebraska (Pavou ek 1967:306), it originated in Dodge County under Joseph Hanzl and existed until 1893, playing an extremely important role in the lives of Nebraska Czech settlers. This organization, as well as the above mentioned organizations, offered life and illness insurance to Czech immigrants who, because they were not fluent in English, were not allowed to join English-speaking insurance organizations (Rosický 1929:351-352; Svoboda 1976:159).

The Sokols (meaning falcon), were nonprofit gymnastics organizations joined by virtually all Czech people until they reached age 30. The first Sokol organization in the United States was formed in St. Louis in 1865. Sokol halls and
fraternal lodges housed many cultural events (e.g. gymnastics shows, plays, dances, drama, singing circles, town meetings). A primary slogan for Sokol has been "A sound mind in a sound body" (Pavouk 1967:299).

The Reading and Benevolent Society, organized in 1873, promoted the Czech language and Czech cultural traditions. It was disbanded in 1875, but transferred its funds to the Klicpera Dramatic Club which was organized in 1874 in Omaha, Nebraska (Kuera 1979:13).

The Czechs brought with them a deep and rich dedication to their native Czech traditions which can still today be seen in their music, drama, dancing, gymnastics, etc., all of which were upheld and strengthened through education. High standards in education were of primary importance. The University of Nebraska was the first state university in the United States to establish a department of Czech; this was accomplished in 1907 (Kuera and Nová 1976:55). A Comenius Club was founded through the university in the early 1900s to further promote Czech cultural heritage in communities throughout the country. By 1918 there were some 29 clubs in a six state area, 13 of which were in Nebraska. The organization’s name is derived from Jan Amos Komenský (Comenius), a world-renowned teacher (Kuera and Nová 1976:21, 55, 61-63; Šašková-Pierce 1993:211).

The Czech dedication to drama, singing, and dance can be seen through their promotion of countless theatrical activities throughout the country. A stage for theatrical activity was built in almost every Czech Hall, which were found in every Czech settlement. Halls with stages can still be found today in towns throughout Nebraska settled by Czechs (e.g., Niobrara and Verdigre). The Czech Heritage Preservation Society, Inc., was organized in Tábor, Nebraska, in 1961 to perform plays throughout Nebraska (Mila Šašková-Pierce, Department of Modern Languages, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, personal communication, 1993). The most popular Czech drama today is the "Pageant of the Czech People" (Kuera 1979:17), and the Czech national dance, the Beseda, is still performed to celebrate their heritage at annual "Czech Days" celebrations in Tábor, South Dakota (Richards 1981:260), and elsewhere.

There are local Czech lodges that are no longer active like the Lodge Hall Sladovský in Pishelville (established in 1884), but many of the Czech lodges throughout Nebraska and South Dakota are still active (Joseph Svoboda, Lincoln, Nebraska, personal communication, 1993). Near the NIMI region in South Dakota, are the following Czech Halls:

Hv zda Západu No. 41 - Tábor
Star of South Dakota - Utica
Pravda No. 80 - Tyndall
Near the NIMI region in Nebraska, are the following Halls:

Bílá Hora No. 5 - Verdigre
Vyšehrad No. 53 - Niobrara
Karlin Jr. No. 342 - Spencer
Sladkovský No. 8 - Verdigre
Lipany No. 56 - Lynch

In addition to activities sponsored by the local lodges, the Western Fraternal Life Association sponsors over 20 festivals annually in Nebraska (Mila Šašková-Pierce, Department of Modern Languages, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, personal communication, 1993). Through these festivals, the Czech people have an opportunity to share some of their traditional Czech foods. Among the favorite Czech dishes are "duck, dumplings, kraut and kolacky (a Bohemian tart, fruit-filled pastry), bologna, wiener's, roast pork, poppyseed rolls, rye bread, apple strudel and housky (a braided Bohemian bread)" (Rood 1985:77).

Finally, in towns like Tábor and Verdigre, remnants of abandoned Czech lifeways and economic pursuits can be found (i.e., buildings associated with brick making, creameries, cigar factories, blacksmith shops, printing shops, barber shops, theaters, employment by railroads, fraternal lodges, etc.) (see Verdigre Diamond Jubilee, Inc. 1962).

The town of Verdigre is a representative example of Czech ethnic heritage and culture, as many vernacular structures remain that are reminiscent of the Czech people. The Verdigre flour mill, built in 1890, has been moved from its original place near the Niobrara River into the center of Verdigre where it has been well preserved. The Bílá Hora Lodge, also known as the Z BJ Opera House (established 1903) in downtown Verdigre, sponsors annual events, monthly meetings, county-wide activities, and more (Dobry 1987). Traditional card games like Darda and Taroky are still played by some of the male elders in the community of Verdigre. The Verdigre brass band still plays traditional Czech arrangements each Wednesday night in the town park. "Kolache (Kolá ky) Days" events each July include a queen selection, alumni gathering, parade, carnival, dance, music, etc., all of which are traditional Czech events. The women of Verdigre keep active in numerous organizations, including sewing clubs which are organized through the county extension office. Some of them also bake home-made kolaches (Kolá ky) to sell in local Verdigre shopping marts. The Verdigre Heritage Museum houses literature
and photographs on Czech history and artifacts of Czech culture, past and present. In addition, the Upper Missouri Chamber of Commerce (including the counties of Antelope, Knox, Pierce, and Holt) is working to promote the conservation of "ethnic identity" through grants to communities to develop their own heritage preservation projects (Ron Dobry, Verdigre, Nebraska, personal communication, 1993). The citizens of Verdigre are attempting to further promote the Czech heritage through Czech language workshops, local and national Czech publications, improved employment opportunities with local industries that might keep youth in the area, and the like (Jack Kotrous, Verdigre, Nebraska, personal communication, 1993).

In conclusion, there are extant physical remains (historical places) of the Czech presence throughout the NIMI region. Some of these have been nominated to the National Register of Historic Places, while others are under consideration for the Register as they are considered potentially eligible properties (see Franklin, Grant, and Hunt 1994; Gilchrist 1989:26, 82, 84; additional current information is available in the State Historic Preservation Offices of Nebraska and South Dakota). The latest comprehensive published list of National Register properties in the nation lists no less than 14 separate properties in Bon Homme County, South Dakota, alone that represent historic Czech folk architecture. Additionally, some 50,000 buildings are listed in the Nebraska Historic Buildings Program, some of which may potentially reflect the historical presence of Czechs (Joni Gilkerson, Nebraska State Historical Society, personal communication, 1993).

The number of vernacular structures remaining within the region is fairly extensive and includes many privately-owned structures such as farm buildings, homes, churches (Ku era 1974), cemeteries (Ku era and Novaček 1972), flour mills, lodges, and theaters. An especially notable Czech property is the Pechan Farmstead, in Yankton County, which "represents the best example in the study area of a significant ethnic architectural type, the Czech vernacular house/barn" (USDI 1993:100).
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CHAPTER 23

FRENCH-CANADIANS

By Michelle Watson

In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries many people of French descent traveled into the Missouri River basin with the advance of Euroamerican exploration westward from the Mississippi River, many working in various capacities in the fur trade (Hartley and Smith 1983). According to the authors of Dakota Panorama, as quoted from History of South Dakota by Herbert S. Schell, "Probably four-fifths of the trappers and hunters [in the fur trade] were of French nationality" (Jennewein and Boorman 1961:120).

Most of these people had only a transient presence, but in the mid-nineteenth century other people of French descent settled along the Missouri River valley. They were primarily French-Canadians who began to develop small communities in and along the river valley. Their settlements were not purely "French," however; they were comprised of French, American Indians, and French-Canadians, as well as people of mixed blood (United States Department of Interior [USDI] 1981).

The only identified French-Canadian settlement within the NIMI study area is an area known as the "French Settlement" in Union County, South Dakota. It was established in the 1850s by a group of French-Canadian fur traders and farmers (USDI 1981). Some of these original French-Canadians came from the province of Quebec, Canada, and New England (Berthoff 1971:322, 325), while others came either directly from France, the Canadian province of Ontario, or the states of Michigan and Wisconsin (Jennewein and Boorman 1961:121). Before traveling west to the Missouri they established a very successful Roman Catholic settlement in Debuque, Iowa, the location of a large Catholic diocese (Mike Bedeau, South Dakota State Historical Society [SDSHS], Vermillion, personal communication, 1994).

Circa 1859 some of these French-Canadian Catholics once again relocated themselves, only this time in the Union County "French Settlement," an area near the present-day community of Jefferson, South Dakota (USDI 1981). This settlement was new; unlike many other Western towns, it had not earlier been a military fort or fur trading post (Jennewein and Boorman 1961:121).

The first post office of the "French Settlement" was named Willow, later being changed to Adelscat before finally being named Jefferson (USDI 1981). According to Bedeau, these settlers
brought in construction supplies from Sioux City so they did not have to depend upon local resources. Most of the original settlers were land-owning farmers, while a few made at least some of their livelihood by trading pelts until the commercial fur trade declined because of the depletion of fur-bearing animal populations, as well as rapid colonization and homesteading along the Missouri River, which resulted in the founding of Union County in 1862. The "French Settlement" is said to have contained 25 French-Canadian and three Irish families (USDI 1981). Today, Jefferson remains one of two communities in South Dakota that has a significant French population (Jennewein and Boorman 1961; Mike Bedeau, SDSHS, Vermillion, personal communication, 1994), the other being Turton in Spike County.

There is only one remaining building in Jefferson that is identified with these French-Canadian settlers, the St. Peter's Catholic Church, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (Mike Bedeau, SDSHS, Vermillion, personal communication, 1994). According to the National Register nomination form for the church (USDI 1981):

...the second Catholic church in the territory was a log structure erected at Jefferson in 1862. It was located just to the north of the present St. Peter's Catholic Church...on February 22, 1867, the Catholic residents at Jefferson became the first Catholic mission organized and founded in southern Dakota. (USDI 1981)

In 1869, "the parish obtained the services of a French-speaking Canadian priest, Fr. R. Boucher" (USDI 1981), and during the same year they erected yet another, second church named St. Peter's. It was Father Boucher who responded to the grasshopper plagues of the 1860s and 1870s by arranging, in 1876 (Jennewein and Boorman 1961:122), a 13-mile religious pilgrimage that began at the church cemetery. It extended two miles west of Jefferson to the Montagne farm and six miles north of the church to the Morin farm, returning to the cemetery. Three "Grasshopper Crosses" were erected to mark the triangular route (USDI 1981).

It is unknown where the original crosses are today. The church, however, erected three new crosses in the 1970s approximating the location of the original crosses. Each cross is accompanied by a state historical society highway style marker (Mike Bedeau, SDSHS, Vermillion, personal communication, 1994).

The pilgrimages were sporadically continued until 1933, and renewed once again circa 1989 in connection with the South Dakota Centennial Celebration (USDI 1981). The tradition continues as this celebrated pilgrimage is conducted annually around Memorial Day.

The St. Peter's Catholic Church that exists today (the third
of that name in Jefferson) was built in 1891 (USDI 1981). The church eventually served not only French-Canadians, but Irish, Germans, Norwegians, and other ethnic groups as well (USDI 1981). The parish continues to serve a congregation of some 250 families (Rectory Supervisor, St. Peter's Catholic Church, Jefferson, South Dakota, personal communication, 1994), many of whom are descended from the original founders of the community (USDI 1981:3). Even though the church has undergone some changes of interior decor, it continues to retain "most of its original architectural integrity. In excellent condition, it remains a tribute to those French-Canadians who settled the region" (USDI 1981:3).

In conclusion, the "French Settlement" in Union County, South Dakota, is the only area that has been attributed to French-Canadian settlement in or near NIMI. However, there have been no systematic studies done of French-Canadian settlement in either South Dakota or Nebraska, so the possibility exists that other concentrations of French-Canadian-descended people are located in these states (Frederick Luebke, Department of History, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, personal communication, 1994).
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CHAPTER 24

MORMONS

Michelle Watson

Introduction

With the advent of Euro-Americans heading west came various religious sects as well. One religious group historically associated with NIMI is the Mormons who established themselves in "winter quarters" near present-day Vermillion and Niobrara before heading further west toward the Rocky Mountains. The Mormons were first documented in the area in 1846 and are still present within and near NIMI today. Mormons today represent approximately one percent of the total population of the state of South Dakota (over 7,700 members) and approximately just under one percent of the total population of the state of Nebraska (some 14,000 members) (Michael Hunter, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Historical Department, personal communication, 1993).

The Mormons are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, founded in New York State in 1830 by Joseph Smith (1805-1844), at the completion of his translation of the Book of Mormon (Hinckley 1979:29). Mormons today are largely located in Utah. Their impact within NIMI is difficult to determine as there are no particular traditional Mormon settlement patterns. The following is a brief account of their history, journey, and their settlement, however brief and limited, in and near the NIMI study area.

History

Fleeing religious persecution, some of Smith's followers, migrated westward, establishing themselves in 1831 in Kirtland, Ohio, where one of the first Mormon temples was built (Hinckley 1979:29). Mormonism continued to grow and spread into Missouri and Illinois with the church, or Zion, headquarters being relocated to Independence, Missouri.

In 1844, Smith's arrest was forced by antipolygamist Mormons, and while he was being held in jail he was murdered by a mob (Jones 1971:120; Bennett 1985; Arrington 1992). It is likely that the persecution of polygamy-practicing Mormons was fueled by their prosperity and political power, by their self-assurance, and by their practice of polygyny.

After Smith's death, Mormonism continued under the...
leadership of Brigham Young who led an exodus of Mormons to Utah during the period of 1846-1847, and successfully sent missionaries to bring converts to Salt Lake City. The migrations of the converts were basically successful but not without suffering hardships on the journey to Utah (Hafen and Hafen 1960). During these migrations, some of the Mormons established winter quarters in and near the NIMI study area under the leadership of James Emmet and Newel Knight.

Mormons at Fort Vermillion, 1845-1846

The first of two Mormon settlements in what is now South Dakota was a camp of some 90 to 130 Mormons under the leadership of James Emmet, one of the Twelve Apostles of the Mormon Council. After the death of Joseph Smith in 1844, Emmet directed this expedition from Illinois in search of a new settlement away from persecution. They made camp at Fort Vermillion, an American Fur Company trading post on the Missouri ten miles below the mouth of the Vermillion River, between 1845 and 1846. A post of declining economic importance to the American Fur Company, Fort Vermillion was described as "a very miserable little place" by one visitor in 1843, two years prior to the Mormons' arrival (Sunder 1965:65). According to one authority, Emmet acted without the church's authority (Bennett 1985:220), but according to another source (Jones 1971), this expedition was deliberately sent by Young to establish good relations with Native Americans; they were to keep their intentions quiet from other Anglo-Saxon immigrants along the way (Jones 1971:123-124). Authorized or not, the expedition went forward. Upon arrival in Vermillion they were met by traders and Native Americans who escorted them to the trading post, Fort Vermillion, where they stayed until the next spring. While there, they established friendly relations with the Pawnee and the Ponca (Bennett 1985) despite warnings to fall back within the boundaries of Missouri by Thomas H. Harvey, Superintendent of Indian Affairs at St. Louis (Jones 1971:128). In the spring of 1846 the camp received its final instruction to join other Saints traveling down the Missouri toward the Salt Lake valley from Illinois and Iowa, thus leaving behind Fort Vermillion.

Mormons at the Ponca Village near Niobrara, 1846-1847

During the winter of 1846-1847, the Mormons had another experience within NIMI while on their journey West out of Nauvoo, Illinois (Rich 1972:83-96). In late July, 1846, a large party of Mormons were established in a main camp near present-day Omaha, Nebraska, and Council Bluffs, Iowa; it became known as "Winter Quarters." In this same area there were numerous camps made; the entire area became known as the "Saints' Communities" (Rich 1972:88--see map).

One of these camps was under the leadership of Bishop George
Miller and Newel Knight, high councillor and one of the Church's earliest baptized members, respectively. It was on August 7 that they received word from church leaders to make winter quarters near the Pawnee Village on the Platte River and continue the journey West in the spring (Rich 1972:84). While encamped at Pawnee Station (near present-day Columbus or Genoa), the party was invited by visiting Ponca Indians to winter with them at the mouth of the Niobrara River (Fry 1922:5). Consequently, the Knight party (some 65 families and 150-160 wagons) did not make camp at the Pawnee Village but traveled north to the Niobrara River rather than taking the more southerly route along the North Platte (Bennett 1987:151). They were the first "Saints" to leave the camp at Council Bluffs (Mangum 1993), eventually settling temporarily near the Ponca near present-day Niobrara, Nebraska (Jenson 1914):

On August 9, the Saints held a council with a number of Ponca Indians for the purpose of helping the Poncas make peace with the Pawnees, with whom the Poncas had been at war and whom they expected to find there. The Ponca chief invited the Saints to winter with them in their country. . . the council accepted the invitation. (Rich 1972:85)

The Ponca camp, the so-called "Gray-blanket" village which was home to one of two divisions of the Ponca tribe, was located on the Niobrara River about three miles from its confluence with the Missouri River, approximately two miles west and three miles south of the present-day town of Niobrara (Howard 1965:21, 29, 138). The Mormons and the Poncas enjoyed a peaceful and cooperative relationship, and the Saints, called "Monmona" by the Poncas, are fondly remembered in Ponca traditional history (Howard 1965:21, 29-30). The Mormons built a fort of log cabins and Knight, a millwright by trade, chiseled mill burrs out of boulders to grind corn (Anonymous n.d.; Knight 1940:17; Niobrara Bicentennial Committee 1976:5-6).

In addition to building a fort, the Mormons have been given credit by some for digging the "Mormon Canal." This mile-long canal, which still carries water, runs along the west edge of the Niobrara River and is today marked by road signs just outside of the town of Niobrara:

Bishop Miller, leader of the group, prophesied that if they would build a canal and be faithful in planting their crops, they would have so much grain by the time they left that they would not be able to haul it all off. The prophecy was fulfilled, and their accomplishments were great. Today, 1944, fresh water runs in the canal which they built. (Anonymous n.d.)

However, scholars who have researched Newel Knight and his stay
among the Ponca indicate that there is no solid evidence that the
Mormons built this canal (Fry 1922:6). They suggest instead that
the canal name was simply borrowed from the fact of the Mormons’
historical visit to the vicinity (Michael Hunter, The Church of
Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Historical Department,
personal communication, 1993).

As the winter progressed for the Newel Knight party during
1846 and 1847, he and sixteen others died (Fry 1922:5; Hartley
1986:178). Their sickness is blamed on an enormous prairie fire
that broke out on Christmas Day eve resulting in the exposure and
overwork of members of the camp, several of whom were thus
interred in lumber coffins at Ponca adjacent to the Niobrara
River (Rich 1972:86-87). At the instruction of church elders,
the Mormon party returned to Florence, Nebraska (near Omaha), in
the spring of 1847, with travel directions furnished by their
friends, the Poncas (Fry 1922:6; Howard 1965:30). They resumed
their westward trek the following spring (Fry 1922:6).

In 1908 a monument to their memory was erected at the site
of the Ponca Gray-blanket village two miles west and three miles
south of Niobrara along the Niobrara River (Howard 1965:29, 138).
Isaac Riddle, just a young boy at the time the Knight party
wintered with the Ponca, was later sent from Provo, Utah, to
Niobrara to locate any physical remains of the camp (Fry 1922).
Some graves were found but most had been obliterated. The mill
burr Knight chiseled were never located but ashes from
fireplaces that were once in the fort barracks were discovered
(Fry 1922:5; Knight 1940:18). Subsequently, in 1908 the monument
was dedicated by relatives of the Knight family. It stands
several feet tall and bears the names of eleven of the Mormons
who were interred there during the winter of 1846-1847 (Ballard

The Newel Knight Monument is today owned by the Mormon
Church in Utah and maintained by the local branch in Yankton
which is overseen by the Mormon Church Historical Sites Office in
Independence, Missouri (Michael Hunter, The Church of Jesus
Christ of Latter-day Saints, Historical Department, personal
communication, 1993).

Church Doctrine

The Mormon Church began in 1830 when Joseph Smith completed
his translation of the Book of Mormon. It was also Smith, at
Nauvoo, Illinois in 1842, who publicly announced the doctrine of
polygamy; the practice of polygamy was practiced and sanctioned
by the Mormon Church between 1852 and 1890 (Hinckley 1979:129-
135).

The early Mormon Church doctrine diverged from Christian
Orthodoxy in its polytheism, in its affirmation that God evolved
from man and that men might evolve into gods, and in its belief
in the eternal transmigration of souls. Today, The Church of
Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints continues to hold firmly to the
same organization that existed in the early church, that of
apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, evangelists, etc. They
follow the tenets of the Book of Mormon, accept the evolutionary
conceptions of deity and of polytheism, and practice tithing
(giving of money) and baptism (Hinckley 1982).

The practice of adult baptism by immersion occurs at age
eight in a Mormon chapel (stake center or meeting house); anyone
baptized after age eight is considered a convert to Mormonism.
Baptism symbolizes one's faith, purity, and eternal life (Michael
Hunter, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints,
Historical Department, personal communication, 1993).

Proxy baptism is practiced to baptize church members who
become deceased before they are baptized; this takes place in a
Mormon Temple. Other ordinances or rituals that take place after
baptism are laying on of hands, washing, anointing, endowments,
and sealing ceremonies. These rituals in Mormon Faith support
the well-organized patriarchal priesthoods and extend strong
allegiances (Michael Hunter, The Church of Jesus Christ of
Latter-day Saints, Historical Department, personal communication,
1993).

Church Organization

The Mormon Church, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day
Saints, is a hierarchical organization in which exists a
patriarchal system of church government controlled by priests and
other clergy in graded ranks. The Mormon Church has one
president (the prophet), who is advised by two counsellors; these
three men make up the first presidency of the Mormon Church.
Under them are 12 apostles, and under the apostles are two
quorums of seventy priests each (these quorums serve as the
general authorities of the church worldwide). The members of the
first quorum serve for life and the members of the second quorum
serve five-year terms each.

The order is further organized into regions, stakes, and
wards or branches. Within the world regions there are "stakes"
which are symbolic of stakes in a tent; the "stakes" represent
regional central headquarters of the Mormon Church, and
symbolically support the Church just as tent stakes support a
large tent (Michael Hunter, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter­
day Saints, Historical Department, personal communication, 1993).

At the local level the Church "stakes" are further divided
into wards or branches, within which are found the meeting houses
(also known as stake centers or chapels, each of which may have a
kitchen, gymnasium, meeting rooms, and a chapel).
The Mormon "stakes" that encompass the wards and branches in the NIMI study area are the Sioux Falls, South Dakota, Stake, and the Kearney, Nebraska, Stake. Under the Sioux Falls Stake there are thirteen wards or branches encompassing parts of Nebraska, South Dakota, and Iowa: Brookings Ward, Huron Ward, Sioux City Ward, Sioux Falls 1st Ward, Sioux Falls 2nd Ward, Macy Branch, Madison Branch, Marshall Branch, Spencer Branch, St. Lawrence Branch, Wagner Branch, Watertown Branch, and the Yankton Branch. The O'Neill Branch in Holt County, Nebraska, falls under the Kearney Stake. Additionally, if membership within a geographical region is minimal, then a stake will not be established; missions are organized instead. Under the Rapid City, South Dakota, Mission is the Rosebud, South Dakota, District, under which are the Gregory Branch, and the Valentine, Nebraska, Branch (Michael Hunter, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Historical Department, personal communication, 1993).

All Church "stakes" are under the leadership of a stake president, who works with two counsellors and one bishop. Under this organization, and through the church's elaborate welfare plan, the life of the individual Mormon (religious, economic, and social) is closely regulated. The hierarchy meets at the General World Conference of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints held annually each April and again at a semi-annual conference held each October. In addition, regional "stakes" and local wards hold conferences which meet at different times throughout the year.

Ancillary organizations like sunday schools, women's relief societies, mutual improvement associations, and missionary work programs are undertaken by Church members to ensure a wide distribution of responsibility and involvement for all members. Men serve as missionaries for two years, women can serve for 1.5 years, and older couples can choose to serve as missionaries for 1.5 years. The missionaries cover a different geographic area than the "stakes" or wards do. Missions are designed to serve worldwide and in areas where there is not an established church (i.e., stake), or where there is high population density. Men become deacons at age twelve, teachers at age fourteen, priests at age sixteen, and elders at age eighteen. After this they may eventually become high priests and bishops. Because the priesthood is a patriarchy no women may take part.

Women can serve the Church through participation in relief societies, by teaching sunday school, by becoming teachers, or by serving as missionaries for the Church; men participate in all of the above as well. Basically, the status of the individuals is widely diffused while the hierarchy is clear; all is equally under the authority of the church.

Conclusion
In conclusion, the Mormon impact within the NIMI study area is difficult to determine as there are no traditional settlement patterns and no communities or settlements of Mormons exist today. The Mormon Church owns the Mormon Monument near Niobrara, and Mormons currently make up a portion of the populations of Nebraska and South Dakota. The Sioux Falls, South Dakota, Stake is one of the largest stakes in the country with respect to geography (not population), encompassing land in South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, and Minnesota (Michael Hunter, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Historical Department, personal communication, 1993).

The current president of the Sioux Falls, South Dakota, Stake, David Rope, resides in Iowa (Michael Hunter, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Historical Department, personal communication, 1993). The South Dakota Rapid City Mission is responsible for recruitment of new members and for providing welfare and guidance for existing members. The Mission's address is 2525 West Main, Suite 311, Rapid City, South Dakota 57702 (telephone 605-348-1520).
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CHAPTER 25
SCANDINAVIANS
By Michelle Watson

Introduction

The Scandinavians who immigrated to and settled in present-day Nebraska and South Dakota, were primarily seeking economic prosperity. They immigrated directly from Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, many via temporary residence in the eastern United States. As they established themselves in Nebraska and South Dakota, they created some distinct and diverse ethnic enclaves, some of which are within and adjacent to NIMI.

The origination point of these people was Scandinavia, a northern European region comprised of five small nations that share largely interrelated histories. Those nations are Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, and Iceland. For the purposes of this study, however, immigration from Scandinavia will refer only to immigration from the nations of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. Icelanders and Finns are not addressed, primarily because their immigration to Nebraska and South Dakota has been minimal.

Reasons for Emigration from Scandinavia

The earliest Scandinavians to immigrate to the United States were prompted by religious dissatisfaction in the "old country:" the Norwegians began to immigrate in 1825, the Swedes in the 1840s, and the Danes in the 1850s (Derry 1979:231).

While religious dissatisfaction prompted some Scandinavians to emigrate, others emigrated because they were living in near impoverishment for a variety of reasons. Poor harvests resulted in famines (Ostergren 1983:57; Lowell 1987). The traditional practice of primogeniture caused additional economic stress among the younger generations (Jennnewein and Boorman 1961:137). Land was already scarce and early marriages resulting in larger families only further contributed to restricted economic opportunities and increased land pressures throughout Scandinavia (Dowie 1973:48). Thus, the culmination of these factors resulted in decreased employment opportunities in virtually all primary activities (e.g., forestry, fishing, agriculture) causing high rates of emigration (Lowell 1987).

By the mid-nineteenth century, thousands of Scandinavians were immigrating to the United States and elsewhere primarily in search of economic opportunity and prosperity (Berthoff
1971:318), the majority of them being Norwegians (Lowell 1987).
Between 1865 and 1870 one out of every ten immigrants to the
United States was Scandinavian. In 1881 and again in 1901, five
out of every ten immigrants to the United States were
Scandinavian (Derry 1979:255).

In their homelands, the Scandinavians were "divided into
several homogeneous regions and districts" (Lowell 1987:230).
Their settlement in the United States resembled these traditional
settlement patterns, as they formed rather large and stable
homogeneous communities (Ostergren 1983).

However, during the Dakota boom times of the 1880s and the
early 1900s, the religious and cultural homogeneity of these
Scandinavian settlements began to decline as the children of
earlier immigrant families moved to urban areas where employment
opportunities were more abundant; in South Dakota there were
insufficient opportunities due to mass immigration in the latter
part of the nineteenth century (Ostergren 1983). By the 1950s,
the religious and cultural homogeneity of the more than
12,000,000 Americans of Scandinavian descent had disappeared.
These people rapidly assimilated and are today difficult to
distinguish from other ethnic groups (Furer 1972:83, 84).

Norwegian Immigration and Settlement Patterns

Norway was the greatest contributor of immigrants from
Scandinavia: "Norway has sent a larger per cent of its
population to America than any other country excepting Ireland"
(Norlie 1925:73). Norwegian colonizers were sailing for the
United States prior to 1850, but it was not until 1859 that the
first Norwegian settlers arrived in South Dakota (Norlie
1925:186). The Norwegians comprise the largest immigrant group
in that state precluding the French and others who arrived
earlier but not in sufficient numbers to be thought of as groups
(Jennewein and Boorman 1961:135).

The Norwegians originally settled in the southeastern part
of South Dakota in Union, Clay, and Yankton counties and
eventually spread into other parts of the state. Some of these
settlers came directly from Norway, while most came from the
existing Koshkonong Prairie settlements of Wisconsin (a region
about 60 miles west of Milwaukee) and settlements in Iowa (Norlie
1925; Ostergren 1983:66). It was in Union county that two
extensive Norwegian settlements developed, "one extending from
the Big Sioux crossing at Sioux City to Elk Point, the other
located along Brule Creek farther up the Sioux Valley" (Schell
1975:78). Norwegian communities also sprang up near Yankton,
Vermillion, Elk Point, Clay Creek, and Brule Creek (Ravndal
1924). Another settlement was the Lakes Settlement, now
Gayville, northwest of Vermillion in Yankton County.
In 1860 there were some 129 Norwegians living in and around Vermillion, South Dakota, and farther up the Missouri River. By 1890 there were about 20,000 first-generation Norwegians living in present-day South Dakota, mostly concentrated in the eastern counties. The Norwegian population for Nebraska at this time (1890) was considerably smaller being only about 3,600 first-generation Norwegians (Norlie 1925:188, 233; Furer 1972:39). According to the NIMI historical overview, there were some Norwegian immigrants at St. Helena, Nebraska, as early as 1859 but their presence was predominant in South Dakota (U.S. Department of the Interior (Franklin, Grant, and Hunt 1994).

The first published Norwegian newspaper in South Dakota was the Folkstidende published at Sioux Falls. Other regional Norwegian newspapers were the Grand Forks Tidende (established 1880) (Furer 1972:54, 55), and the Syd Dakota Ekko (1889) also at Sioux Falls (Jennewein and Boorman 1961:268).

The first church built by Scandinavians in present-day South Dakota was the Bergen (est. 1866), a Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran congregation located about seven miles north of Vermillion (Ravndal 1924). By 1889 there were 128 Norwegian churches established throughout South Dakota, and by 1926 there were about 259. Norwegian was the primary language used in services until 1935 when "congregations were equally divided between English only and both languages" (Myers 1989:151).

Ethnic and social organizations of the Norwegians included the Sons of Norway, the Bygdelags (nationalistic Norwegian organizations based on origin from specific valleys or districts in Norway), and the Norwegian Singers Association of America, all of which were formed nationally between 1880 and 1900. Their existence, however, was short-lived, having served as insurance providers and cultural preservation organizations until circa 1921 (Jennewein and Boorman 1961:108; Myers 1989:152).

The Norwegians are the most extensive Scandinavian ethnic group in southeastern South Dakota, with many of their ethnic communities being encompassed within the NIMI region (Mike Bedeau, South Dakota State Historical Society [SDSHS], personal communication, 1994). However, because of their high degree of assimilation early in the twentieth century, their communities are quite difficult to distinguish from other ethnic communities in the region (Furer 1972).

Swedish Immigration and Settlement in South Dakota

The first Swedish immigrants in the United States settled at Fort Christina, a Swedish colony near present-day Wilmington, Delaware, in 1638 (Alexis 1919:79; Norlie 1925:84). They began to settle west of the Missouri River after 1860, migrating as individuals or as separate families, but generally not in groups,
which accounts for their scattered settlement patterns throughout South Dakota and Nebraska. Many of the Nebraska Swedes who settled in or adjacent to the NIMI region came primarily from other areas of Nebraska (Kastrup 1975), while many South Dakota Swedes immigrated directly from Sweden, or from earlier established Swedish settlements in Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. Much propaganda was generated throughout eastern states by railroad agents, agricultural promoters, and others attempting to lure Scandinavian immigrants into the Dakota region despite a negative image due to climatic extremes and the presence of presumably hostile American Indians (Ostergren 1983:59).

Some of the earliest Swedish settlements in present-day South Dakota in the early to mid-1860s were located in Union, Minnehaha, and Clay counties. One such settlement was located to the north of Vermillion where a school and cabin had been built by Daniel Peter Brown; according to Kastrup (1975:455), these structures have been preserved, but we have not been able to further document the survival of them.

In 1868 many newly arrived Swedish settlers established themselves to the north of Vermillion, in an area that extended some 15 miles along the eastern side of the Vermillion River. By 1873 more than 200 claims had been made in an area stretching "from the Vermillion River in the central part of Clay County to the southwestern corner of Lincoln County" (Schell 1975:115, 116). This area became known as Dalesburg, formerly Dahlsborg, because many of the original settlers came from the Swedish province of Dalarna. Today, the area is referred to as "Swedefield" by some contemporary writers (Schell 1975:115) and Dalesburg by others.

Most of the Swedish settlers at Dalesburg came directly from Europe while others arrived in South Dakota after brief residence in Wisconsin, Minnesota, or Iowa. Those who came directly from Sweden brought with them distinct dialects and architectural construction techniques in the log cabins they built to resemble their cottages in the "old country" (Kastrup 1975:455), contributing greatly to the homogeneous distinction of the Dalesburg area. Their homesteads expanded northward along the creeks where there was sufficient water and timber, although two areas along the Vermillion River known as "Cabbage Flats" and "Vermillion Bottom" were avoided by early settlers because of poor drainage conditions (Ostergren 1980:76).

The Swedish settlements within the area of Dalesburg were not unlike other Scandinavian settlements in that they were organized into small homogeneous communities or neighborhoods (Ostergren 1980:90). Their social organization centered upon 1) the common experience of journeying together from Europe to South Dakota, and 2) their religious affiliations. Thus, they were
organized around the religious institutions to which they were
affiliated, in addition to being socially organized according to
which region they immigrated from in Sweden (Ostergren 1980:76,
90). Within the settlement area were the Dalesburg Lutheran
Church, the Bloomingdale Baptist Church, and the Mission Covenant
Church.

Swedes in Nebraska

Swedish immigrants arrived in Nebraska in the early 1860s.
By 1890 there were as many as 28,000 Swedish immigrants living in
Nebraska (Kastrup 1975:444), but their settlements were small and
scattered in comparison to Swedish settlements throughout South
Dakota. Thus, their locations are more difficult to distinguish
from other ethnic settlements.

Over the course of several decades, there were some 17
Swedish-language weeklies and periodicals published in Nebraska
which served to promote the settlement opportunities that lay
west of the Missouri River (Alexis 1919:83; Kastrup 1975;
Gilkerson n.d.). The Hemlandet, the first regularly published
Swedish-language newspaper in the United States, established in
Chicago in 1855, advertised land around Wakefield and Wausa
(Dowie 1973:58), two of the larger Swedish settlements near the
NDMI study area in Nebraska (Gilkerson n.d.).

Wakefield, which borders Dixon and Wayne counties, was
established in 1881 (Huse 1973:103). Some of Wakefield's
earliest Swedish settlers, however, arrived in Dixon County as
early as 1869 from Illinois (Trott 1967:21; Holm 1981:3, 4). The
town was given its name in honor of a civil engineer of the St.
Paul and Sioux City Railroad who had helped survey the region for
Scandinavian settlement. The Swedish Evangelical Lutheran Salem
Church in Wakefield is listed on the National Register of
Historic Places (UND 1983). Another area that remained
predominantly Swedish was Concord which was platted in 1883 ten
miles to the northwest of Wakefield (Alexis 1919:82).

Another successful Swedish settlement was Wausa in Knox
County, Nebraska. It was established in 1882 by colonizers from
Oakland in Burt County, Nebraska (Kastrup 1975:445). The
original name of this settlement was Thorson, being named after
the first settler, Theodore Thorson who came from Scandia Grove,
Minnesota (Trott 1967:12). In 1885, the name was changed to Vasa
in honor of the Swedish king named Gustaf Vasa. Finally, in 1890
the name was changed to Wausa, a combination of the king's name
and the letters U.S.A., "a tribute to both their new and old
country" (Wausa Centennial Book Committee 1990:8).

The present-day residents of Wausa continue to celebrate
their ethnic heritage by holding an annual Smorgasbord each
October, during which they raise funds for county projects and
special programs that will help to maintain aspects of their Swedish ethnic heritage (Wausa Centennial Book Committee 1990:27).

Another, smaller Swedish settlement established in 1888 was Sparks in Cherry County. This settlement was named in honor of the Sparks family who helped found the community. The settlers for the most part lived off the land, making their livelihood by trapping, ranching, and hauling freight for neighbors into Valentine, the nearest trading center. Most of them were eventually bought out by large cattle ranching operations (Empkey 1974).

Other predominantly Swedish settlements near the NIMI study area are the following in their respective counties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Settlements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boyd County</td>
<td>Rosedale (founded 1898)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anoka (1902)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bristow (1891)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baker (1891)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar County</td>
<td>Obert (1909)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hartington (1883)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon County</td>
<td>Concord (1883)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt County</td>
<td>Agee (1882-1934)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox County</td>
<td>Sweden (1872)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that many of the Swedish settlers in this part of Nebraska immigrated from other parts of the state and not directly from Sweden (Gilkerson n.d.).

The Swedish center of social organization in Nebraska was the church. About 140 Swedish churches existed in Nebraska representing the Lutheran, Methodist, Baptist, and Evangelical Mission (Covenant) sects. Many of these churches are no longer standing, although a number of associated cemeteries remain (Gilkerson n.d.:16). Through the church, the Swedish language was preserved until it was discontinued and replaced by English circa 1920 (Findlay 1987:24, 25). According to Gilkerson, some Swedish churches in Nebraska were holding all services in Swedish as late as the 1930s (Joni Gilkerson, Nebraska State Historical Society, personal communication, 1994).

Two major Swedish organizations in Nebraska include the Vasa Order and the Independent Order of Vikings. The Vasa Order, organized in 1896 in New Haven, Connecticut, was the largest Swedish organization in the United States in 1935, with some 70,000 members. Its primary purpose was to provide moral and material support to Swedes and their families and to provide
social and intellectual stimulation. The Independent Order of Vikings was organized in 1980 in Chicago to provide insurance and to sponsor a Swedish and English library (Gilkerson n.d.).

Danish Immigration and Settlement

The Danes did not begin to immigrate in large numbers to the United States until after 1880. They were, however, immigrating as early as 1869 from the area of Schleswig, Denmark, and establishing settlements throughout the Midwest. Some of their settlements in South Dakota were much like those of the Norwegians, being made by settlers from "daughter settlements of older midwestern communities" (Ostergren 1983:66).

Some of the first Danish settlers in South Dakota, who settled as individual families rather than as communities of people, established themselves at Lakeport and Yankton in Yankton County in 1869. That same year, more Danes established a rural community "along the Clay and Yankton County border" (SDSHS n.d.). This Danish community did not receive a name but "formed the nucleus of Norway Township in Clay County" (Franklin, Grant, and Hunt 1994).

Their first congregation was organized in 1880, and their first church, the Trinity Lutheran Church, was built in 1893 and was torn down several years ago (Mike Bedeau, SDSHS, personal communication, 1993). Prior to 1880 Danes as well as Norwegians from this community attended the Bergen Church which was established in 1870 (SDSHS n.d.). This church continues to serve the spiritual needs of both Norwegian and Danish Lutherans in the area (Mike Bedeau, SDSHS, personal communication, 1993). Within their settlement area, they also established a hotel/supply station which served the stage and wagon road from Sioux City to Fort Randall (Franklin, Grant, and Hunt 1994).

More Danish settlers arrived in 1872 and settled at Lodi (Wakonda) in Clay County, at Gayville in Yankton County, and at Paris bordering Union and Lincoln counties, which later became known as Beresford. Some of these Danish immigrants arrived directly from Denmark, while many came from Danish settlements established earlier in Wisconsin and elsewhere.

Other Danish settlements established within the NIMI study region are in Dakota, Cherry, and Knox counties of Nebraska (Ostergren 1983:66). One of the Danish settlements in Knox County was Winnetoon, established in 1891. Winnetoon's church, the Danish Lutheran Church, was not built until 1914. Due to depression and drought, however, the town did not grow large; few residents reside in Winnetoon today (Graff 1990:165).

Other predominantly Danish settlements in Nebraska (Matteson and Matteson 1988), with their respective counties, are:
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CHAPTER 26
AFRICAN AMERICANS
By Michelle Watson

Introduction

The African Americans who immigrated to and settled in present-day Nebraska and South Dakota following the Civil War were seeking economic prosperity and freedom from persecution. Most of those who settled near the NIMI study area arrived with the advance of the military and the agricultural frontiers. Some came directly from southern states while others came from other parts of Nebraska, or Canada. These original settlers were either former slaves, children of former slaves, Civil War veterans, or African Americans who had escaped from the South via the "underground railroad" to Canada.

These African Americans made several "settlements," however limited, close to the NIMI study area. Settlements identified near NIMI include the DeWitty homesteading colony in Cherry County, the Bliss homesteading colony near Goose Lake in Holt County, and the Black community within the town of Yankton, South Dakota. In general, these African American communities are little known historically. In addition, African Americans at times comprised large elements of the military garrisons at Fort Niobrara and Fort Randall (Thomas Buecker, Nebraska State Historical Society, personal communication, 1993).

Factors that Stimulated African American Immigration to the West

Though some Black Americans had sought to enlist in the U.S. Army before the Civil War (Alberts 1972:258), the events of that conflict eventually led to the movement of large numbers of African Americans into the American West. By 1861, the territorial legislature abolished slavery in the Territory of Nebraska. In 1863, slaves throughout the United States became "freedmen" through President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, which eventually resulted in a mass exodus of African Americans from the South before 1870.

Primary catalysts for African American homesteading in Nebraska were the Homestead Act of 1862, the Timber Act passed in 1872 and effective in 1873, and the Kinkaid Act of 1904, the last of which opened up ten million acres of public land in the Sandhills for settlement (Farrar 1988a:47). Another impetus for African American homesteading was the campaign of President Roosevelt's administration to curtail the illegal fencing of
public lands by cattle ranchers (Aeschbacher 1946:220). Land
available in the Sandhills was generally poor for crop farming
but better suited for cattle grazing. Initially, for the African
American settler, land quality was not an issue as the land
itself was the symbol of an opportunity to make a better life.

Many African Americans were introduced to the prairies of
Nebraska and South Dakota through service in military units that
were stationed at frontier forts. This experience is discussed
below.

The organized efforts of the Freedmens' Bureau and other
agencies in Kansas also encouraged African American immigration,
resulting in numbers of Black Americans moving northward from
Kansas into Nebraska (Work Projects Administration [WPA] 1940).
Land availability, and social, employment, and educational
opportunities in Nebraska and Dakota Territory attracted this
immigration.

With the opening of the West and the advance of river and
rail travel, many African Americans found employment in urban
industries; others found employment with steamship companies and
with railroad companies (Bernson and Eggers 1977:243). At
several times in American history, African Americans were brought
in to new areas as strike-breakers during labor disputes (e.g.,
the Union Pacific Railroad strike in 1877, the smelting industry
problems in 1880, the packing industry turmoil in 1894, and the
Burlington Railroad strike in 1923). Following the conclusion of
these strikes, many of the strike-breakers did find at least
temporary or seasonal employment in the immediate region (WPA
1940:10). In addition, in the years following the Civil War and
expansion of the West, many African Americans passed through the
Plains as cowhands on cattle drives that brought cattle herds
north from Texas.

Certain individuals were also responsible for promoting
African American settlement near the NIMI area. In 1904 the
author, writer, and film producer Oscar Micheaux, born a former
slave in Ohio, homesteaded in Gregory County on the Rosebud
Indian Reservation in South Dakota. During the following three
decades he promoted equity in race relations and immigration to
Nebraska and South Dakota as he traveled in the South and in the
Pioneer, which was published in 1913 (Anonymous 1988:192-193).
He continued to publish and produce films until his death in
1951.

Several other contributing factors for the African American
exodus from the South include economic hardship, share cropping
exploitation, floods, and ravages from the boll-weevil
infestation in the cotton fields (WPA 1940). During the post-
Civil War Reconstruction period in the South, Southern whites
were forced to grant African Americans certain civil and political rights, which resulted in compounded resentment toward African Americans (e.g., denial of voting privileges, rough physical treatment, heavy taxation, Ku Klux Klan activity, unsympathetic court judgments, etc.). All of these factors compelled many African Americans to seek better opportunities for themselves and their families elsewhere, and some of these people ended up in Nebraska and South Dakota.

_African American Settlements in Nebraska near NIMI_

African Americans who immigrated did so as individuals among white communities or neighbors, or they settled near one another in African American colonies, which were families settled on clusters of nearby farms, giving the participating families a sense of community. Prior to the DeWitty colonization attempt, many other settlement attempts failed, while many other colonies, having actually existed for a short time, left no written records (WPA 1940:12-13; Williams 1969:30).

Of the African Americans who settled in South Dakota, only a small number resided near the NIMI study area; most were located in the Black Hills where they were primarily employed with mining. The town that became and remained the center for African American settlement within the NIMI study area during the settlement period of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was Yankton (Bernson and Eggers 1977:251).

_The Yankton Community_

Yankton was well established as a town by 1880 when several southern families arrived from Alabama (Bernson and Eggers 1977:250). They built the Allen African Methodist Episcopal Church in 1885 and the Second Baptist Church in 1916. Their population in 1890 was only around 59 (Blakely n.d.:92). During World War I (1922-1930), growth of the local Black community in Yankton slowed dramatically. Following the war, the Black population of the state began to increase slowly, but most of the new settlers scattered themselves throughout rural areas in South Dakota because racism was becoming an increasing problem for African Americans in urban centers like Yankton and Sioux Falls; housing and employment were also growing concerns (Bernson and Eggers 1977:253).

In addition to the Yankton community, another African American community may have been established near NIMI by the name of "Texas" in Union County in the 1860s (Jim Wilson, South Dakota Historic Preservation Office, personal communication, 1993). The town, said to be located south of the present-day community of Elk Point, is reported to have contained a post office and a cemetery (Jim Wilson, South Dakota Historic Preservation Office, personal communication, 1993). However, no
documentation of this settlement has been located.

The Goose Lake or Bliss Colony

Around 1875, several African American families homesteaded at the Bliss colony in the area near Big Goose Lake in southern Holt County. Little information is generally available about the Goose Lake settlement, but the following information is taken from Yost's (1976:358-365) history of Holt County. The exact date of the settlement's founding is unknown, but the families probably arrived in the area before 1875. Many of the settlement's inhabitants were employed after that date by John Henry Dirks, a German settler who established a ranch in the area surrounding the lake. The Bliss post office was located about two miles west of Dirks' ranch. The school was located about a mile from the ranch and was attended by all children in the district whether white or Black. A church was maintained in the southeast corner of the ranch and was served by a circuit minister.

The cemetery at Goose Lake was known as the "Negro Cemetery", but whites were also buried there. Due to wind erosion, bodies were moved from it twice, the last time in 1934 to a common grave in Trussell Cemetery in Holt County (Yost 1976:364).

According to Mary Cloud (Lincoln, Nebraska, personal communication, 1993), a descendent of some of the original Bliss Colony African American settlers, the colony was connected with the Exodusters in Kansas and the Westerville and DeWitty settlements in Nebraska. She stated that the lack of success of these African American settlements was due to two primary reasons. First, many African American settlers were at a disadvantage due to illiteracy; they often agreed to legal arrangements with outsiders without being able to read the legal documents they were asked to sign. Second, the colonies did not join together or expand, even though kinships relationships connected many of them, because racism was prevalent. If the colonies remained small, they experienced less prejudice and racism from suspicious, white neighbors.

The DeWitty Colony

The most successful documented African American colony in Nebraska was the DeWitty settlement located approximately ten miles northwest of Brownlee, Nebraska, in Cherry County, along the North Loup River. The settlement's success has been attributed to its being founded by Southern Blacks shortly after passage of the Kinkaid Act in 1904 (Farrar 1988a:15).

Clem Deaver was responsible for promoting interest in African American colonizing in the Sandhills. In 1904 he filed in Valentine for his Kinkaid claim. Hearing that there were some
50,000 acres left unclaimed, he sent word to other African Americans living elsewhere in Nebraska. This news attracted, in 1907, three African American families from the successful, but smaller, Overton colony in Dawson County, Nebraska. The Overton settlers originated in Canada and settled in Dawson County in 1880. They have been described as "educated, weather oriented, and conditioned" (Williams 1969:32), thus being well suited to agrarian life in the Plains. By 1912, the DeWitty settlement consisted of 79 land claims which extended up the North Loup River for about fifteen miles (Reece 1945:93; Nebraska State Historical Society [NSHS] 1989):

In 1916 the name of the post office was changed from DeWitty to Audacious. Located in section 34 of township 38, range 30 Audacious had a church and cemetery. The area around the African American settlement included two school districts with three schools. Today there is no physical evidence of the African American community. (NSHS 1989)

With the exception of Charles Meehan, the original DeWitty settlers from Overton were former slaves, children of former slaves, Civil War veterans, or African Americans who had escaped from the South via the "underground railroad" to Canada. Meehan, a white, was born in Detroit, Michigan, of parents who migrated from Ireland in 1855. Later, the Meehan family lived in the Windsor, Ontario, area before coming to the Overton colony (Williams 1969:32).

It was near Windsor that Meehan met his wife, Hester Freeman, an African American, who had been adopted by the George Brown, Sr., family when her parents died (Mary Cloud, Lincoln, Nebraska, personal communication, 1993). Around 1880, the Meehans came to the United States. Hardships suffered in Canada on account of his wife being an African American compelled Charles Meehan to move his family, together with the Browns, to Nebraska, where they established the Overton colony in 1880 (Day 1979:489).

However, following the drought years of 1905-1907 and having proved up on their claims near Overton, many of these colonists were considering a new location where they could make a better living. Thus, with the news from Clem Deaver that Kinkaid land was yet available in the Sandhills, many left in 1907 and established the DeWitty settlement under the leadership of William Walker, Charles Meehan, and George Brown. Some discrepancy exists as to the exact founding date of the DeWitty settlement. In "The Lost Pioneers," Beryl Decker (1963:63-64) writes:

According to Roy Brown of Valentine, Nebraska, DeWitty was first established by George Brown in 1905 section 1,
towship 27 and range 30...Charles Meehan, William Walker, and others followed George Brown...Seth Hanna, long time rancher in Cherry County, believes that Clem Deaver did in fact make the first claim in Cherry County in 1904.

No matter the exact date of the establishment of the DeWitty settlement, or by whom, its impact and significance in Nebraska history are no less important than any other settlement by any other ethnic group.

These African American colonies were often interconnected by blood and marriage ties. For example, in addition to the Overton and DeWitty settlements, there was the Westerville settlement in Custer County (Day 1979:488-493):

Thanksgiving Day 1907 was memorable for the Irishman, Charles Meehan, and his wife. Their two oldest children, Rosetta and Dennis, were married in a double-wedding ceremony at Westerville in Custer County. Dennis married Ida Shores while Rosetta married Charles Speese. (Williams 1969:33)

The DeWitty settlement existed until approximately 1936 when there were no African Americans left at the site. Albert Riley, Jr., was the last to sell out. He moved to Valentine to work for the Niobrara Wildlife Reserve between 1936 and 1956, which was located where Fort Niobrara was once active (Williams 1969:33; Decker 1963:65; Alberts 1972:259; Lighty 1960:169).

Because wood was scarce, the settlers built dugouts until they were sure their claim boundaries were clear; then they built "soddies," a more elaborate and permanent form of housing commonly used by settlers throughout the Plains region. Many contained only one room partitioned off by curtains, while a few had several rooms like those of "Uncle Bob" Hannahs and Charles Meehan, two of the original and most successful of the DeWitty settlers.

The principal livelihood for these settlers was farming. The primary crop raised for both the livestock and the table was corn. Other crops included beans, black-eyed peas, potatoes, melons, sorghum cane (used to make dark syrup), carrots, squash, pumpkins, etc. They also raised hogs, beef, and fowl, and used mules as burden animals. In addition to farming, they gathered wild berries and fruit and hunted and fished regularly (Farrar 1988c).

Some of the settlers hired out to neighboring ranches to earn money for staples and commodities that could not be grown or made. Others worked as masons or carpenters (Decker 1963:65). Some produced a surplus of milk and cream to sell, while others hauled supplies for neighbors. Supplies were typically brought
from Seneca, 25 miles south of DeWitty, as it was the nearest railroad town.

The local barber was Robert ("Uncle Bob") Hannahs. He operated a barbershop in Brownlee two days a week (Fridays and Saturdays) for the settlers of Brownlee. He did not barber for his African American neighbors at his Brownlee shop; they would have to visit his home during the evenings in the DeWitty settlement (Farrar 1988d:39).

The DeWitty post office was named after the first postmaster, Miles DeWitty (Farrar 1988d:39; Hanna 1986:246). According to Day (1972:262), however, DeWitty's first name was Jim. William Crawford carried the mail out of Seneca to DeWitty twice a week (Farrar 1988d:39). DeWitty lost its post office in 1916 when Arthur D. Meehan became the new postmaster and the post office location was moved west of DeWitty. Apparently in a flourish of optimism about the success of the settlement, he named the post office "Audacious." In 1918, it was moved once again several miles north of the river to the Triple-L ranch where it was known as "Gard," and remained until 1943. (Farrar 1988d:40)

DeWitty had at least one store:

Ed White, who ran a store at Brownlee said that the African Americans would purchase merchandise from his store to sell from the DeWitty store. (Decker 1963:64)

Education was important to the inhabitants of DeWitty (Williams 1969:32). School districts 110 and 113 were attended by African Americans. Two more districts (164 and 108) were later organized for both white and Black children. These rural schools taught only through the 10th grade. Books were supplied by the State Library at Lincoln, Nebraska (Decker 1963:64; Farrar 1988d:41).

The only community church to be established near DeWitty, the St. James African Methodist Episcopal Church, was established across the river to the north about a mile from the DeWitty post office in section 28, township 28, range 30 (Day 1986:247). It was founded in 1910 by Reverend O. J. Burckhardt of the African Methodist Episcopal Church of Lincoln, Nebraska (Decker 1963:64). Prior to the establishment of the church, services were held in private homes in the community (Williams 1969:33). Reverend Burckhardt recruited new colony membership from Lincoln, Nebraska, and elsewhere across the state (Farrar 1988b:43). During the period of the settlement's existence, people of all faiths worshiped together in the one church.
An important annual event for the settlers of DeWitty was the Fourth of July celebration put on by the Danish settlers of nearby Brownlee. They enjoyed a rodeo, games, footraces, picnicking, dance, and more.

Music was a very important part of their lives. Joe and Turner Price, along with some local white men, played music for all occasions (Farrar 1988e:42). Joe Price and a couple of white men formed the Red Hot Jazz Bandits, a non-conservative band. They often performed in the Harmony Hall in Merrick County, the same hall that the Ku Klux Klan rented during the Prohibition era to hold meetings (Merrick County History Book Committee 1987:120). Joe Price left the DeWitty colony with the Red Hot Jazz Bandits during the era of big band music, and performed at dances all over the United States (Farrar 1988e:42).

Baseball was another pleasurable pastime:

The DeWitty baseball team, the Sluggers, played teams from Thedford and Brownlee and always drew a crowd. Besides being fine players, members were natural clowns. The "Sluggers" antics were similar to those of the Harlem Globetrotters of basketball renown. (Williams 1969:50)

The DeWitty settlement did not last more than about 30 years, however. All the DeWitty settlers' land holdings, combined, controlled less than one mile of river bottom. Few claims contained land that was good enough to provide hay crops for cattle ranching; the good lands were claimed before the African Americans arrived (Farrar 1988b:44). In addition, a lack of knowledge about the practice of crop rotation and other methods of crop improvement contributed to the withdrawal of the settlers. As a result of the depression and drought years that followed World War I, the DeWitty settlers, like many farmers in agriculturally marginal Plains areas, were forced to sell out and move to where they could once again find a better way of life (Decker 1963:65; Farrar 1988e:43).

The land where the DeWitty Colony once thrived is owned today by the family of Don Hanna, Jr., of Mullen, Nebraska. Mr. Hanna has indicated that little physical trace of the DeWitty colony remains today. For the safety of his cattle, Mr. Hanna (personal communication, 1993), with the help of his grandchildren, have removed from the pasture where DeWitty once was located, all of the stoves and other debris from the former townsite. However, three distinct groves of trees exist that mark the former homesites of "Uncle Bob" Hannahs, Charles Meehan, and Josh Emanuel. One large grove of cottonwood trees on the north side of the North Loup River was planted by Charles Meehan, a grove of smaller trees on the south side of the river was planted by "Uncle Bob" Hannahs, and a gathering of stunted and
dying box elder trees was planted by Josh Emanuel (Don Hanna, Jr., personal communication, 1993).

In addition, the scant foundation of the DeWitty (Audacious) post office and store can still be seen. There are no signs of the church and homesteads, as they were made of sod and have become trampled down by pasture cattle. Mr. Hanna identified the unmarked graves of Mrs. Curtis, of Mrs. George Brown, of Josh Emmanuels' child, and of three or four other colony residents who were buried in the DeWitty cemetery on the north side of the North Loup River near the church (Don Hanna, Jr., personal communication, 1993; Hanna 1986; Farrar 1988:44).

The African American Military Experience Within NIMI

In reviewing the African American experience near NIMI, the presence of Black soldiers at Fort Randall and Fort Niobrara should not be overlooked. With legislation passed on July 17, 1862, Black Americans were given the opportunity to serve in U.S. Army regiments composed of volunteer Black soldiers commanded by white officers (Fowler 1971:12; Leckie 1967:06). Many of these military units served with distinction during the Civil War.

As the military frontier in the West continued to expand, following the close of the Civil War, a larger standing army was needed than before the war. New regiments were recruited for Western service, among them two regiments of Black cavalry (the Ninth and Tenth U.S. Cavalry regiments) and four regiments of Black infantry (Fowler 1971:12):

The original four black infantry regiments were designated as the 38th, 39th, 40th, and 41st Infantry. The 39th and 40th Infantry remained in the South and the 38th and 41st were sent to the West. The War Department in 1869 consolidated the 38th and 41st into the 24th Infantry and the 39th and 40th into the 25th Infantry. (Fowler 1971:15)

Legislation passed on July 28, 1866, specifically authorized the recruitment of African Americans into the regular army (Fowler 1971:12; Newby 1975:4).

The African American cavalrymen and infantrymen came to be called "Buffalo Soldiers," being first referred to in this way by Native Americans:

Called all manner of names—"Moacs," "Brunettes," "Africans"—by all manner of people, they were dubbed "Buffalo Soldiers" by their red antagonists. The origin of the term "buffalo soldier" is uncertain, although the common explanation is that the Indian saw a similarity between the hair of the Negro soldier and
that of the buffalo. The buffalo was a sacred animal to the Indian, and it is unlikely that he would so name an enemy if respect were lacking. It is a fair guess that the Negro trooper understood this and thus his willingness to accept the title. (Leckie 1967:26)

In the 1880s, portions of two Black regiments, the Ninth Cavalry and the 25th Infantry, were posted to the vicinity of NiMi, and constituted the first sizeable Black population in this region of the predominantly white-populated Plains (Buecker 1984:312).

The 25th Infantry at Fort Randall and Fort Niobrara

The 25th Infantry arrived at Fort Randall in 1880. Coming from Texas, these soldiers found a change in scenery and climate as well as new duties in Dakota Territory:

During 1881 and 1883 they were in charge of guarding Sitting Bull and the Hunkpapas during their period of imprisonment at the fort. (Bernson and Eggers 1977:247)

They were assigned to remain in the field for many days performing duties of chopping wood, guarding railroad gangs who were cutting ties, and protecting telegraph workers and Native Americans alike from animosity and physical aggression for one another (Bernson and Eggers 1977:246). In Dakota Territory, the infantrymen provided relief to settlers during droughts, floods, and severe winter storms (Fowler 1971:53). Following the Ghost Dance troubles at Pine Ridge during the winter of 1890-1891, the African American military presence in the Dakotas diminished (Carroll 1971:187).

Between 1902 and 1906, various companies of the 25th Infantry were stationed at Fort Niobrara, following their return from duty in the Philippine Islands (Buecker 1984:319). Their service at Fort Niobrara during this time was brief and without any conflicts with the local white population. Fort Niobrara was abandoned in 1906 after 26 years of operation. Between 1906 and 1911 some of the remaining buildings were used by quartermaster officers who supervised the purchase of horses for the cavalry and artillery. Finally, 16,000 acres of the military land were retained for a national game reserve.

The Ninth Cavalry at Fort Niobrara

Companies of the Ninth U.S. Cavalry arrived at Fort Niobrara in 1885 and remained until 1890 (Leckie 1967:251; Buecker 1984:307). While there, they served as guardians of the Rosebud Sioux. As relations with Native Americans were relatively peaceful in the area, the duties at this post were generally limited to routine field and garrison duties such as wood
chopping, building, abode brick making, escorting, and bridge and road building and repairing. In addition, they intermediated in civil disputes between cattlemen, ranchers, and settlers (Buecker 1984:309-310, 316).

With the posting of Ninth U.S. Cavalry and 25th U.S. Infantry troops at Fort Niobrara, some African American civilians settled around the frontier post. Some civilians settled to the south of the railroad near Valentine to provide goods and entertainment for the soldiers, while others settled in other vicinities near the fort.

One place of entertainment was operated by Ms. Mattie Sanderson along the Minnechaduza Creek west of the post office (Buecker 1984:312). The Deer Park Hotel was located on the north side of the Niobrara River. The Casterlines' Ranch was located about two miles east of the post. Some of these establishments served as houses of prostitution, called "hog ranches" (Hart 1963:32; Buecker 1984:312). All of these facilities offered entertainment such as dance, gambling, whiskey, entertainment, card playing, etc. Other, more organized diversions were also provided to the soldiers on the post, such as educational courses, dances, celebrations, baseball, etc. (Buecker 1984:312).

Blacks have a long and honorable history of service in the U.S. military. During the Civil War (1861-1865), the Indian campaigns of the late nineteenth century, the Spanish-American War (1898), and the Philippine-American War (1899-1902), African American soldiers served with distinction, although the U.S. Army, like the United States society in general during that time, was rigidly segregated along racial lines. In "The Black Soldier and Officer In The United States Army, 1891-1917," Marvin Fletcher writes:

Despite the renewed evidence that these black Regulars could fight, most whites felt blacks were cowards. White officers continued to be influenced by their predispositions about the race rather than the concrete evidence of the soldiers' performance. After 1890 the policy of racial separation had been implemented in every facet of American life, and the army was no exception. (Fletcher 1974:60-61)

Military service provided career employment and some degree of job advancement potential for many Blacks who were faced with fewer socio-economic prospects in other aspects of American life at the time:

Certainly for the black male of this time period, the army, which was far from being a citadel of democracy and equality, did provide as fair an opportunity as the American nation could offer. (Fowler 1971:148)
Conclusion

In conclusion, accounts of African Americans in Nebraska and South Dakota history are few and incomplete. In Broken Hoops and Plains People (Welch 1976:118), some of the reasons given for this are 1) Ku Klux Klan influence; 2) economic problems; 3) crop failures; 4) intensified racism; 5) chauvinism of the World War I period; and 6) isolation from other African Americans.

As settlers, African Americans controlled very little quality haying, feeding, or cropping land because the good lands were mostly settled before the African Americans arrived (Farrar 1988b:44). In addition, their lack of knowledge about state-of-the-art agricultural practices contributed to the eventual withdrawal of the settlers from the Sandhills. Finally, during the economic depression and drought years that followed World War I, most African American settlers in the Sandhills were forced to sell out and move to where they could once again find a better way of life (Decker 1963:65; Farrar 1983:e:43). The African American infantrymen and cavalrymen who were present near NIMI between 1885 and 1906 contributed in a significant, if transitory, way to the ethnic diversity within the NIMI study area.
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CHAPTER 27

IRISH IMMIGRATION

By Michelle Watson

Introduction

This overview of the Irish people in Nebraska and South Dakota in the nineteenth century describes those Irish immigrants who came seeking economic opportunity and freedom from English authority in Ireland and prejudice from the English-descended population in the states of the eastern United States (Creigh 1980). Most of the Irish who immigrated to the United States were forced to move into the slums of the industrial cities of the East until successful colonization efforts were made (Gordon 1964:92, 135). Those Irish who resettled on the Plains in settlements like O'Neill and Atkinson in Holt County, Nebraska, (Nebraska State Historical Society [NSHS] 1988) were given economic opportunity and, more importantly, freedom from English supremacy: "What the Irish desired most was the ownership of the soil upon which they lived and cultivated" (Casper 1966:11).

As early as 1855, with the opening of Nebraska Territory for settlement, a group of some 60 Irish settlers led by Father Jerimiah Trecy traveled from Dubuque, Iowa, to the bluffs of the Missouri River and established the St. John's City settlement located "approximately ten miles west of the community engaged in the organization of Sioux City" (Kemp 1992:7); it was to be part of a larger St. Patrick's Colony which was organized by Bishop Mathias Loras of Dubuque. Irish colonization progress was, however, briefly hampered by church hierarchy who believed that it was alright for the Irish to go west as individuals. To emigrate to the west in little Catholic groups would make the Irish become as distinct as the Mormons...they might fall victim to the same kind of harassment suffered by the members of the Mormon religion. (Kemp 1992:9)

Nevertheless, "Bishop Loras sent Father Trecy as his personal envoy" (Kemp 1992:8) from the St. John's City settlement to the Irish Emigrant Aid Convention in New York in 1856 and to the cities in the East, to lecture on and promote Irish emigration to the West in 1857. Opposition from the church hierarchy did not slow efforts to develop Irish settlements in the West. In 1862 the St. John's City settlement was moved a few miles east and renamed Jackson, presently located in Dakota County, Nebraska. In 1863 and again in 1870 this settlement suffered natural disasters which "destroyed a greater share of the remaining..."
buildings" (Kemp 1992:9). Because of the colony's location along the Missouri, the original settlers played an important role in promoting continued Irish settlement in the West.

In addition to these settlements, a "French Settlement" was established in the early 1850s near present-day Jefferson in Union County, South Dakota. According to the authors of Dakota Panorama, a number of Irish settled in Jefferson at the same time as these French circa 1859 (Jennewein and Boorman 1961).

The Irish Experience in Ireland

The history of the Irish is generally a story of plight and suppression. Their exodus from their beloved Ireland ("Erin") was primarily the result of shrinking land availability, of famine condition (i.e., the "Potato Blight" that began in 1845), and of the English domination and manipulation of the Irish economy (Moody and Martin 1989; Harris and Jacobs 1989; Hachey et al. 1989:92).

The breakdown of traditional inheritance patterns, in which family farms were typically inherited by the eldest son and women were given a dowry of land at marriage, decreased the size of land holdings, which were divided up among the sons of landowners, thus lowering the economic status of the younger generation of Irish by the mid-nineteenth century (Lowie 1960:150-151; Miller 1985:58). In addition, as medical knowledge and general health conditions improved throughout Europe, the Irish population boomed, creating additional pressures for land which only intensified the mass migration of Irish families to other places in Ireland, Britain, and eventually the United States (Harris and Jacobs 1989). Because of the English political and economic domination over Ireland, the Irish were barred from having their own legislature and control of their domestic affairs. The Irish agricultural and industrial economies were suppressed by the English to prevent any progress which might have threatened English economic supremacy over Ireland. These great distresses were fueled by the "Great Famine" during the period 1845 to 1848, also known as the "Great Hunger." Those Irish who did not emigrate prior to 1845 were largely forced to live as impoverished renters on their ancestral homelands under this English supremacy. Their diet was primarily limited to potatoes while the produce and livestock that they raised were either taken by the English and sold outside of the country, or purchased at rates well below their resale value (Miller 1985:286). As a result of these conditions, the Irish revolted unsuccessfully in 1848. When it became clear that they could not stand up to English military force and would have no opportunity to improve their economic and social status, thousands emigrated from Ireland. The population of Ireland decreased from 8-10 million in 1845 to 3-4 million in 1860, the result of high death rates as well as high emigration (McShane...
and Murphy 1976:371). It is estimated that 200,000 Irish emigrated each year between 1845 and 1855 (McShane and Murphy 1976:371). Many Irish emigrants settled in the United States, even before 1845:

U.S. government records indicate that Ireland was the native land of the largest number of immigrants in each census period from 1790 to 1840— that is, even before the famine. (McShane and Murphy 1976:373)

Ireland continued to lose population into the early twentieth century. Between 1856-1921 Ireland lost between 4.1 and 4.5 million inhabitants, of whom perhaps 3.5 million ended their travels in North America, primarily in the United States. (Miller 1985:346)

In 1850, the percentage of Irish-born in the foreign-born population of the United States was at its highest, nearly 43 percent. This figure remained over 30 percent until 1880 (Schrier 1958:160). Of the Irish who immigrated to the United States, "only a few became farmers in the West" (Berthoff 1971:305). Most were engaged in trades and as laborers:

In 1870...out of a total work force of nearly a million Irish-born, over 47 percent were working as general laborers, as servants, in cotton mills, and on the railroads; only 14 percent were classed as farmers and agricultural laborers. (Schrier 1958:7)

The majority of the Irish who immigrated to the United States were Catholics who distinguished themselves by the term "Irish-American." Many of the remaining Irish immigrant population were Protestants who called themselves "Scotch-Irish" (Berthoff 1971:47-48; McShane and Murphy 1976:370). Their religious separation in Ireland began in the eighteenth century when the Irish Catholic population was disenfranchised and Irish Catholics were legally considered "non-persons." It was not until 1829 that Catholics were allowed to hold public office and have some voting power (McShane and Murphy 1976:370). This religious separation continued, however, upon settlement in rural Nebraska and rural South Dakota as they settled in religiously homogeneous communities isolated from other religious influences.

Settlement in Nebraska and South Dakota in or adjacent to NIMI

After the territories of Nebraska and South Dakota were opened for settlement, the Irish (predominantly Catholics) were among the first to seize the opportunity to colonize. Colonization efforts were promoted by organizations like the Irish Catholic Colonization Bureau in southwestern Minnesota, and
the Minnesota Irish Emigration Society. The Northern Pacific Railroad in 1883 established 122 Irish Immigration Agents in Ireland and Scotland (Hammer 1980:303). Additionally, the efforts of individuals like Bishop James O’Connor of the Irish Catholic Colonization Association (founded 1879) of Omaha further promoted Irish colonization in rural Nebraska. As Vicar of Nebraska west of the Missouri River, O’Connor contributed greatly to Irish colonization in Nebraska and South Dakota, and competed with Montana and Iowa for Roman Catholic settlers of Irish origin who, it was hoped by the colonization promoters, would recreate the small, rural, religious communities that the Irish were familiar with in their ancestral homelands (Kemp 1992:3).

In 1855 two of the first Irish settlements were established in South Dakota. Chris Mahoney, an Irish immigrant, established a trading post in present-day Union County, "an important stopping point on the military road from Sioux City to Fort Randall" (Kemp 1992:9). Fort Randall was also established that year:

In October, 1855, Father Trecy paid his first visit to the fort...he found over 600 Catholics, mostly Irish...These Irish-American soldiers and their families should be considered part of the first Irish-American community in the region. (Kemp 1992:7)

Thus, immigrant Catholic soldiers played a major role in fostering future Irish settlements in Nebraska and South Dakota. The greatest concentration of Catholics living on the Dakota side of the Missouri was several miles from St. Helena, Nebraska, at the mouth of the James River, beginning at "John Stanage’s Post". John Stanage’s Post originated as a trading post established in 1859 by John Stanage, who is described as "Irish born and both English and Gaelic speaking" (Kemp 1992:11, 19).

These Irish colonization efforts met with resistance from Irish-American politicians in the cities of the eastern United States, and by Roman Catholic archbishops who believed that Irish colonization of the West would make the Irish become too distinct a group from the general population and result in harassment (Kemp 1:32:9). Nonetheless, Irish colonizers pushed westward, settling in Nebraska Territory in the mid-1850s and in Dakota Territory after the 1858 Yankton Sioux Treaty was signed (Kemp 1992). There were some 20 Irish settlements established within or near the NIMI region between 1854 and 1889 (Kemp 1992:iv-vi). Communities near NIMI that contained sizeable Irish populations included Garyowen, Emmett[Michele—is this name correct?], Pt. Vermillion, Bloomingdale, Yankton, Walshtown, Bon Homme, Springfield, Running Water, Wakonda, Star Corners, Lodi, Wheeler, Wagner, and Geddes.

However, two of the more successful Irish settlements in
northeastern Nebraska were O'Neill and Atkinson, both located in Holt County, which experienced some of the earliest major ethnic immigration in the state (NSHS 1988:16). The O'Neill settlement was founded in 1874 by John O'Neill, a former U.S. Army captain and self-styled "General" of the Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB; also known as the Fenians), a secret society organized in Ireland and American to achieve Irish nationhood. It's first post office was named Rockford, later changed to O'Neill (Yost 1976). "General" O'Neill arrived in Nebraska with a second group of settlers in 1877 and established Atkinson, also in Holt County. Atkinson was named after Colonel John Atkinson of Detroit, Michigan (Yost 1976:5-9). The colonizers chose this name because of the large land interests that Colonel Atkinson possessed in the vicinity (Fitzpatrick 1960:74). O'Neill selected Nebraska as a focus for Irish colonization because of the vast government and railroad land that was available at a fair price and because it was located a great distance from the English in the cities of the East (Casper 1966:11). Other Irish colonizers followed O'Neill to examine land west of the Missouri and to promote Irish settlement, but they were generally not as successful, with the exception of Greeley in Greeley County, Nebraska (Shannon 1957:143). Some of the members of these early settlements, however, disseminated information about opportunities in Nebraska to encourage continued Irish colonization in the state (Bedard 1924).

These settlements survived by utilizing sod, willow, and clay to build structures (Shannon 1957:195). They thrived during the depression, droughts, and other natural disasters because of their location on the route heading to the Black Hills of South Dakota which was traveled extensively by gold seekers heading West (Martin 1937). As one historian has stated, "O'Neill was the last place where the gold seekers could buy provisions" (Langan 1937:32-33).

Organized Irish Activities

One of the first Irish newspapers to be published in Nebraska was the Evening Times, established in 1869 in Sioux City, Nebraska (Kemp 1992:20). It provided a medium through which the Irish could express their sense of nationalism in their new homeland.

Contrary to the immigrants' expectations, the American future of the Irish was uncertain and the Irish found themselves segregated and economically depressed. They banded together to form religious and political organizations unlike any previously seen in America (McShane and Murphy 1976). With financing from the pennies of thousands of impoverished Irish men and women, these organizations "established mutual self-help societies, self-contained quasi-legal systems, separate Catholic schools," and more (McShane and Murphy 1976:377). They formed labor
organizations to protect themselves and to improve their social
status as one of America's first white working classes. Their
organized efforts were not always nonviolent. The "Nativist-
Americanism" Movement arose to encourage segregation for
religious and economic reasons leading to the organization of
secret societies such as the "Molly Maguires," a society formed
in mining communities of the West. These organizations
instigated both Irish and Nativist-Americans to engage in
numerous civil disturbances and agitations (McShane and Murphy

A major important Irish movement behind these organizations
was the Fenian Brotherhood. Another name for the Fenians is the
Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB). Its primary purpose was to
rebel against English rule both in Ireland and in Canada (McShane
and Murphy 1976). The organization was "founded simultaneously
at Dublin and New York in 1858" (Moody and Martin 1984). Later,
during the American Civil War, the IRB recruited heavily among
discharged Irish veterans of the Union army (Kemp 1992:27;
McShane and Murphy 1976:378). A major organ of the Fenian
movement was the publication, the Chicago Irish Republic. The
movement's ultimate goal was to secure home rule for Ireland
(Hayes and Cox 1889). The Fenians encouraged the formation of
secret societies like the "Emeralds", the "Shamrocks", and the
"Phoenix", each having a military branch and recruiting its own
members independently (Casper 1966).

The founder of the IRB in Nebraska was "General" John
O'Neill. He and others organized this society not only to help
Ireland achieve nationhood, but also to encourage colonization in
Nebraska and South Dakota (McShane and Murphy 1976):

I have always believed that the next best thing to
giving the Irish people their freedom at home is to
encourage and assist such of them as come here of their
own coalition in procuring homes for themselves in this
free land... (O'Neill 1876:9)

Beyond the settlements of O'Neill and Atkinson that O'Neill
fostered in the 1870s, expanded colonization efforts were stunted
by spreading economic difficulties and natural devastation during
the 1880s which forced many Irish to move from their recently
established rural settlements in Nebraska and South Dakota and
move to urban towns and cities where they were employed as
industrial, rail, and coal laborers. Some, however, exercised
highly developed skills as politicians. Others, like Mark Coad,
contributed in other ways to farming in Nebraska. Coad purchased
40 head of Percheron, draft stallions and mares, and had them
shipped to a farm at Fremont, resulting in the first importation
of pedigreed horses into the state (Coad 1936).

Although Fenian military efforts to invade Canada in 1866
and 1870 failed, during the 1870s and the 1880s the Irish continued to show their support of nationalism in Ireland by sponsoring American counterparts like the Irish Land League and later the Irish National League (Miller 1985). Between 1890 and World War I, the Irish began to concentrate their energies on improving their social and economic status in the United States by building cultural centers, schools, churches, and other institutions that would benefit their own kind.

Irish Organizations Today

One active Irish organization in Nebraska is the Nebraskans of Irish/Scotch-Irish Ancestry (NISIAN), a nonprofit, nonpolitical, educational organization for the study of Irish and Scotch-Irish culture, history, and genealogical research. Membership is open to paying members. Presently, there are no members in counties within the NIMI study area. The organization publishes a newsletter which contains information on Irish ethnic events and activities across the nation, Irish publications (genealogical and historical), etc.

Other contemporary Irish organizations in Nebraska are the Hibernians and the Fenians, both of Omaha. Like NISIAN, these organizations have no members in communities within the NIMI study area.

An Irish national organization is the Irish American Cultural Institute (IACI) at St. Thomas University in St. Paul, Minnesota. There is a branch of this organization in Omaha. The IACI primarily supports guest speakers from Ireland, sponsors tours to Ireland, supports academic research on Irish topics, teaches Irish dancing, and supports local Irish musicians, poets, and writers. The organization’s goal is to promote and keep Irish culture alive; issues involving politics and religion are avoided.

Today, the success of the Irish can primarily be seen in organizations centered around the Catholic Church, its schools, colleges, and other benevolent enterprises—organizations like Nebraska's Creighton University, St. Mary's College, and Father Flanagan's Boys Town (McShane and Murphy 1976). Irish musical groups continue to perform for numerous occasions nationwide. However, no traditional Irish musical instruments (i.e., bagpipes and drums) are played by any members of communities within the NIMI study area (W.D. Melena, instructor of the "Irish Dancers" of O'Neill, personal communication, 1993). The O'Neill Irish Dancers perform throughout the state and have also performed in Washington, D.C.. Their agenda is, however, not strictly Irish. They also perform patriotic dances and modern dances.

Aspects of Irish culture can be seen in St. Patrick's Day celebrations throughout the nation, a day that is celebrated by
all who have a love for Irish people and culture. St. Patrick's Day was first celebrated in the United States in 1737 to mark one day of unity each year between the divergent Catholic and Protestant Irish factions. The citizens of O'Neill annually hold the O'Neill St. Patrick's Day Celebration on the weekend either before or after March 17. Among the weekend events are a parade, fun run, quilt show, coronation and awards show, and a local American Legion Club presentation. Other events include activities at the Kinkaid Building, children's games, dances (traditional and non-traditional), and the preparation and consumption of traditional Irish stew. The danes are generally performed by the O'Neill Irish Dancers. These annual celebrations give citizens and visitors alike a sense of the true "Irish Spirit" (O'Neill Chamber of Commerce, personal communication, 1994).
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CHAPTER 28
ETHNOGRAPHIC PLACES NEAR THE
NIOBRARA/MISSOURI NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS
Thomas D. Thiessen

INTRODUCTION

Members of all societies share a sense of common identity, that is, a body of shared historical experiences and beliefs that greatly helps to bond them together as a group. This feeling of group identity is often reinforced by visits to geographical places where group members in the past underwent certain experiences that continue to have importance to the group today, where ancestors are buried, and where spiritual beliefs are centered. These geographical representations of a group's common historical and spiritual illeu strongly tie each society to its past or present physical environment. Such places can be said to have ethnographic importance for the group.

This chapter attempts to identify ethnographic places that have importance for the ethnic and religious groups that are reviewed in this overview. Information about specific places is presented in several tables, keyed to published and unpublished sources of information. All of the information has been garnered from written documents, and without the benefit of visits to the identified places or a field study designed to systematically identify and document places of ethnographic importance. For these reasons, available information about ethnographic places in the NIMI study area, and about details (particularly precise locations) of the relatively few ethnographic places that are known by reference to historical and ethnographic literature, is notably incomplete in most instances. Many of the places listed in Tables 28-3 through 28-6, other than documented archeological sites, cannot be located on the ground on the basis of present knowledge.

Some of the ethnographic places identified in this chapter are also discussed in historical site inventories of the region that were previously prepared by historians. Two such historical site inventories relating directly to the NIMI region were prepared by the National Park Service. The earliest of these is Ray H. Mattison's inventory of historic sites along the Missouri River from Gavin's Point Dam to the site of Fort Randall, completed in manuscript report form for the Corps of Engineers in 1953 and subsequently published in 1957 (Mattison 1953, 1957). The most recent historical site survey conducted in the NIMI region is the historical overview and inventory recently prepared for NIMI by the Service's Midwest Regional Office (Franklin et al. 1994). The author has chosen not to include in this chapter some historical places which, while they certainly may have both historical and
ethnographic relevance to a specific society, do not relate to the
survival of traditional lifeways and beliefs of that society. For
example, on the Yankton and Santee reservations are a number of
surviving churches and church-related structures that represent
19th century missionizing efforts among these tribes by
missionaries from Euroamerican religious sects. In sponsoring
religious missions among American Indians, most organized
Euroamerican churches intended to convert Native Americans from
traditional religious beliefs and practices to those sanctioned by
church doctrine. The mission churches were forces working against
the persistence of traditional religions. For the purpose of this
study, ethnographic places are defined as subsistence and
ceremonial locales, landscapes, structures, and cemeteries that are
assigned traditional cultural significance by members of a society.
Society members perceive such places as meaningful to their
identity as a group and the survival of their traditional lifeways
and beliefs. Consequently, places that lack significance for the
preservation of traditional lifeways and beliefs—such as church
missions, government schools, and trading posts—have largely been
excluded from the tables presented in this chapter, although a few
historical places such as Indian agencies have been included
because of their important roles as centers for administration of
Federal Indian policy among the tribes. Many places that did not
contribute to cultural preservation nevertheless played an
important role in the history of societies, and further information
about them can be found in the historical studies previously cited.

The information presented in the tables that follow in this
chapter has been gathered from systematic review of relevant
historical and anthropological literature. A number of studies
have been particularly useful, and are briefly discussed in
sections of this chapter that follow. As explained in the first
chapter of this overview, the study area for this project generally
consists of a corridor along the Missouri and Niobrara rivers,
stated as 15 miles on either side of the Niobrara Scenic River
segments and five miles on either side of the
Niobrara/Missouri/Verdigre recreational segments. However, in
selecting places to be listed in Tables 28-1 through 28-6, the
study area boundaries have not been rigidly observed, partly
because the locations of many places are not known with precision
and partly because it is considered desirable to "highlight"
certain places of ethnographic importance outside the defined study
area. In general, however, most of the places that appear in these
lists are within the defined study area boundaries.

In reviewing Tables 28-3 through 28-6, which present
information about Native American ethnographic places, it will be
noticed that a large majority of the places listed are along the
Missouri River segments of NIMI, and few are found along the
Niobrara segments. This disparity primarily reflects differences
in Native American occupation and use of the region. Permanent
native settlements tended to be located along the larger waterway,
the Missouri, which offered an abundance of diverse resources from
several distinct environmental zones (river channel, floodplains, 
higher terraces where they exist, dissected breaks, and uplands). 
The Niobrara tributary to the Missouri was generally used for 
hunting, warfare, and as a travel corridor. Ethnographic places 
along the Missouri River portions of NIMI are simply more abundant 
and better documented.

NATIONAL REGISTER PROPERTIES

Tables 28-1 and 28-2 list properties that are included in the 
National Register of Historic Places and that are located in 
counties contiguous to designated waterway segments of NIMI. The 
properties included in Table 28-1 are of Euroamerican origin, while 
those in Table 28-2 relate to Native Americans. The specific 
location of all of these properties is known with precision, and 
additional information can be obtained from the State Historic 
Preservation Officers of Nebraska and South Dakota, as well as the 
Keeper of the National Register of Historic Properties in the 
Washington, D.C. office of the National Park Service.

Of the 26 Euroamerican National Register properties listed on 
Table 28-1, only three (the Bon Homme Hutterite Colony, Rad 
Sladkovsky in Pishelville, and the Z.C.B.J. Opera House in 
Verdigre) are close to NIMI and may be taken into consideration in 
planning the boundaries of NIMI. The historical and cultural 
context of these properties is explained in the historical overview 
and inventory that has been prepared for NIMI (Franklin et al. 
1994), as well as in chapters of this study that concern Hutterites 
and Czech immigrants in the NIMI region.

Of the 11 Native American National Register of Historic Places 
properties listed in Table 28-2, three are Euroamerican mission 
churches and one is the site (complete with standing architecture) 
of a New Deal-era experimental commune on the Yankton reservation; 
further information about these can be found in the NIMI historical 
overview and inventory (Franklin et al. 1994). The other seven 
properties listed on Table 28-2 include one sacred locality (Spirit 
Mound) and six archeological sites or complexes of sites. Spirit 
Mound is located north of Vermillion, outside the NIMI study area. 
Of the six archeological properties, five are within five miles of 
the Missouri or Niobrara rivers. Three of these relate to a 
prehistoric (A.D. thirteenth and fourteenth centuries) 
archeological complex, the St. Helena Phase, which is considered to 
be ancestral to the historic Arikaras of central South Dakota 
1981:165). Of the two remaining archeological sites, Ponca Fort is 
an earthlodge village believed on the basis of ethnographical 
documentation to have been occupied by Poncas ca. 1790-1800 (Wood 
1993:115) and the Redbird I site is an earlier (ca. A.D. 1600-1700) 
earthlodge village occupied by people who were ancestral to the 
historic Poncas (Wood 1965:126-130). Both of the latter sites are
also included on Table 28-3, which lists ethnographic places relating to the Poncas.

These are properties that have been judged to be of sufficient state, regional, or national historical significance that they merit explicit consideration in Federal agency planning processes. Federal agencies are required by the National Environmental Protection Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act to disclose and take into consideration the impact that agency actions will have on properties listed in the National Register, as well as properties that have formally been determined to be eligible for inclusion in the Register. Properties are recommended for inclusion in the National Register through an ongoing survey process carried out by State Historic Preservation Officers and by Federal agencies in the course of their planning activities. Because few areas of the nation have been systematically surveyed to inventory archeological resources, it is almost always essential for lands that will be affected by Federal undertakings to be professionally examined by archeologists and historians prior to completion of agency planning processes. This means that most future National Park Service actions in the NIMI region—whether within the eventual NIMI boundaries or not—will require archeological and historical surveys in advance of decision-making points in the Service’s planning process. Undoubtedly, inventories resulting from these surveys will, in time, add many more properties to the National Register of Historic Places.

Table 28-3 lists 53 ethnographic places that associate with the historic Ponca tribe. These can be grouped into the categories of villages (26), camp sites (5), mineral resource areas (5), lairs of mythological creatures (5), Indian agency sites (4), landmarks/places of prayer (2), game trail/hunting location (2), cemeteries (2), mound (1), and 20th century standing building (1). They are organized by county in Table 28-3, to facilitate geographical reference to the several NIMI studies that are underway.

Only 13 of these 53 places can be located on the ground with presently available information. Of the 26 villages, the precise locations of only six are known; the remaining 20 are known only through brief mention in historical documents or in recorded Ponca traditions. Four of the villages whose locations are known have been classified by archeologists as sites of the Redbird Focus, a cultural complex believed to be ancestral (ca. A.D. 1600-1700) to the historic Poncas (Wood 1965). The Ponca Fort site is a well-preserved fortified earthlodge village that is well documented in historical literature and was extensively excavated in 1936 and 1937 (Wood 1993). The remaining village site, the "Scary Creek" village, was subjected to very limited archeological excavations in
193 1964 and 1965, but no architectural features were found and only a
194 small number of artifacts (Howard 1970:124-125). Of the six
195 archeologically-known Ponca villages, four are probable candidates
196 for villages also known through Ponca traditional sources as
197 recorded by the ethnographer of the Ponca tribe, the late James H.
198 Howard (1970): Redbird II archeological site = "Dusty" or "Black
199 Buffalo" village; Ponca Fort archeological site = Nanza "dirt
200 fort"; Minarik archeological site = "Farming Ground" village; and
201 an archeological site near the mouth of Ponca Creek = "Scary Creek"
202 village.

203 All of the five camp sites have been assigned to the
204 ancestral-Ponca Redbird Focus by archeologists (Wood 1965), and are
205 known only through archeological information.

206 The five mineral resource areas are represented by two
207 quarries for obtaining flint to fashion into tools; two sources of
208 clay for use as paint and in making clay figurines; and a source of
209 yellow ocher used as paint. Of these, the approximate (a quarter
210 section of land) location of only one, the yellow ocher pigment
211 source area is precisely known and has been designated as
212 archeological site 25KX401, though it has not been archeologically
213 investigated (Howard and Gant 1966:27).

214 None of the locations of the five mythological creature lairs,
215 the two places categorized as landmarks/places of prayer, the game
216 trail/hunting location places, or the single mound are known with
217 certainty, though relatively precise locations are recorded for the
218 sites of the four historic Indian agencies.

219 One of the two cemetery locations is known and was the scene
220 of archeological investigations in 1963 and 1964 (the Niobrara
221 Railroad bridge site, 25KX207; Howard and Gant 1966:24-27). Two
222 locations of "Indian Graves" on bluff tops north of the Missouri
223 River and east of Greenwood, South Dakota, were noted on sheet 32
224 of the Missouri River map published by the Missouri River
225 Commission in 1892-1895. These have been listed in Table 28-6 as
226 being uncertain as to tribal affiliation. However, it is likely
227 that these are cemeteries of the Poncas or Yanktons.

228 The Ponca Self-help Community Building (also known as the "Old
229 Ponca Agency Building" despite the fact that there appears to be no
230 evidence that it ever served an Indian agency function) has been a
231 ceremonial and social center for the Northern Poncas since its
232 construction in the 1930s (Howard 1965:69). At present, the
233 building is being rehabilitated by the tribe for use as a center
234 for tribal traditional activities, tribal offices, display of
235 tribal artifacts, and a library. In 1994, the tribe obtained a
236 grant from the Tribal Historic Preservation Fund administered by
237 the National Park Service to replace the roof of the building (see
238 page 10 of "A Report on Fiscal Year 1994 Historic Preservation Fund
239 Grants to Indian Tribes and Alaska Natives," issued by the National
A relatively small number of published sources of ethnographic, ethnohistorical, and archeological information have proven especially useful in gathering information about Ponca ethnographic places for this chapter. Perhaps the single most informative ethnographic source is an article by the noted ethnologist, James H. Howard (1970), entitled "Known Village Sites of the Ponca." In the article, Howard summarizes a variety of published and unpublished sources of information. Among the unpublished sources are 1) information provided to Howard by the late Ponca tribal historian, Peter Le Claire, as well as by other Ponca tribal elders; 2) oral testimony of Poncas recorded during litigation of an Omaha land claim case between 1912 and 1914 (Omaha Tribe of Indians vs. the United States, U.S. Court of Claims No. 31002); and a map of Omaha and Ponca places in Nebraska compiled between 1877 and 1892 by early missionary and ethnologist, J.O. Dorsey, based on information provided by Omahas and Poncas. The land claim case testimony and the Dorsey map have not been published, but copies are on file with the Nebraska State Historical Society. Howard’s earlier work (1965), The Ponca Tribe, also furnished much useful information, and provides a broader cultural context for it as well.

In a paper entitled "Ethnohistory of the Ponca with Reference to Their Claim to Certain Lands," which was originally prepared on behalf of the U.S. government as expert testimony submitted to the Indian Claims Commission in the 1960s (Docket No. 322), Joseph Jablow thoroughly reviewed ethnohistorical evidence pertaining to Ponca occupancy of lands in Nebraska and South Dakota. Many places are mentioned in his study, and one of the report’s appendices is entitled "Ponca Village Sites and Other Locations." The study was published in 1974 by Garland Publishing Company of New York as part of an extensive series of volumes containing expert testimony reports prepared for the Indian Claims Commission (Jablow 1974).

Two archeological reports, by a single author, W. Raymond Wood, provide most of the information available on archeological sites attributed to the Poncas and their forebears. Wood’s "The Redbird Focus and the Problem of Ponca Prehistory" (1965) is a thorough analysis of a relatively small number of archeological sites found in northeastern and north-central Nebraska. In that study, published as a memoir of the Plains Anthropologist, Wood proposes the Redbird Focus as the name for an archeological complex whose geographical span coincides with the known historic homeland of the Poncas. He suggests that Redbird Focus sites represent the villages and camp sites of an ancestral Ponca population in the period ca. A.D. 1600-1700, shortly after the Poncas arrived in northeastern Nebraska. This study was originally completed in 1956 as a master’s thesis at the University of Nebraska, but with a different conclusion—that the Redbird Focus sites were the remains
of early Pawnee settlements. Wood rethought the matter between 1956 and 1965, and arrived at the different finding that Redbird sites were of Ponca origin, a conclusion generally accepted by most Plains archeologists today.

At the same time that Wood was studying the Redbird sites as a graduate student, he also analyzed the human remains, artifacts, and data recovered during 1936-1937 archeological excavations at a well-documented historic Ponca village site, Nanza, the Ponca Fort. Using several lines of evidence, Wood has convincingly shown that this fortified village site was occupied by the Ponca ca. 1790-1800. His report was first published in 1960, but recently has been revised, expanded, and republished (Wood 1993).

Two other reports, produced for cultural resource management purposes, also provide a current summary perspective on our understanding of Ponca archeology in the northeastern Nebraska area by several archeologists who have been more recently active in field research in that region (Ludwickson et al. 1981; Blakeslee and O'Shea 1983). In summarizing the Native American ethnography, history, and archeology of the northeastern Nebraska-southeastern South Dakota region, they provide an invaluable complement to the studies discussed above.

YANKTON ETHNOGRAPHIC PLACES

Table 28-4 lists 25 places of ethnographic relevance to the Yankton tribe. Of these, 16 are historic village locations, three are the sites of New Deal-era experimental farm communes on the Yankton reservation, two are the lairs of mythological beings, and one each are an historic event location, the site of an Indian agency, a cemetery, and a plant resource area. One of the 16 village locations also is near the lair of mythological creatures, but it is not counted above in the latter category.

Only one of the 16 village locations is documented archeologically; the others remain unknown. The Yanktons were not as sedentary a people as their neighbors, the Poncas, who lived in settled villages of earthlodges and farmed nearby floodplain fields. The Yanktons, in contrast, were more nomadic, like the other Sioux groups. They moved their village locations more often and typically lived in pole and skin or fabric-covered structures called tipis that left little trace of their presence after being struck and removed from any location, although log houses and even some earthlodges are known to have been used by various Sioux groups as early as the 1850s (Hurt and Howard 1950; Howard 1961; Howard 1972:296). Consequently, few archeological sites have been linked to any of the Sioux tribes (Ludwickson et al. 1981:61), and little is known of their archeology in comparison to the semi-sedentary farming villagers who lived along the Missouri (the Poncas, Omahas, Arikaras, Hidatsas, and Mandans). Thus, it is no surprise that only one Yankton village is known in the NIMI study...
area. That site in the Gavin's Point archeological site, located on Gavin's Point on the north shore of Gavin's Point Reservoir in Yankton County, South Dakota. Despite repeated visits and limited excavations by archeologists, the Gavin's Point site is poorly known (Hall 1961; Howard and Gant 1966:7-8; Zimmerman and Bradley n.d.; Zimmerman and Bradley 1978; Ryder 1978; Blakeslee and O'Shea 1983:308, 311, 312-313; Lueck 1987; Lueck and Hannus 1987). However, the site has yielded evidence of a historic Native American occupation as well as several prehistoric complexes. It is clearly an important multi-component archeological site and has been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (Lueck and Hannus 1987:7), though it is not clear if this is was formally determined by the Keeper of the National Register or whether the site has been nominated to the Register in follow-up to the determination. The site lies within the Gavin's Point Recreation Area. On the basis of historical documentation, Howard (1972:296), Hall (cited in Blakeslee and O'Shea 1983:304), and Blakeslee and O'Shea (1983:304, 311) have identified this as the probable village of the Yankton band led by Chief Smutty Bear in the 1850s. Blakeslee and O'Shea (1983:312-313) have recommended that the site, along with several other historic Yankton sites in the region, be considered for thematic nomination to the National Register of Historic Places, but it is not clear that all of the sites so recommended are sufficiently well known archeologically to warrant nomination to the Register.

Three of the sites listed in Table 28-4 are the remains of experimental Native American farming communes that were established under the authority of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. Through its Indian Relief and Rehabilitation Division, the Bureau of Indian Affairs cooperated with several other New Deal programs to purchase land and build housing and other structures at twenty locations on South Dakota Indian reservations between 1936 and 1942 (Bromert 1984:34-35). The goal of this program was to "rehabilitate" Native Americans by making them self-sufficient in communal communities where they could profit from agricultural pursuits. Four of these experimental communes were located on the Yankton Reservation (Hoover 1988:60-61), three of which were located within the NIMI study area (Table 28-4). One of the earliest and most successful of these was the Rising Hail Colony (named after a prominent Yankton chief), which was built in 1938 and 1939 by the Rising Hail Cooperative Development Association (Bromert 1984:38-39). The commune housed ten Indian families, who jointly owned the community's livestock, machinery, and other property. The communes were reasonably successful only as long as they continued to receive Federal support. The Indian Relief and Rehabilitation Division ceased to exist in 1941 and rehabilitation funds dried up in the early 1940s. These events, coupled with decimation of the cattle herd by anthrax, a grasshopper plague, the accidental burning of the colony's barn, and tensions among the resident families arising from the closeness of communal living, led to the dissolution of the Rising Hail cooperative in 1949.
(Bromert 1984:40, 46). Many of the buildings of the Rising Hail Colony still stand, and in 1975 the site of the commune was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in recognition of the community's historic role in a unique aspect of the administration of Federal Indian policy and the distinctive architecture of its structures, which were built from local deposits of "chalkrock" (Franklin et al. 1994:36-39).

Two of the locations on Table 28-4 are lairs of mythological beings. One of these, Spirit Mound, is not within the NIMI study area but is situated approximately eight miles north and west of the city of Vermillion. It is a prominent hill believed by several Indian tribes to be the abode of small (about 18 inches high) malevolent beings who shoot arrows at humans (Moulton 1986:504-505). Lewis and Clark climbed the hill on August 25, 1804, and Clark remarked in his journal that the hill "was viewed with Such turrow [terror] by all the different Nation[s] in this quarter" (Moulton 1987:9). Clark also observed that the Sioux, Otos, and Omahas would not approach the hill for fear of these creatures, and that the death of three Omaha men a few years earlier was attributed to the "murceyless fury" of the hill's denizens (Moulton 1986:504-505). The hill is included in the list of Yankton ethnographic places (Table 28-4) because it lies in the historical territory of the Yanktons, and also on Table 28-6, which identifies ethnographic places relating to other tribes as well. It is publicly marked by a roadside sign.

Although not tabulated as a mythological lair, the White Swan Yankton village is noted on Table 28-4 as being in a locale that was home to creatures with faces on both sides of their head, who Howard (1972:295) refers to as "legendary sirens of the Dakota."

The single historic event location identified on Table 28-4 is Calumet Bluff, so-called because of a council that Lewis and Clark held nearby with the Yanktons on August 30 and 31, 1804 (Moulton 1987:26-37). Today the southern end of the Gavin's Point Dam axis ties into Calumet Bluff and the adjacent floodplains have been inundated or destroyed by construction of the dam. Consequently, the appearance of the bluff and surrounding area is substantially different from the time of Lewis and Clark's visit. Lewis and Clark's council with the Yanktons at Calumet Bluff was the first formal meeting of the U.S. government with any of the Sioux tribes, though it was not the first formal council held by Lewis and Clark with Indians along their route. This meeting with the Yanktons was indeed an important event in the history of governmental relationships with American Indians, and particularly with the Sioux, as pointed out by Ronda (1984:253). However, it's broad significance to the history of the U.S. government's Indian policy can easily be overstated. Franklin et al. (1994:25-26) wisely caution that the significance of the meeting not be construed as dictating the "course for diplomatic relations between Plains Indians and the government for the next half century," an assertion
that is broader than the historical circumstances warrant.

The remaining three places identified on Table 28-4 are an historic agency for administration of the Yankton reservation (still in operation at Greenwood); a place (exact location unknown) where dogwood bark was gathered to include in kinnikinnick, a native form of smoking tobacco; and a church cemetery at Greenwood which contains the grave of Struck-by-the-Ree, one of the most revered of the Yankton chiefs and a leader who was largely instrumental in advocating and maintaining the long-term peaceful relationship between the Yanktons and the U.S. government (Hoover 1988:34-35; Hodge 1910:644-645).

Sources of information about places of importance to the Yankton tribe are few. No comprehensive ethnography of the tribe has been written by a professional anthropologist, and historical works are typically limited in scope and scattered in older publications. A recent exception to this is the book, The Yankton Sioux, written by Herbert T. Hoover (1988), which comprehensively reviews the history of the tribe, though briefly and for a popular audience. Much of the information in this book is based on a thematic survey of Yankton historical sites conducted by Hoover in the 1970s. Hoover’s survey notes (Hoover 1985) are on file with the State Historical Preservation Center in Vermillion and furnish a number of useful leads about ethnographic places.

Probably the most useful source of information about Yankton ethnographic places is an article entitled "Notes on the Ethnogeography of the Yankton Dakota," by James H. Howard (1972), which was published in Plains Anthropologist. Howard’s essay reviews Yankton history in general and surveys Yankton geographical landmarks on the basis of information provided by Yankton elders in 1966-1967 and earlier.

Three published Indian Claims Commission reports prove useful reviews of ethnohistorical information bearing on the historical movements of the Yanktons. Two of these (Woolworth 1974; Champe 1974) focus specifically on the Yankton tribe, while the third (Hurt 1974) is of broader scope and reviews the history of the Sioux groups in all three of the tribal linguistic divisions (Lakota, Nakota, and Dakota). Howard’s 1972 study, however, is more useful than any of these three works for the purpose of this chapter.

Yankton archeology is poorly known, for reasons that have been presented above. Only one Yankton village site in the NIMI study area (Gavin’s Point site, 39YK203) is known archeologically, but has been little investigated, and one other occupation site (39BO55) from the early reservation period has recently been attributed to the Yanktons, but likewise is poorly known archeologically (Blakeslee and O’Shea 1983:276-278, 312).
Of the three "resident" American Indian tribes in the NIMI region, the Poncas appear to have resided there longest, possibly from ca. A.D. 1600 (Wood 1965). The Yanktons originated in central Minnesota but probably moved to the southeastern South Dakota area as early as about A.D. 1720 (Howard 1972:281, 283). The Santees, however, are by far the most recent newcomers to the NIMI region, having been settled on their reservation by the government in 1866 following the Dakota-American warfare that began in Minnesota in 1862. A few Santees had occasionally been present in the NIMI region before establishment of the Nebraska reservation for them, usually as part of a mixed Santee-Yankton community near the mouth of the Vermillion River in the 1830s and 1840s (cf. Blakeslee and O’Shea 1983:96-103).

Despite the fact that the Santees’ association with the NIMI region has not been of as long duration as that of the Poncas and Yanktons, they have in fact lived on their Nebraska reservation for nearly 130 years and have developed strong attachment to the land over that time. The fact that Table 28-5 shows few (only five) locations associated with the Santees, does not mean that the Santee reservation and the surrounding region are devoid of places that are important to the tribe. However, little information about such places are available in the published literature relating to the Nebraska Santees. Other than Meyer’s (1993) history of the tribe, few studies have focused specifically on these people and relatively little published historical or ethnographic information about them is available as a result. Few details about Santee ethnographic places in the NIMI region can be incidentally gleaned from published works that focus largely on subjects other than the Santees (e.g., Woolworth 1974, Howard 1972, Chitterlen and Richardson 1905, and the scattered historical works cited in Blakeslee and O’Shea 1983).

As mentioned above, ethnographic fieldwork could be undertaken on the Santee reservation and in the surrounding vicinity for the specific purpose of identifying and documenting places of ethnographic importance to the Nebraska Santees. The same holds true for the Yanktons and the Poncas as well. Undoubtedly, ethnographic field work among the elders of all three tribes residing in the NIMI area has the potential to expand our knowledge of ethnographic places severalfold. This chapter has only scratched the surface of such knowledge, however, based solely on a review of relevant historical and ethnographic literature. Because the status of all three tribes as dependent sovereign nations is recognized by the Federal government, future ethnographic studies conducted by means of interviews with members of these tribes should be conducted only with the explicit permission of their respective tribal governments as well as with the consent of the individual interviewees.
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Table 23-1. National Register of Historic Places properties in counties close to MHI that relate to European ethnic or religious groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Name/Type</th>
<th>Date Listed</th>
<th>General Location</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ron Homme County, South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Homme Hutterite Colony</td>
<td>6/30/82</td>
<td>on Missouri River south of Tabor</td>
<td>First Hutterite colony in U.S. founded 1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Wenceslaus Catholic Church and Parrish House</td>
<td>2/13/85</td>
<td>in Tabor</td>
<td>Historic Czech immigrant church complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cihak Farmstead</td>
<td>11/25/84</td>
<td>Scotland vicinity</td>
<td>German-Russian folk architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C.B.J. Hall</td>
<td>1/31/85</td>
<td>in Tyndall</td>
<td>Czech fraternal lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Frydrych Farmstead</td>
<td>6/5/87</td>
<td>Tyndall vicinity</td>
<td>Czech folk architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hulka Chalkrock House</td>
<td>6/6/87</td>
<td>Tabor vicinity</td>
<td>Czech folk architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Herman Chalkrock House</td>
<td>6/6/87</td>
<td>Tabor vicinity</td>
<td>Czech folk architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Herman Log Stable</td>
<td>6/6/87</td>
<td>Tabor vicinity</td>
<td>Czech folk architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Herman Rubblestone Barn</td>
<td>6/6/87</td>
<td>Tabor vicinity</td>
<td>Czech folk architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Honner Chalkrock House</td>
<td>6/5/87</td>
<td>Tabor vicinity</td>
<td>Czech folk architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Herkman, Jr. Rubblestone House</td>
<td>6/5/87</td>
<td>Tabor vicinity</td>
<td>Czech folk architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John and Kate Herkman Log and Rubblestone House</td>
<td>6/6/87</td>
<td>Tabor vicinity</td>
<td>Czech folk architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar County, Nebraska</td>
<td>6/6/87</td>
<td>John and Kate Merkwan Rubblestone House-Barn</td>
<td>Czech folk architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/6/87</td>
<td>Joseph Noll Chalkrock Barn</td>
<td>Czech folk architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/6/87</td>
<td>Jacob Sedlacek Chalkrock House</td>
<td>Czech folk architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/6/87</td>
<td>Teibel-Sykora Rubblestone Barn</td>
<td>Czech folk architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/6/87</td>
<td>John Travnicek Chalkrock House</td>
<td>Czech folk architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/6/87</td>
<td>Albion Walker Chalkrock House</td>
<td>Czech folk architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/21/83</td>
<td>St. Boniface Catholic Church Complex</td>
<td>1886 church and 1902 school built for German-Catholics; design incorporates Czech church design elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/31/85</td>
<td>Franz Zavadil Farmstead</td>
<td>Historic Czech immigrant farmstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay County, South Dakota</td>
<td>12/20/88</td>
<td>Jens N. and Anna Junker Farmstead</td>
<td>Historic Danish immigrant farmstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/30/78</td>
<td>Anderson Homestead</td>
<td>Historic Swedish immigrant homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/20/78</td>
<td>Rice Farm</td>
<td>Historic Norwegian immigrant farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox County, Nebraska</td>
<td>6/22/82</td>
<td>Rad Sladkovsky (aka C.S.P.S. Cis. 68 Z.C.B.J. Cis 8 and Pishelville Hall)</td>
<td>First Czech fraternal lodge built in Nebraska, constructed in 1884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Z.C.B.J. Opera House
Union County, South Dakota
St. Peter's Catholic Church

7/5/38 in Verdigre
7/19/39 in Jefferson

1903 Czech fraternal lodge
Historic French-Canadian and Irish church

Information taken from National Register of Historic Places 1966-1988 (Anonymous 1988) and the Spring 1989 theme issue of Nebraska History magazine (vol. 70, no. 1), and from lists provided by Mr. Mike Bedeau of the South Dakota Historic Preservation Office, Vermillion. See also Franklin et al. 1994 for historic context of these sites, as well as various chapters by Michelle Watson in this study.
On James River at mouth of Beaver Creek, a tributary from the W.

Yankton village

Yanktons

Reported to be near a "yellow bluff" (Howard 1972:296)

(AReIA 1857:123-125)

Note: AReIA denotes the Annual report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the year indicated.
INTRODUCTION

The federal government of the United States of America has a unique legal and political relationship with more than 300 federally-recognized Native American Nations resident within the 48 contiguous states (Klein 1995:30-32; Federal Register, Vol. 58, No. 202, pp. 54364-54369, October 21, 1993). This complex relationship has evolved as a result of numerous treaties, statutes, Supreme Court decisions, international law, and, particularly, the U.S. Constitution (Wilkinson 1987; Deloria 1985; Deloria and Lytle 1983; Prucha 1984; Wunder 1994; Hall 1979). Because the federal government and the tribes are so closely interconnected, it is essential to discuss the histories of American Indian tribes within the context of federal Indian policy. The various histories and contemporary situations of the Yankton Sioux, Santee Sioux, and Ponca Tribe of Nebraska will be placed within the historical context of changing federal Indian policy to gain a more comprehensive picture of the larger forces at work over time. These tribes provide well-documented case studies of the major policy periods, as well as demonstrating the implications of those policies for these particular plains peoples.

The following discussion will be organized in terms of major federal policy periods which have impacted the history and traditions of the three NIMI-resident tribes. Arguably, one of the primary underlying goals of federal Indian policy has consistently been the dispossession of the tribal landbase and control of strategic natural resources (Barsh 1988; Jorgenson 1978; Ritter 1994). This theme will be examined via six major policy periods: Treaty-Making; Removal, Relocation, and the Establishment of Reservations; Allotment and Assimilation; the "Indian New Deal;" Termination; and Tribal Self-Determination. After a brief discussion of the nature of the federal/tribal relationship, the major policy periods will be discussed, drawing examples from the histories of the Northern Poncas, Santee Sioux, and Yankton Sioux.

Federal/Tribal Trust Relationship

Fundamentally, the federal/tribal relationship is based on the notion of inherent tribal sovereignty delimited under the guardianship of the U.S. federal government (Deloria 1985;
Deloria and Lytle 1983; Wunder 1994). This model dates from the landmark Supreme Court decision, Cherokee Nation v. Georgia (1831). Deloria (1985:239) describes the significance of this ruling:

The federal-Indian relationship, as Chief Justice John Marshall commented, is like no other in the world. Indian tribes are denominated "domestic dependent nations," but their practical relationship with the United States "resembles that of a ward to his guardian."

Justice Marshall's opinion was a vindication for the Cherokee Nation because it recognized that the state of Georgia (and by extension, all states) lacked jurisdiction over tribal lands and affairs. Jurisdiction over tribal matters was defined as exclusively within the purview of the federal/tribal relationship. However, the decision effectively diminished the exercise of tribal sovereignty because Justice Marshall narrowly interpreted this right to be dependent upon the benevolence of the federal government. Despite, or perhaps because of, Chief Justice Marshall's 1831 opinion, jurisdictional disputes between tribal, federal, and state polities have persisted (Wilkins and Ritter 1994).

Legal precedent (e.g., Worcester v. Georgia [1832], Cherokee Nation v. Georgia [1831], and Solem v. Bartlett [1984]) clearly reserves jurisdiction over tribal matters to the federal government. The exception to the general rule of federal jurisdiction over tribal matters is found in the P.L. 280 states (including Nebraska; see below), which have varying degrees of jurisdiction over civil and criminal matters on various Indian reservations (Olson and Wilson 1984; Wunder 1994; Deloria and Lytle 1983).

As the federal government increasingly entered into real estate transactions with tribal governments, the ward/guardian model eventually evolved into the federal/tribal "trust" relationship. However, no specific document (code, statute, treaty, etc.) has been produced to precisely define this reciprocal relationship which is commonly acknowledged between the federally-recognized tribes and the federal government.

For the NIMI-resident tribes (the Yankton Sioux, Poncas, and Santee Sioux), this relationship is well-established by numerous treaties (see Appendix II). For the Yankton Sioux, the trust relationship was established by the Treaties of 1815 (Art. 3), 1825 (Art. 1 and Art. 2), and 1858 (Art. 4) (Hall 1979). For the Poncas the trust relationship was made explicit in the treaties of 1817 (Art. 3), 1825 (Art. 1 and Art. 2), and 1858 (Art. 2). The Santee Sioux Tribe's trust relationship dates from the treaties of 1815 (Art. 3) and 1825 (Art. 1 and Art. 2). For other tribes, inclusion under federal trusteeship stems from the
extension of statutes, the U.S. Constitution or international law
(Hall 1979).

The specific trustee for American Indian tribes and
individuals is the United States Congress, which is the only
federal entity that may define the scope of the federal
trusteeship (Hall 1979:9). Practically speaking, the bulk of
administrative oversight of the trust responsibility is vested in
the Department of the Interior, primarily with the Bureau of
Indian Affairs. However, technically, all federal agencies share
responsibility for the trust relationship. For example, the
Department of Health, Education and Welfare has the formidable
responsibility of administering the Indian Health Service.

Recently, the Clinton administration has reinforced the federal
commitment to this responsibility in a presidential directive
(Presidential Memorandum of April 24, 1994, published in the
Federal Register, Vol. 59, No. 85, pp. 22951-22952) as well as in
a number of high-profile meetings between administrators and
tribal leaders.

As trustee, the federal government has the following general
duties:

1) Protection of Indian trust property; 2) Protection of
the Indian right to self-government; and 3) The provision
of those social, medical and educational services
necessary for the survival of the tribe. (Hall 1979:9)

These federal responsibilities are the result of Congressional
ratified treaties, entered into under the terms of the United
States Constitution, with the tribal nations. Because the Indian
nations were treated as sovereign nations under the provisions of
the U.S. Constitution, responsibility to uphold the treaty
obligations, and therefore Indian affairs in general, have fallen
within the federal domain. Under the U.S. Constitution, treaties
are considered to be the "supreme law of the land."

TREATY MAKING AND DISPOSSESSION

By and large, the transfer of nearly two billion acres of
Indian land into the public domain of the United States for
subsequent sale to non-Indian settlers was conducted in a
systematic, legal manner under the auspices of the U.S.
Constitution (Sutton 1994). The question of fairness (i.e.,
whether Indian nations were compensated and treated in a "fair"
manner) is another issue altogether (see Wishart 1990; Wishart
1994).

The Doctrine of Discovery

The "Doctrine of Discovery" was a legalistic device used by
the European colonial powers (and later the United States of
America) to justify the "taking" of land already occupied by native inhabitants. Because claiming title by discovery was only admissible if the land had no owners, the European colonial powers chose to resolve their dilemma by entering into formal "government to government" treaty-making. Deloria and Lytle (1984:2) suggest that

Every legal doctrine that today separates and distinguishes American Indians from other Americans traces its conceptual roots back to the Doctrine of Discovery and the subsequent moral and legal rights and responsibilities of the United States with respect to Indians.

For this reason, legal scholars continue to cite precedents established by the Doctrine of Discovery, vis-a-vis American Indian nations (e.g., Cohen 1942).

In North America, the legacy of formal diplomatic relations with Native Americans was established by the British. The British negotiated treaties during the colonial period which included military alliances with powerful Indian nations and real estate purchase agreements to facilitate the orderly settlement of the eastern regions of North America (Deloria 1994). With the outbreak of the American Revolutionary War, the Continental Congress continued this tradition by sending out authorized representatives to negotiate neutrality treaties with the powerful northeastern tribes.

After the American Revolution, the Americans laid claim to the Doctrine of Discovery rights secured by the British in order to void previous British land patents (Deloria 1985:240). As a result of Johnson v. McIntosh (21 U.S. 543 [1823]), the U.S. Supreme Court established the principle

in American domestic law that the Indian owned the equitable title to their lands subject only to the superior title exercised by the discoverer, or his successor, in this instance the successfully independent United States. Relying on the Johnson v. McIntosh theory and the commerce clause of the Constitution, the executive branch negotiated treaties with Indian tribes as a function of its responsibility under international law. (Deloria 1985:240)

We can gain some understanding of the status attached to the official political nature of treaties by the fact that they are handled by the Department of State, which oversees the relationships between the federal government and foreign nations.

Cyrus Thomas (in Royce 1899:642) identified the official federal position under which land titles of Indian nations have
been recognized: 1) original right of occupancy, and 2) title to
the established reservations. These categories of recognition
differ from the legal concepts of "original title" because they
are ultimately derived from the United States government, as the
"discoverer" (Royce 1899:642).

Questions of land tenure have permeated the federal/tribal
relationship from the earliest days of European settlement of
North America. Lasting removal (dispossession) was accomplished
primarily through the negotiation, interpretation, and
implementation of treaty-negotiated land cessions.

The history of treaty-making with Indian nations is
important in several regards. Treaty-making provides a written
documentation of the formal political relationships forged by the
U.S. Government with the various Indian nations. In the context
of international law and human rights, the list of Indian
treaties "provides a guide to diplomatic activities of the United
States with indigenous peoples" (Deloria 1994:646).

The treaty-making provision of the U.S. Constitution is
found in Article II:

He [the president] shall have Power, by and with the
Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties,
provided two thirds of the Senators present concur.
(quoted in Prucha 1994:70)

The Constitution established the superiority of federal laws and
treaties over state laws and treaties in Article VI:

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States
which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all
Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the
Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme
Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be
bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of
any State to the Contrary notwithstanding. (quoted in
Prucha 1994:69)

Under the Constitution, treaty-making is presumed to take
place between sovereign nations (Deloria 1994). In this spirit,
it is important to note that, legally speaking, any right not
specifically enumerated in the treaty language is presumed to
remain with the Indian nation (Deloria 1994; Wunder 1994). This
point is important because it reinforces the claims of
sovereignty articulated by American Indian nations today.

The first major step towards tribal dispossession involved
the negotiation and eventual ratification of 371 treaties with
the various sovereign Indian nations who occupied what would
eventually become the continental United States (Prucha 1984).
However, for various reasons, dozens of other treaties and agreements failed to achieve Congressional ratification despite good-faith negotiations on the part of Indian leaders.

The treaties fall into two major categories: 1) treaties of trade and intercourse, intended to foster "friendly" trade relationships; and, later, 2) the treaties of cession, designed to free up vast tracts of Indian land for American settlement (Prucha 1984). Both categories of treaties were inspired primarily by economic considerations, although federal officials were also anxious to militarily buffer burgeoning frontier borders from hostile natives. In this context, the treaties are clearly politically-motivated as well economically-motivated.

The "first" treaties to be negotiated by the United States with Indian nations were nearly always trade and intercourse treaties, which sought to establish mutually-beneficial economic and political arrangements (e.g., the extension of the lucrative "factory system;" see below) (Ronda 1984). These treaties reflect both the perceived sovereignty of the Indian nations and the keen desire of the Americans to gain entry by establishing formal diplomatic channels.

When the Treaty of Ghent (1814) ended the War of 1812, one stipulation required Great Britain and the United States to make peace treaties with the Indian allies of the other country. The United States took this stipulation as an invitation to negotiate new treaties (of friendship) with non-aligned Indian Nations living near the Missouri and other western rivers, eventually including the NIMI-resident tribes (Deloria 1994).

In this era, "Manifest Destiny" drove the philosophy behind securing vast cessions of Indian land. "Treaty Commissions" routinely criss-crossed the continent, e.g., 1851 Treaty of Ft. Laramie, securing Indian land cession agreements for ratification in the United States Senate.

Unfortunately, the settlement of Indian lands by Euroamericans frequently preceded these treaties of cession. In fact, pioneer thrust prior to the completion of negotiations for title to Indian lands constituted a problem in land administration for at least 3/4 of the last century. The cession of Indian lands was a prerequisite for the ultimate transfer of acreage to individuals, to the railroad, and to the future states, and such transfers of tribal land came about under the disposal policies of public land laws. (Sutton 1975:44)

In this environment the treaty commissions, Congress, and the tribes themselves came under increasing pressure to yield to
"preemption laws to give good title to settlers squatting on Indian lands" (Deloria 1985:241). Many of the treaties specifically provided for continued hunting and fishing rights (in ceded territories) as well as formally identifying the recognized homelands of the various tribes (Deloria 1994). Eventually these delimitations would prove to be valuable evidence for the decisions made by the Indian Claim Commission.

The timing of the "treaties of cession" reflects the growing nineteenth-century American hegemony over Indian territories. Frequently individual tribes actually petitioned Congress (e.g., the Poncas in 1857) to cede aboriginal territory because the rate of American encroachment, coupled with growing tribal impoverishment, left tribal leaders in the unsavory position of raising revenue by selling their only asset—land (Wishart 1994).

The relative cost of acquiring Indian lands for the public domain also increased. Wishart (1990:103) has observed that "once the bison were gone and the Indians confined to reservations, the government reluctantly had to pay more for cessions in order to finance intensifying assimilation policies and feed Indians who could no longer feed themselves." However, as Wishart (1990:97) has demonstrated, the Indians seldom received fair market value for their lands ceded to the federal government:

From 1825 to 1900 the US paid the Indians a total of $29,977,015 for 290 million acres on the central and northern Great Plains, an average compensation of 10 cents per acre, and often nothing at all.

Wishart (1990:101-102) also comments on the long-term consequences of this penny-wise, pound-foolish policy:

The result was that the Indians' land base rapidly diminished, but the Americanization program was never given the necessary funds to have even a chance of succeeding.

Cheap, abundant land benefitted settlers as well as the government, whose role as "real estate agent" netted considerable profit when the cheaply acquired Indian lands were quickly sold at the prevailing market price to eager settlers. The Indian dispossession policy of the federal government did not come without a price, however. Battey (1970) estimates that the United States government expended approximately $500,000,000 between 1850 and 1890 fighting the "Indian wars."

For many tribes, treaties of cession were perceived as the only rational hope of receiving compensation for and/or legally-recognized entitlement to any portion of their aboriginal homelands.
In 1899, the Smithsonian Institution published a compilation of information pertaining to all tracts of land within the United States that were ceded by treaties or reserved for the establishment of Indian reservations (Royce 1899). The information was presented in tabular form, accompanied by a series of colored maps showing the limits of each ceded or reserved tract, which have come to be individually called "Royce areas" after the compiler of the volume, Charles C. Royce. The "Royce areas" in the NIMI region are shown on Maps 29-1a and 29-1b, which are based on maps 11, 41, and 42 in the original publication. Pertinent information about the "Royce areas" shown on Maps 29-1a and 29-1b is summarized in Table 29-4. These "Royce areas" are somewhat different from the "aboriginal territories" of tribes, as established by final judgments of the Indian Claims Commission (see Map 29-2 and subsequent discussion of the Commission in this chapter).

The resident tribes were well-acquainted with the treaty-making process. The Yanktons negotiated seven ratified treaties (Hoover 1976). The Santees negotiated six specific treaties and were involved, to a degree, in a total of thirteen (Meyer 1993). The Poncas have four ratified treaties (Howard 1965). (See Appendix II for treaty texts.)

Despite the relatively remote locale of the Ponca, Santee, and Yankton tribes to the frontier borders, they were specifically included in some of the most significant early treaty-making expeditions on the plains. The Yanktons were among the tribes met and documented by the Lewis and Clark expedition in 1804. The Lewis and Clark expedition visited a deserted Ponca village in 1804, while the Poncas were away on their summer bison hunt.

President Jefferson intended to achieve many goals beyond merely exploring the newly acquired Louisiana Purchase with the Lewis and Clark expedition of 1804-1806 (Ronda 1984). Jefferson was keenly interested in establishing diplomatic relations which would encourage trade in the newly-acquired territory. To achieve this goal, the President realized the necessity of acquiring detailed ethnographic information. Jefferson recognized that the specter of incorporating plains tribes into the lucrative "factory system" would be a political vindication for his bold acquisition policy. The factory system (already well-established with the eastern tribes) was a system of government-operated trading posts, strategically located along the frontier borders to facilitate and regulate trade with the Indians. He also recognized that incorporating the vast territory west of the Mississippi into the United States would potentially provide a necessary "outlet" if removal of the eastern tribes was warranted in the future (Prucha 1984).

The first official meeting between the United States
government and the leaders of the Yankton Sioux was well-documented by the Lewis and Clark expedition. Lewis and Clark were anxious to improve upon their initial diplomatic experience with the Otos and Missourias. Ronda (1984:24) has suggested that, "While the Oto and Missouri meetings were important as first forays in frontier diplomacy, the explorers knew that talks with any Sioux groups would be of lasting significance." For their part, the Yanktons were equally anxious to secure their foothold in the dynamic Missouri River fur trade evolving under American control.

On the morning of August 30, 1804, the Corps of Discovery began the official council with the Yankton delegation at Calumet Bluff. Ronda (1984:24) describes the Yankton chiefs (e.g., Weuche and White Swan) as entering in "high ceremony" with musicians and ceremonial protocol. Lewis began the proceedings with a lengthy prepared speech (repeated for the duration of the expedition with subsequent Indian nations) expounding themes of American sovereignty and lucrative trade opportunities for the Yanktons. Lewis also proposed the need to negotiate a lasting peace between the Yanktons and the Oto, Missouri, and Omaha nations.

The Americans were well received, and on the following day, the Yanktons laid out their own proposals. Chief Weuche was intent on seizing the opportunity to enhance the economic and political position of the Yanktons, vis-a-vis the Missouri River trade and the larger regional and global economy (Ronda 1984). The Yanktons had ample prior experience with the English and Spanish and "pointedly complained, [that] the Yanktons needed more than bits of bronze and silver to fend off poverty" (Ronda 1984:25). Towards this end, Chief Weuche suggested that the Yanktons required greater access to trade goods, namely firearms and ammunition (Ronda 1984). Chief Weuche also maneuvered to insert himself and the Yanktons into the diplomatic milieu to act as intermediaries with other Indian nations on behalf of the Americans (Ronda 1984).

In the early days of the expedition, the experience with the powerful, friendly Yanktons was considered a grand success:

Here were Sioux headmen and warriors who welcomed the Americans and gladly joined the new trade system. The expedition's diplomacy appeared to have come of age... Worries about 'the nations above' were easily dispelled in the glow of proceedings at Calumet Bluff. (Ronda 1984:26)

The positive experience with the Yanktons proved to be diametrically opposed to the "hostile" encounter waiting upriver when Lewis and Clark met the Tetons.
The historic meeting between the Yanktons and the Corps of Discovery (Lewis and Clark expedition) made an indelible impression on the Yanktons as well as the relatively inexperienced expedition leaders. Among the more colorful legends (handed down through oral history) which has survived to the present is the story of the birth of Yankton Chief Struck-by-the-Ree. Reportedly, Struck-by-the-Ree, son of a prominent Yankton headman, was born during the Lewis and Clark visit in 1804. The American delegation requested that the baby be presented to them and reportedly wrapped the newborn in an American flag and predicted that "he would someday become a leader among his people and a steadfast friend of the whiteman" (Sansom-Flood and Bernie 1985:5). Struck-by-the-Ree was likely not the name given to him at birth, but was probably acquired at some point later in his life, possibly as a result of a skirmish with the Arikaras or "Ree" (Sansom-Flood and Bernie 1985).

Padaniapapi, or Struck-by-the-Ree, eventually became the Wicasa Itancan, most influential chief of the Ihanktonwan (Yanktons) for more than three decades (Sansom-Flood and Bernie 1985). Struck-by-the-Ree's leadership was instrumental in guiding a peaceful government-to-government relationship throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century. He vigorously supported the Treaty of 1858, although later in life he reportedly regretted that decision: "[I]f I had understood from what my grandfather told me that I was to be treated as I have been, I would never have done as I have done; I never would have signed the treaty" (Congressional Globe, 1866, in Sansom-Flood and Bernie 1985:6).

As a result of the Lewis and Clark expedition, considerable ethnographic and demographic information about various Plains tribes is available to researchers and scholars today. Of particular relevance to the NIMI study area are the notes from the expedition which have provided some of the earliest reliable ethnographic, geographic, and demographic information available about the Omaha, Ponca, Yankton, and Teton Sioux tribes.

As treaties of cession became commonplace on the plains, various tribes attempted to outmaneuver neighboring tribes in treating for the acknowledged ownership and, therefore, monetary compensation for the cession of "aboriginal territories" (Wishart 1994). For example, in the Ponca Treaty of 1858, the Poncas were constrained in defining their aboriginal territory for cession because the Pawnee and Omaha had already ceded all but 2.3 million acres included in the Ponca homeland (Wishart 1994). The Poncas claimed over 25 million acres of hunting territory in the present states of Nebraska and South Dakota (Lake 1981:454). These issues resurfaced during the proceedings of the Indian Claims Commission (1948-1978) and resulted in numerous disputes between various tribes seeking to define their aboriginal territories for compensation (see Wishart 1990; Wishart 1994;
In another move that is exemplary of complete American hegemony over Indian territories, Congress officially ended bilateral treaty-making with Indian nations in 1871. Consequently, "...until March 3, 1871, Indian titles to lands were extinguished only under the treaty-making clause of the Constitution" (Royce 1899:640). After 1871, real estate transactions were negotiated unilaterally via "Executive Agreements" which function in many of the same ways as treaties. Executive Agreements exemplify the guardian/ward relationship which has characterized much of the historical federal/Indian relationship.

With treaties of cession, the federal government assumed a new role with Native Americans, a marked departure from the "economic partnerships" embodied by the trade and intercourse treaties. The real estate transactions and the creation of reservations spawned a new role for the government as "trustee" of Indian lands, natural resources, and trust funds (which are managed by the U.S. Treasury) (Deloria 1994). The federal government has a "trust" responsibility with the federally-recognized Indian nations which includes 1) provision of treaty-guaranteed goods and services (health, education, housing, etc.); 2) protection; and 3) trusteeship of Indian assets (Deloria 1994).

Hoover estimates the Yanktons ceded sole claim to 13,356,000 acres and partial claim to 60,308,000 acres (Hoover 1976:125). The Poncas ceded aboriginal title to 2,334,000 acres (Wishart 1990:98). The Santees (Mdwakantons, Wahpekutes, Sissetons, and Wahpetons) ceded aboriginal claim to approximately 21,000,000 acres (Hoover 1994:161).

REMOVAL, RELOCATION, AND RESERVATIONS

With western expansion and settlement of the frontier, came increasing pressure to extinguish the Indian title to lands as recognized by the Doctrine of Discovery. Initially, this pressure was greatest east of the Mississippi and resulted in grand schemes in the 1820s and 1830s to segregate and remove eastern Indians away from the American frontier (Prucha 1984). In this manner, the "Five Civilized Tribes" (Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Seminole, and Creek) and others were permanently removed to reserved lands in Indian Territory during this period. The Cherokee Trail of Tears stands as a well-documented result of this policy (Prucha 1984; Olson and Wilson 1984). Removal policies enjoyed support from both the Christian Reformers, who felt that segregation away from American settlers was the only solution to "save" the Indians, and from speculators, settlers, and politicians who wanted the former reservations opened for American settlement and development.
assigned an Episcopal priest, Paul Mazakute, who built three
schools on the reservation (Sansom-Flood et al. 1989).

Presbyterian minister Reverend John P. Williamson established his
own mission at the Yankton reservation. Befriended by Chief
Struck-by-the-Ree, Reverend Williamson became the "most
influential missionary on the Yankton Reservation" for the next
47 years (Sansom-Flood et al. 1989:16). Williamson's strategy
was to teach Yanktons to read and write (and convert to
Christianity) by using their own language. Towards this end, he
established a bilingual newspaper (Iapi Gaye), and wrote an
English/Dakota dictionary and a Dakota language hymnal (Sansom-
Flood et al. 1989).

By 1874, the missionaries had built seven schools and six
churches on the Yankton reservation. Reverend Williamson
exercised his considerable power to effectively ban the Sacred
Pipe religion. The last nineteenth-century Yankton Sun Dance was
performed on the reservation in 1873 (Sansom-Flood et al.
1989:10). In the 1880s, a new tribal court system was
established, which ultimately undermined the traditional ways of
handling grievances and disputes among the Yanktons.

Preferential treatment was meted out to Yankton "progressives"
who supported the Civilization Programs: "[Y]anktons who dressed
in whiteman's clothing, attended church, and told the agent they
no longer followed Sioux customs, were 'competent'" (Sansom Flood
et al. 1989:31). However, the Agents and missionaries were not
successful in completely "stamping out" the old ways; generally
the traditionalists went "underground" and continued to practice
their traditions.

The "Old" Ponca Reservation

The Poncas' bargaining position with the federal government
for cession of their ancestral homelands was constrained by the
earlier cessions made by the Omahas and Pawnees: "From 1855 on
they repeatedly expressed their willingness to sell their lands
in return for a reservation and annuities" (Wishart 1994:133).

In December of 1857, a delegation of Ponca leaders travelled to
Washington, D.C., to negotiate the terms of their first treaty of
cession with the United States of America. The proposal the
Ponca delegation presented to Indian Commissioner Charles Mix
defined the boundaries of their territory for sale, set the
price, and outlined the services they required (Wishart 1994).

Commissioner Mix, unwilling to seriously consider the Ponca
proposal, dictated a considerably lesser settlement (Wishart
1994). The Poncas received the equivalent of 19.5 cents per acre
for their 2.3 million acre cession (Wishart 1994:107). The fair
market value of their land at the time of the extinguishment of
their aboriginal title in 1858 was $1 per acre (Wishart 1990).

The Poncas were settled on their newly-established 58,000-
acre reservation in 1859. The original reservation was situated
on "sub-marginal" lands, devoid of adequate timber, hay, or agricultural potential. Eventually, the Poncas were allowed to negotiate a supplemental treaty which expanded their reservation to 96,000 acres in 1865 (see Appendix II). The early reservation years were extremely difficult for the Poncas who endured droughts, grasshopper infestations, inadequate provisions, poverty, hunger, and incessant raiding by the Teton Sioux:

The inadequate rations were only one example of the failure of the reservation policy to secure the lives of the Ponca. Their annuity from the 1858 treaty was...inadequate, being about 'one-third to one-half as much per capita as [that of] the other Tribes which they visit.' Their annual cash payment in the second half of the 1860s was less than five dollars per person. After payment of the previous year's debts they often had nothing left. The remainder of the annuity--the 'useful goods'--also left much to be desired. The delivery in 1862, for example, included a large amount of useless axes, a supply of fish hooks and lines which did not work for catching fish, thirty-six dozen pairs of mirrors which were simply left on the ground, and spoons, butcher knives, and scissors which were already in abundance at the village.

(Wishart 1994:150)

In addition, the government failed to live up to the treaty stipulation (Article 2, 1858 Treaty) of providing "protection" to the Poncas who suffered repeated depredations by the Brulé, non-Indian settlers, and, on occasion, the very soldiers charged with carrying out their protection (Wishart 1994; Mulhair 1992).

Life on the Ponca reservation became exceedingly difficult after the inadvertent cession of nearly the entire Ponca reservation to the Teton Sioux in the Treaty of Ft. Laramie of 1868 (Article 2 established the "Great Sioux Reservation"--which included the former Ponca reservation lying north of the Niobrara River). The Poncas were thus trapped in the geopolitical crossfire of federal Indian policy and the intensification of aggressive behavior on the part of the powerful Brulé band.

The Government was intent on concentrating all Indians on a few reservations, primarily in the Northern Plains and Indian Territory (Wishart 1994). In this context, the solution to the troublesome "Ponca problem" was to remove them to Indian Territory. As Lake (1981:501) has observed, "that policy was neither clearly articulated nor universally followed," offering little comfort for the displaced Poncas.

In fact, ample evidence exists to suggest that the Poncas have been treated unfairly throughout their official relationship with the federal government (Jackson 1881; Tibbles 1972; Ritter
Several persons close to the Ponca case observed that small, weak, and peaceful tribes received worse treatment than larger, more powerful, and certainly more hostile tribes. While the Poncas were starving, wagon loads of supplies for the far more hostile Sioux were delivered. The Poncas observed this, as did many whites interested in justice for the Poncas. (Lake 1981:501-502)

Embroided in political and military struggles with the powerful Tetons, the Government behaved towards the peaceful Poncas as if they were "expendable."

The Poncas became desperate to protect their families and well-being. At one point, in 1873, the Ponca chiefs negotiated an agreement with the Omaha chiefs to purchase a portion of the Omaha reservation to relocate away from the incessant Teton raiding (Lake 1981:459). Standing Bear was one of the Ponca chiefs who signed this agreement. However, the agreement never materialized and at subsequent hearings held on the "Ponca Affair," many of the Ponca chiefs, including Standing Bear, claimed that when they initially agreed to consider relocating from their Niobrara reservation, they believed their destination would be the Omaha reservation, not Indian Territory (Lake 1981).

The Ponca Trail of Tears

Rather than protect the Poncas (as promised in the Treaty of 1858), the government's solution was to remove them to Indian Territory, voluntarily or involuntarily. The decision was hastened by the government's intent to immediately move Spotted Tail's Brulé agency closer to the Missouri (onto the former Ponca reservation), for purposes of greater military supervision (federal troops were stationed at nearby Ft. Randall) and to facilitate the dispensing of annuities. In 1876, $25,000 was appropriated to remove the Poncas to Indian Territory, ostensibly with their consent (Tibbles 1972:122).

The Poncas were not allowed adequate time to council about their pending removal (Lake 1981). Ten chiefs travelled with Indian Inspector Kemble to Indian Territory to survey possible reservation sites in 1877. Displeased with the "hot country" (and their reception), the Poncas clashed with Kemble and, according to their accounts, were abandoned by Kemble to make their way back home with little money, provisions, or an interpreter. This fresh experience with Indian Territory and Inspector Kemble did not bode well for gaining the trust of the Poncas. Reportedly, Chief Standing Bear was particularly vocal in his opposition to the pending removal and was imprisoned (with his brother, Big Snake) at Ft. Randall until the second contingent of Poncas was prepared for removal.
Kemble called in troops from Ft. Randall to "escort" the Poncas off their reservation. The forced removal of the Poncas commenced in May of 1877. The first contingent to depart with Special Agent Kemble was the group of Poncas who were "willing" (i.e., did not require force) to remove. Although their journey was difficult, the hardships associated with the second contingent came to be known as the "Ponca Trail of Tears." Bad weather, a lack of provisions, and poor planning contributed to the miserable conditions endured on the trail. Many Poncas died of exposure, disease, and injury on the way to Indian Territory and in the weeks and months after their arrival. Chief Standing Bear's daughter was among the casualties, and she was given a Christian burial by the citizens of Milford, Nebraska, a humanitarian gesture which greatly impressed Chief Standing Bear. No provisions had been made for the Poncas when they arrived in Indian Territory. The poor management of their removal directly contributed to high rates of morbidity and mortality; nearly one-quarter of the tribe died within two years of their removal (Howard 1965).

The Trial of Chief Standing Bear

In the winter of 1879, following the death of his son, Chief Standing Bear led a party of 29 disaffected Poncas out of Indian Territory, toward their former home on the Niobrara. They were intercepted on the Omaha reservation and taken into custody under the authority of General George Crook. Their dramatic story was publicized by Thomas Henry Tibbles, editor of the Omaha Daily Herald, who rallied the good citizens of Omaha to the defense of Standing Bear and his followers (Tibbles 1972). Tibbles secured the expertise of two prominent attorneys, John L. Webster and Andrew J. Poppleton, to defend Standing Bear, Ma-Chu-nah-zha, in the first American Indian civil rights case to be tried in the American courts, United States ex rel. Standing Bear v. Crook, (25 F. Cas. 695; 1879). The case came to trial on April 30, 1877, in the Nebraska U.S. District Court of Judge Elmer S. Dundy.

The fundamental question addressed in the Standing Bear case was the precise status of Indians under the U.S. Constitution. Article I of the Constitution excludes non-taxpaying persons from American citizenship, but the legal status of Indians was not entirely clear. Ponca attorneys Webster and Poppleton filed a writ of habeas corpus:

The Application alleged simply that the applicants were illegally deprived of their liberty, that they had committed no crime, that they were ignorant of the reason for their arrest and confinement, and that they desired the court to inquire into the matter and order their release (Lake 1981:475).
rights activist John Collier to the post of Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1933 ushered in a period of political and economic innovation, the likes of which has not been seen since in Indian Country (Taylor 1980; Kelly 1983). However, the reception of these innovations proved to be a mixed bag. Some tribes welcomed the "Indian New Deal" as a much-needed respite from the assault on tribalism wrought by allotment and assimilation policies. Other tribes, ever wary of the idea of government-sponsored change, ultimately rejected the reforms proposed by the Indian Reorganization Act (Wheeler-Howard Act of 1934, 48 Stat. 984) in tribal referenda (Taylor 1980; Clemmer 1986). Regardless of whether a particular tribe accepted or rejected the Indian Reorganization Act, the legislation and policies initiated during the Collier years has left an indelible mark on contemporary American Indian affairs. This legacy is articulated in the organization of contemporary tribal political life and the manner in which the federal government conceives of and deals with federally-recognized tribes.

Prelude to the Indian New Deal

The historical context of the passage of the Indian New Deal legislation and policy deserves brief examination. While some have criticized the charismatic Commissioner Collier and his goals as "idealistic," no commentator could fail to acknowledge the dire straits Indians faced in the early twentieth century. Largely due to the tireless advocacy work of Collier and other reformers in the 1920s, the "Indian problem" was beginning to get some long-overdue attention at the federal level. Under political pressure, the Meriam Commission was established in 1927-1928 to document the plight of Native Americans and to provide substantive recommendations for future action. Before the Meriam Report, the American politicians and general public considered Native Americans to be a "vanishing race," an enigmatic people who somehow failed to fit in with prevailing progressive attitudes of twentieth-century America.

Although the socio-economic profiles came as no surprise to those familiar with life in "Indian Country," the grim realities of Indian life chronicled in the Meriam Report set in motion a humanistic response to resolve the many problems evident in Indian Country. The Meriam Report provided documented proof that while the Indians were undeniably suffering from abject poverty, poor health, and racist policies, they were not dying out as a people. The message was clear, the federal government had an "Indian problem" and was obliged to deal with it.

The Meriam Commission collected socio-economic data throughout the United States in 1928 (Brookings Institution 1971, originally published in 1928). Among the most telling of the statistics are those that reflect the extreme levels of poverty. The Commission found that the average per capita annual income of
Indian citizens was less than $200 in 1928 (Taylor 1980:7). On the Yankton reservation, per capita income in 1926 was $149; by 1933, annual per capita income had fallen to a mere $1.28 (Clow 1989:365-67). The roots of this poverty lay in decades of dependency fostered by the reservation system but perhaps more directly by the dispossession due to alienation of individual allotments after the passage of the Dawes Act of 1887, exacerbated by the Great Depression and the collapse of the farm economy. The destruction of traditional resource bases and landlessness were acute problems throughout the United States on the eve of the Indian New Deal.

The Civil Works Administration found that in 1933, 49 percent of all Indians on allotted reservations were landless and that the per capita value of the remaining land averaged only $800 (Taylor 1980:7). A particularly poignant statistic which gives insight into the overall quality of life on Indian reservations was the infant mortality rate for 1934 which averaged twice the rate of non-Indian infant deaths (Taylor 1980:9).

The legacy of the allotment policy was clearly a factor in the debates that surrounded the IRA legislation. Representative Edgar Howard (D-Nebraska), who sponsored the Wheeler-Howard Act in the House, gave an emotional speech on June 15, 1934, regarding the roots of Indian poverty:

In 1887 our Indian wards numbered 243,000. They owned 137,000,000 acres of land, more than one-third good farming land and a considerable portion of valuable timberlands. Today they number about 200,000. Their land holding has shrunk to a mere 47,000,000 acres. Of this remnant only 3,500,000 acres may be classed a farming lands, 8,000,000 acres as timberlands of any value, 16,000,000 acres as good grazing lands, and 19,000,000 acres, almost one-half the Indian land remaining, as desert or semiarid lands of limited value. (Dippie 1982:315)

Representative Howard (in Dippie 1982:315) went on to say that in 1887 there were less than 5,000 landless Indians, but that figure had increased twenty-fold by 1934 to more than 100,000. And he went on to observe that Indian trust funds, which amounted to approximately $29 million in 1887, had collected and disbursed over $500 million, leaving just $13.5 million coupled with rampant poverty by 1934. In 1934, at the height of the Great Depression, Howard reported to Congress that total family incomes of Indians were a mere $48 per year. He also reported that mortality rates had risen from 18 per 1,000 in 1887 to 26 per 1,000 in 1934.

One of the most obvious culprits of separating Indians from their trust-protected allotments was the federal competency
commission which criss-crossed the nation's reservations expediting the patenting of Indian allotments. When Indian allotments passed out of trust status, the allottee received a patent in fee simple, which gave the allottee title to the property and returned the land to taxable status. Typically, patented allotments were sold to land speculators or settlers to help alleviate abject poverty (Wishart 1994). Patented allotments were frequently sold to satisfy debts with local merchants.

Between 1915-1920, the federal competency commission issued 20,000 fee patents for allottees with one-half Indian blood quantum or less (Taylor 1980:5). This pattern of distinguishing between full-bloods and mixed-bloods in terms of competency for fee patents (which were generally sold) eventually fueled contentious factionalism within many tribes. Because of the Commission's work, full-bloods were much more likely to have retained their allotments in 1934 (due to trust protections) than the mixed-blood members of their tribe (Taylor 1980). This dichotomy of landless mixed-bloods vs. landed full-bloods proved to be divisive in the years to come.

The Meriam Report strongly recommended that Congress curtail allotment policy and move to restore the tribal landbase. The repudiation of allotment policy, however, was more than land reform; it was nothing short of repudiation of assimilation policy (Dipple 1982:315). Assimilation into the dominant society had long been considered the most appropriate solution to the Indian problem. Consequently, the federal debate began to focus on questions of the desirability and/or the success of assimilation policy.

John Collier and the "Indian New Deal"

The Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) is considered to be among the most important pieces of legislation to affect Indians in the twentieth century (Hauptman 1992:326; O'Brien 1989). At the very least, the package of legislation and policy reforms which accompanied the Indian New Deal signalled an "attitudinal change towards Indians and tribal government" (Deloria and Lytle 1983:100).

The Act was intended to reorganize American Indian tribes politically, with the specific goal of "home rule" which sought a return to self-determination and limited autonomy for tribal governments (Clemmer 1986; Hauptman 1992). The reforms also targeted economic reorganization, with the introduction of a number of economic development programs for tribally-sanctioned corporations. Under the IRA, tribal governments were encouraged to set up corporate charters to facilitate economic development:
According to Collier, the Act was intended to implement these policies: economic rehabilitation; organization of the Indian tribes for managing their own affairs; provision of civil and cultural freedom; and a return to the bilateralism that had characterized U.S.-Indian relations in the treaty-making period which ended in 1871. (Clemmer 1986:19)

Collier was interested in preserving "the biological Indian and Indian cultures," and as a staunch environmentalist, he was committed to the conservation of natural resources (Taylor 1980:30).

The goal of shifting federal policy away from paternalism and toward tribal self-determination was evident in Collier's commitment to taking the proposed reforms directly to the various tribal governments. The IRA was the first piece of major Indian legislation ever taken into "Indian Country" for open debate since the Congressional renunciation of bilateral treaty-making in 1871 (McNickle 1980). Collier held ten "Indian Congresses" between March 2 and April 24, 1934, to promote the IRA (Dippie 1982:311). Special priority was given to convincing the Navajos and the Sioux tribes to accept the reforms (Taylor 1980).

The Act was also the first major piece of Indian legislation whose acceptance or rejection was left up to the individual tribes by the explicit design of the Act (Dippie 1982:317). This "voluntary" feature of the IRA eventually proved to be one of the most significant obstacles to implementing the reforms Collier envisioned. "Between October 28, 1935 and January 15, 1939, ninety-seven Indian tribes framed constitutions for self-government, which were approved under the Act of June 18, 1934" (Cohen 1940:40).

Provisions of the IRA

Despite the fact that Collier's original bill had been pared down considerably by Congress, Collier maintained that the most essential ingredients of his envisioned reforms remained intact. The major provisions of the IRA included: 1) the repeal of the allotment laws; 2) permission to restore surplus reservation lands to tribal ownership; 3) voluntary exchanges of restricted trust lands for shares in tribal corporations; 4) the appropriation of $2 million annually for the purchase of additional tribal lands; 5) the establishment of a $10 million revolving credit fund to provide loans to chartered tribal corporations; and 6) an additional appropriation of $250,000 a year for organizing tribal governments and to establish a loan fund for Indians seeking college or vocational training. The Act explicitly provided for tribal referenda to determine whether each reservation would voluntarily participate in the IRA. Such referenda were to commence within one year at each reservation...
(later extended to two years). If the reservation community
accepted the IRA the tribal governing body was obligated to
prepare a constitution for ratification by the majority of the
tribal members (pending approval of the Secretary of the
Interior). Interestingly, if the reservation rejected the IRA,
these tribes would stay under the direct control of the BIA—
i.e., there would be no change.

Because most tribes had limited experience with
representative democratic constitutions, a model constitution was
prepared by Nathan Margold and Felix Cohen (Taylor 1980:37). The
organizational staff sent teams of attorneys around to the
reservations which had accepted the IRA to present the model
constitution and advise changes that would best reflect the
circumstances of the individual reservations. The basic format
of the IRA tribal constitutions authorized by the Act were
remarkably uniform, with nine articles covering territory,
membership, governing body, powers of the tribal council,
elections, removals from office, referenda, land, and amendments
(Taylor 1980:97-98).

One of the most noteworthy consequences of the Indian New
Deal era was the beginning of the codification of Indian law
under the direction of Interior Department Solicitors Nathan
Margold and Felix Cohen (Taylor 1980):

This made explicit in statutory law for the first time the
principle, which the courts had followed since Justice
Marshall's rulings in the 1830s, recognizing the residual
right of Indian tribes to govern themselves. (McNickle
1973:94)

This codification was necessary in order to draft the IRA
legislation and to draw up the model constitutions facilitated by
the IRA. In this context, Margold was responsible for laying out
the basic tenets of tribal sovereignty which are still
acknowledged in Indian law today.

Accomplishments of the IRA

Under the IRA, approximately 2 million acres of land were
restored to the tribal landbase under the land reconsolidation
provisions of the Act (Taylor 1980:121). This was accomplished
primarily through the transfer of public domain lands on the
reservations back to the control of the tribes. The IRA also
extended the trust period indefinitely for allottees who had not
yet received fee patents (Dipple 1982:316). This provision also
contributed to the ability of full-blood allottees to retain
their allotments.

However, contrary to Collier's intent, the IRA did not allow
the Secretary of the Interior to purchase non-Indian lands on the
"checkerboarded" reservations. In all, 2,755,019 acres were added to the tribal landbase between 1934 and 1940 (Taylor 1980:123). Of this, only 20 percent of the lands were purchased by tribal corporations or exchanged under the land reconsolidation provisions of the IRA (Taylor 1980:123).

Despite the end of allotment and the provisions to enhance tribal landbases, examination of Indian land tenure in the immediate post-IRA period revealed that seven million acres remained in heirship status (1937) and 17.5 million acres were still held by the original allottees (Taylor 1980:124). Taylor (1980:124) estimates that despite the land reform programs, Indian tribes acquired only one-tenth of the landbase necessary to make economic development a reality on the nation's reservations.

With the outbreak of World War II, the attention and resources of the federal government pertaining to Indian affairs were abruptly curtailed. Indian Service appropriations for this era are indicative: in 1935, the Indian Service Budget included $28,146,105; by 1938 that figure had jumped to $47,942,541; and in 1944 the Indian Service Budget was returned to pre-IRA levels of $28,000,000 (Taylor 1980:140).

Commissioner John Collier, as an administrator, lobbyist, and humanistic reformer, achieved an exceedingly high level of change in the bureaucratic machinery guiding federal Indian policy. By the same token, he added an additional layer of federal oversight to implement his policies (Hauptman 1992), which was highly unpopular with many tribal governments and political observers. Perhaps the aspect of the IRA which was most vulnerable to criticism was the charge that the Collier administration designed and superimposed a representative democratic system which was foreign to most of the American Indian nations in the United States.

Self-Determination vs. Assimilation in the IRA

Collier managed to ignite a firestorm of opposition from many different corridors, Indian and non-Indian alike. Many Indians were suspicious that "...John Collier, a native of Georgia, was out to secure a slick, updated form of segregation without removal" (Dippie 1982:313). As LaFarge (in Clemmer 1986:21) commented, "The idea that members of the government should do anything for them for idealistic reasons is impossible for them to receive."

Some saw Collier's advocacy of communal economic development and land tenure as a "communist plot." Others vehemently opposed the abandonment of assimilation policies. For many, particularly powerful Western interests, the specter of empowering tribal governments to reacquire land and control of natural resources...
(Mulhair 1992); it was transferred to Indian Territory during the forced removals of 1877 and reestablished for the Northern Poncas who returned to Nebraska in 1881 under the Santee Agency. When the Santee Agency was closed in 1917, the Poncas and Santees were transferred to the Yankton Agency for supervision. When the Yankton Agency was closed in 1933, the Poncas and Santees were transferred to the Winnebago Agency, and the Yanktons were returned to Rosebud for supervision (Federal Records Center 1965:2). Despite the similarities, there exist considerable differences in the reactions and ultimate consequences of the IRA for the Poncas, Santees, and Yankton Sioux.

For the purposes of the case studies, two kinds of tribal governments recognized under the IRA charters are important: representative and general council. Representative tribal governments are elected governing bodies that operate under a constitution which tribal members have approved in referenda. General councils are more closely associated with the traditional mode of governing among Sioux tribes. The general council is composed of all adult tribal members. Under this form of government, the tribal membership adopts bylaws which govern and control the tribal officers, but these tribal officials have limited authority. When a substantive issue arises, officers call a general council meeting of the tribe and the members vote on the issue (Deloria and Lytle 1983:108). The Ponca and Santee Sioux tribes chose representative governments (as did most of the IRA tribes); however, the Yanktons chose to stay with a general council style of government.

Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska

The Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska accepted the IRA. They ratified an IRA constitution on February 29, 1936, which was subsequently approved by Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, on April 3, 1936 (see Appendix I). The vote was 68 in favor and 13 opposed, with over 30 percent of those entitled to vote participating in the election (as per Section 16 of the IRA, amended in 1935).

The first Ponca constitution, adopted in 1935, was similar to the "model constitutions." The Ponca constitution provided for the extension of tribal jurisdiction throughout the boundaries of the reservation established by the 1858 and 1865 treaties. It established a governing body, and a nine-member "Board of Governors" to be elected on staggered three-year terms.

The Northern Ponca landbase was seriously eroded by 1934. Very few Poncas had held onto their allotments and those that remained were either heirship allotments (17, totalling about 2,800 acres) or fee patent allotments (six, for a total of 820 acres) with considerable mortgage or back taxes owed (Froehling 1993:120). The government still held title to the original...
agency allotment (Froehling 1993:120).

Under the IRA, the new Ponca constitution allowed for "exchange assignments" which were devised as a way to deal with the troublesome issue of heirship allotments. The holder of a portion of an heirship allotment could voluntarily transfer interest in that land to the tribe; the tribe could then place the transferred land back into trust status (which was tax exempt) and reassign that parcel or one of equal value to the individual tribal member. Despite the relative advantages this kind of arrangement could have held, there is no evidence that Ponca tribal members participated in this IRA feature (Froehling 1993):

By the time the Constitution was adopted, only three fee patented land parcels were left. The remaining fee lands were sold in 1939, 1940, and 1946. Presumably because the Poncas allotted land was burdened by mortgages, it could not be returned to tribal trust status. Or the owners, for whatever reason, preferred to hold the land in fee ownership. There was also little interest in receiving land from the tribe for farming purposes, since no tribal lands were ever assigned to individuals. Instead they were leased to non-Indians. (Froehling 1993:127)

Interestingly, none of the heirship allotments were exchanged for trust-protected shares under the IRA constitution (Froehling 1993:129). By 1958, these allotments had become highly "fractionated" with two to 98 heirs per allotment (Froehling 1993:129). The remaining heirship allotments were sold during the liquidation of the Northern Ponca reservation as a result of tribal Termination in the 1960s (Froehling 1993:130).

The Poncas also ratified a corporate charter on August 15, 1936. This charter allowed for the Ponca tribe to participate in a number of economic development opportunities set up under the IRA. According the report of J.W. Brewer, Farm Agent, the Ponca corporation took advantage of the revolving credit fund set up by the IRA. In 1937, the corporation successfully applied for $7,000 for agricultural purposes, which was in turn loaned to seven of their farm families (total of $6,086.56). Farm Agent Brewer (1939:45) reported that the seven families managed to pay their interest to the corporation ($157.33) and added $412 to the principal (despite grasshoppers and drought). By 1940, the Ponca tribe had received $12,500 from the revolving credit fund (US Dept. of the Interior 1940:72). An additional $20,245.73 had been advanced to individual tribal members. Total payments received on the loan principal were $9,367, with $3,466 reportedly "delinquent" (Brewer 1940:72).

The Ponca tribe also took advantage of the land purchase
program to acquire an additional 691 acres of land. All of the land obtained was operated by Ponca families. In 1936/1937, the Northern Poncas re-purchased the Standing Bear allotment with an IRA revolving credit loan of $2300 (Le Claire 1951). (Brewer (1940:45) reported statistics about the combined activities of the Ponca and Santee farmers at the Santee sub-agency in 1940. He observed that

The Ponca and Santee Indian farm families operated, in addition to Indian and tribal trust land, 3,236 acres of white-owned land, or a total of 10,802 acres of land operated by both Ponca and Santee Indian farm families in 1938, as compared to about 1,500 acres operated by Indians in 1933 and 1934. (Brewer 1940:45)

Brewer credits the IRA for the progress made, "[A] total valuation of all livestock and equipment on both reservation, owned and used by the Indian farm families in 1938 of $58,490.26, which has been made possible mostly by the revolving credit fund and the Reorganization Act" (Brewer 1940:45).

However, the Poncas did not take advantage of the provisions in the land reconsolidation features of the IRA to place individual allotments back into trust status (Froehling 1993; Ritter 1994). It is unclear why this opportunity to protect the remaining landbase was not exercised.

The Santee Sioux accepted the IRA by a vote of 260 in favor, 27 opposed, at a referendum held November 17, 1934. After being approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the constitution and bylaws were accepted by the tribe, in a 284-60 vote, on February 29, 1936. Meyer (1993:311) comments that, "The council elected that year proved a more effective instrument of community policy than the old rubber stamp body that had been instituted late in the nineteenth century and had existed nominally since then".

The Constitution and Bylaws of the Santee Sioux Tribe of the Sioux Nation of the State of Nebraska, approved 1936, contained the standard nine articles of the model constitution (see Appendix I). These articles specifically addressed: territory, defined as that which was established under Executive Order of August 31, 1869, and for which tribal jurisdiction will not extend to any but the trust lands (not fee patent or alienated lands); membership (one-quarter blood quantum); establishment of a governing body (12-member tribal council); enumerated powers of the tribal council; tribal elections; removal from office; tribal referendum; land; and amendments to the constitution. Meyer (1993) suggests that the constitution and bylaws of the Santees reflect the "peculiar status of the Santees as Indians in an advanced stage of acculturation." Specifically, Meyer contends that the Santees were already leaning toward state jurisdiction
for many civil and criminal matters.

Like the Poncas, the Santees had suffered a lack of federal supervision and the gradual withdrawal of government services. This neglect was punctuated by the closing of the agency in 1917. The oversight responsibility for the Santees was transferred to the Yankton Agency at that time. In 1933 the Yankton Agency was closed and the Santees were transferred to the Winnebago Agency in Thurston County, Nebraska. Gabe Parker (a Choctaw) became the new superintendent at Winnebago. He was reportedly a "New Dealer," sympathetic to Collier's reforms (Meyer 1993:308).

The Santees' experience with the erosion of their landbase was also very similar to that experienced by the Poncas. By the time the Santee Agency was closed in 1917, only 18,000 acres of their 115,000-acre reservation remained in Indian hands (Meyer 1993). Of the 1,173 Santees, 735 were officially considered "competent" (Meyer 1993).

The Santees and Poncas benefitted from the diligence of their new farm agent, J.W. Brewer. Superintendent Parker and Farm Agent Brewer concentrated on securing emergency relief as well as facilitating long-term economic development programs on the reservations. The Santees began receiving Emergency Relief Administration funding in 1933 and obtained direct relief from surplus mutton from the Navajos; they also received blankets, shoes, and clothing in 1933 and 1934 (Meyer 1993). In October of 1934, the Santees were issued 130 cattle and given the freedom to eat them or use them to start their own herds (Meyer 1993). This is exemplary of the policies initiated during the Indian New Deal which returned greater autonomy and decision-making to the individual agencies, tribal councils, and reservation communities.

The Santee tribal council recognized that these were only short-term solutions and endeavored to reacquire the landbase as a viable long-term strategy. By 1935, the alienation of allotments left only 3,132.29 acres from the original 115,000-acre reservation (Meyer 1993). Only 1,800 acres of fee patent land remained and most was subject to mortgages and unpaid back taxes. The Santee reservation is only marginally suited to commercial agriculture. The 1935 tribal council estimated that only 2,352 acres of this land could be considered suitable for agriculture. In Farm Agent Brewer's opinion, only three families of 105 had enough land to provide an income from agriculture, only 15 had sufficient land for subsistence needs and the remaining 87 families were "landless" for all intents and purposes (Meyer 1993:309). Under the IRA, the Santees (tribe and individuals combined) were able to purchase 3,368.54 acres in 1936 and 1937 before funding dried up with the outbreak of World War II (Meyer 1993:309). The total acreage purchased for the Santee tribe under the IRA land purchase program totaled 2,544.
acres (Brewer 1940:45). The Santee Corporation successfully
applied for a loan of $20,000 for agricultural purposes, $13,000
of which was loaned out to 18 tribal members.

The Collier administration was high on encouraging community
self-help and rehabilitation programs. At Santee (and at
Niobrara for the Poncas), a self-help community building was
built in 1937. The self-help buildings had room for a tribal
office, large kitchens (for community meetings), and large
meeting rooms (at Santee the capacity was 200 persons). Sewing
projects and canning of garden produce were encouraged
activities. Monies (in the form of reimbursable loans) were made
available to encourage tribal groups—the Santees received
approximately $10,000 for this purpose (Meyer 1993:310). These
projects were fundamentally different than in the past because
the initiatives and ideas were generated at the local level, by
the Indians themselves.

The impact of the IRA was beneficial but did not alleviate
the problems of poverty on the Nebraska reservations. The
Santees at the end of the 1930s were still far from self-
sufficient. In 1940, Superintendent Parker reported that the
condition of all the Nebraska Indian groups was

"one of almost total dependence upon Federal Government
for work and direct relief; Agency allotments and WPA,
Social Security, ADC, Old Age Assistance, NYA, and the
like"...He attributed the situation to more than ten
years of drought and grasshopper infestations,
livestock diseases, and lack of available employment
for Indians off the reservation. (quoted in Meyer
1993:312)

As was true on the Ponca reservation, the alienation of fee
patented allotted land continued; in 1936, the Santees had 3,242
acres, in 1952 only 3,012 remained, and by 1960 the remaining
allotted acres totalled only 2,563 (Meyer 1993:314).

Although the Santees took advantage of the provisions of the
IRA, the long-term problems of landlessness, poverty, and
unemployment persisted. Meyer (1993:296) suggests the Santee
reservation experienced a mass exodus in the 1940s and 1950s
"amounting almost to abandonment of the reservation."

The Yankton Sioux Tribe of South Dakota

At the time of the IRA, the Yanktons were suffering from
extreme poverty; most were completely dependent on relief for
survival (Taylor 1980:101). In 1892, the total acreage allotted
for the Yanktons was 268,000 acres (Hoover 1988:66). By 1940,
the Yanktons retained only 42,086 acres (U.S. Department of the
Interior 1940:36). Eighty percent of the allotted land was
patented, and 80 percent of the Yanktons were landless (Taylor 1980:44). The Yanktons accepted the IRA in a 1935 referendum but failed to ratify an IRA constitution, thereby forfeiting participation in the IRA (Hoover 1988).

Taylor (1980) considers the Yanktons' IRA experience as a classic example of the struggle between landless mixed-bloods and landed full-bloods. Interestingly, the Yankton full-bloods successfully blocked the passage of the IRA constitution (1935) when only 17 percent had originally voted against accepting the IRA. Taylor suggests that the Yanktons had a history of internal disunity which was intensified by the IRA debates (1980). Many of the full-bloods still held their original allotments and were led by Clement Smith (Taylor 1980).

The Yanktons had established their own business council in 1932 (as had many plains tribes before the passage of the IRA). A constitution prepared by this council, led by Ben Reifel, was rejected by a close vote in 1935 (Taylor 1980). The Smith faction presented an alternative constitution (prepared by an attorney, R.T. Bonnin) in December of 1935. This constitution was sent to the Bureau with a petition signed by 300 Yanktons (30 percent of the voters) urging acceptance by the Secretary of the Interior (Taylor 1980). This constitution was returned after an extensive review (nine months) with strong criticisms, the primary one being that the constitution would set up a virtual "political machine" and therefore required substantive revisions (Taylor 1980). In November 1936, a General Council meeting was called which resulted in a petition to request Bureau reconsideration of the Smith-Bonnin constitution. This request was also denied. Also in 1936, a group of landless Yanktons petitioned the Bureau for permission to draw up their own constitution, for the purposes of qualifying for the economic development programs available under the IRA. The request was denied by the Secretary of the Interior as being "contrary to the intent of the Wheeler-Howard Act" (Taylor 1980).

By this time, the Indian Service had grown weary of attempts to organize the Yanktons and resorted to organizing at the tiyospaye (community) level within the reservation. One of Collier's pet IRA projects included the establishment of a number of "rehabilitation colonies" throughout the northern plains. The goal was to promote economic self-sufficiency through a return to communal living. In order to qualify for membership in the colonies, Indian families were required to give up their allotments (assuming they had any) and work collectively for the economic benefit of the group.

The relief and rehabilitation programs were ambitious schemes designed and supervised by the Indian Relief and Rehabilitation (IRR) Division of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (established in 1936) (Bromett 1984). The IRR received an
initial budget of $2 million in 1936 to undertake the
overwhelming task of turning the tide of Indian poverty and
dependency on the nation's reservations. According to Bromert
(1984:32), the "Bureau's objective was 'to clothe the Indian
again with the dignity that comes from self-rule and self-
support'". The IRR coordinated the technical assistance of other
New Deal era programs (Work Projects Administration, Civilian
Conservation Corps--Indian Division, and funding from the Indian
Reorganization Act and Resettlement Administration for the
purchase of submarginal lands) to supplement their efforts
(Bromert 1984).

Rising Hail Colony

Because of the problems encountered on the Yankton
reservation, the Indian Service directly targeted the Yanktons
for the experimental rehabilitation programs. The largest colony
was established at Rising Hail (also known as Chalk Rock), and
smaller colonies were established at Greenwood, White Swan, and
Choteau Creek. Rising Hail was considered to be a "model colony"
by the IRR and will be discussed in detail below.

The Rising Hail Colony (see Chapter 28 for location) was
named in honor of Yankton Chief Rising Hail, although it was (and
is) more commonly known as "Chalk Rock Colony" because of the
distinctive local stone quarried from the Missouri River bluffs
to construct the buildings of the Colony. When completed, the
Colony consisted of nine identical chalk rock cottages, a two-
story cannery, schoolhouse, chapel, and large barn (Bromert
1984:38). The colonists were supplied with fresh water by means
of a windmill.

Because the Yankton Sioux never successfully organized under
the IRA, the IRR sought to creatively extend those opportunities
to the Yanktons anyway. The IRR programs were initiated
cooperatively with the assistance of a three-member Yankton
committee, the "Indian Rehabilitation Committee." Bromert
(1984:39) characterizes the Committee as "the ex-officio tribal
authority that dealt with BIA administrators concerning economic
and political matters on the reservation." In 1938, the
organization known as the "Rising Hail Cooperative Development
Association" was formalized with a board of directors, general
manager, and project officers (Bromert 1984:39). This
organization drew up a constitution and bylaws and petitioned the
Secretary of the Interior to recognize their authority to
formally participate in the IRA revolving loan programs (Bromert
1984).

The Rising Hail Cooperative Development Association was
successful in securing an $8,000 loan for their first year's
expenses (Bromert 1984:39). Their constitution required that all
adult members work 40 hours per week and that any individually-
owned property or livestock become the property of the Colony (Bromert 1984). Colonists were chosen on the basis of several criteria, with priority being given to individuals (and families) who were homeless, landless, of "good character," and willing and able to work (Bromert 1984:35). Members who chose to leave the cooperative were entitled to reimbursement for any property turned over to the Colony (Bromert 1984).

The Rising Hail Colony was successful in its early stages and had become profitable by 1942. In 1942, the Colony had 600 acres under cultivation and an additional 900 acres in pasture (Bromert 1984), as well as successful cannery and livestock operations. Yankton Farm Agent, August Nylander, estimated the annual cash income for the Colony was $13,000 (Bromert 1984:40), over and above subsistence production.

However, the initial good fortune was not destined to last. A series of chance events (e.g., grasshopper infestations, anthrax decimating the cattle herd, and the barn burning down), poor management, and increased agricultural mechanization eventually eroded the morale and productivity of the Colony (Bromert 1984). By 1949, the cooperative was defunct and had been transferred to a Yankton family (Steve Cournoyer family) to manage. Eventually, due to considerable bureaucratic obstacles which prevented the Cournoyers from obtaining loans for this property, the family resorted to leasing the former Colony to non-Indian farmers. The former Colony has fallen into disrepair, but the considerable structures are still largely intact (Hoover 1988).

On the Yankton reservation, despite the lack of an IRA government, the Yanktons who did not participate in rehabilitation projects did benefit in many ways. For example, the new tolerance engendered in the IRA era favored the reemergence of traditional arts and crafts, such as star quilts and beadwork. Many traditions which had gone underground, e.g., speaking the Nakota language and participating in dances and ceremonies, reemerged. Hoover (1988:61) has observed "Under the New Deal policies, traditional practices came into the open for the first time in two generations."

The Yankton Sioux Tribal constitution adopted in 1963 (see Appendix I), does not closely resemble the "cockie cutter" constitutions of the IRA era. The 1963 constitution is an amended version of the 1932 constitution, which the Secretary of the Interior originally disallowed as an IRA constitution. The elected officers of the Yankton Sioux Tribe are known as the "Yankton Sioux Tribal Business and Claims Committee." The General Council is composed of all adults (over age 21) who are enrolled Yankton Sioux members residing on the reservation. The General Council form of government has been retained. Hoover (1988:64) observed that by not changing the government into an
IRA government, the Yanktons did not regain the appropriate political recognition until 1963.

TERMINATION, RELOCATION, AND COMPENSATION

After Collier's departure from the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1945, federal Indian policy vacillated once more towards outright assimilation of Native Americans. Set against the backdrop of the civil rights movement, post-war budget shortfalls, the Cold War, and the perceived need to open and develop the remaining reservation lands (rich with uranium, coal, timber, oil, and natural gas); the government set out to solve the "Indian problem" once and for all (Ritter 1994).

This time the solution, touted by Utah Senator Arthur Watkins and others, was an ominous sounding policy called tribal "termination." Burt (1994:222) has commented that "Termination stood as the last in a long history of policies to extinguish tribalism and force the rapid assimilation of individual Native Americans." Termination was the ultimate assimilation policy because it forced the surrender of tribal identity and stripped tribal members of services and federal supports put into place as part of the federal "trust" responsibility (Ritter-Knoche 1990).

Eventually, 109 tribes and bands were terminated under this policy between 1954 and 1962, affecting 13,263 Native Americans and an additional 1,365,801 acres of tribal trust land (Ritter 1994; Grobsmith and Ritter 1992; Prucha 1984). The 109th tribe to be terminated was the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska (see Chapter 7). In 1962, the Northern Ponca Tribe was terminated, releasing 442 enrolled members from federal recognition; the remaining 834 acres of the Northern Ponca reservation was liquidated as well (Ritter 1994; Grobsmith and Ritter 1992). Northern Ponca termination was effective in 1966 (Ritter 1994) (See Chapter 7 for more discussion of Ponca termination and restoration).

Initially, Congress focused termination efforts towards resource-rich, assimilated tribes, e.g., the Menominee and Klamath, both "terminated" in 1954. However, as the more powerful tribes in "Indian Country" got wind of the changes afoot, Congress was forced to fall back and target the smaller, weaker tribes like the Poncas (Ritter 1994).

The Aberdeen Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs reported in 1954 that the residents of the Yankton reservation were ready for federal withdrawal of services (termination) because of "the populations' high education level and tribesmen's inability to use fractionalized heirship lands" (Clow 1989:384). Ultimately, the Yanktons were spared the upheaval of tribal termination.

Relocation
Complementary legislative and administrative policies were formulated to smooth the transition of terminated tribes and tribal members to state supervision. One early scheme, actively promoted in the 1950s and 1960s, was to render the reservations obsolete by inducing reservation residents to relocate to major urban areas to find employment and greater opportunity (Prucha 1984). Relocated families seldom found the reality of urban life equal to the promise marketed by the BIA. Many families accepted the BIA's one-way bus tickets to the cities only to return, disillusioned, once more to the reservations. Many other families, with nothing to return to, remained in the cities. Such was the experience for many Ponca families who had lost their original allotments and were not able to support their families in the tightening rural farm economy of Knox County, Nebraska (Ritter 1994).

The Santees, Yanktons, and Poncas suffered from considerable reservation out-migration in the post-World War II era (Froehling 1993; Meyer 1993; Hoover 1988; Ritter 1994). Tribal members became concentrated in the local urban areas (e.g., Sioux City, Iowa; Yankton, South Dakota; and Omaha and Norfolk, Nebraska) as well as more distant locales (e.g., Minneapolis, Minnesota, and Denver, Colorado). The wide dispersion of tribal members was among the key factors contributing to the tribal termination of the Northern Poncas in 1962 (which became effective in 1966) (Ritter 1994).

The Poncas, Santees, and Yanktons have also been subject to enhanced state jurisdictional authority as a direct result of termination policy. The Yankton Sioux reservation was "diminished" or "dissestablished" by a 1984 South Dakota supreme court decision, resulting in increased jurisdictional disputes between the state and the Yankton Tribe (see Chapter 7 for discussion of the state diminishment of the Yankton Sioux reservation).

Specifically, the Ponca and Santee tribes (as resident tribes of Nebraska) came under enhanced state jurisdiction over civil and criminal affairs as result of "Public Law 280" (Public Law No. 83-280, 67 Stat. 588), passed in 1953. Specifically, Public Law 280:

- granted five states (California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon and Wisconsin) the mandatory right of criminal jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in Indian country and all civil causes of private action in state court that involved reservation Indians. The law restricted tribal rights in cases that conflicted with federal policy, treaty or executive agreements. If tribal and state laws conflicted, state laws took precedence. In addition, P.L. 280 permitted the states the option to exercise
civil and criminal jurisdiction without the consent of the Indian tribes. (Wilkins and Ritter 1994:308)

P.L. 280 was later revised by the Indian Bill of Rights in 1968 (Title IV), which allows P.L. 280 tribes to "retrocede" from state jurisdiction back to federal/tribal jurisdiction. The Santees and Poncas both came under the mandatory provisions of P.L. 280 in 1953 and although the Santees have the opportunity to retrocede they have not yet exercised this right. As a tribe terminated in 1962, the Northern Poncas' status vis-a-vis P.L. 280 is unclear.

**Compensation: Indian Claims Commission (1946-1978)**

Questions of Indian dispossession took center stage with the establishment of the Indian Claims Commission in 1946 to adjudicate outstanding tribal grievances against the United States government in preparation for the withdrawal of federal services envisioned under termination. Ultimately, this resulted in the awarding of nearly one billion dollars by the Indian Claims Commission to the petitioning tribes for compensation (Sutton 1994:303). The Indian Claims Commission subtracted lands which were judged to have been occupied or utilized by, or sufficiently in conflict between two or more tribes:

Thus former tribal areas came under careful review, were verified through a combination of cartographic, documentary, ethnographic, and other means, and adjudicated as part of tribal territory. (Sutton 1994:305)

Legal discussions of recognized aboriginal territory generally defer to the official findings of the Indian Claims Commission as the definitive adjudication (including aboriginal territories discussed in this overview). Aboriginal territories of tribes in the NIMI region, as recognized through final decisions of the Indian Claims Commission, are shown on Map 29-2. The Commission's final report (United States Indian Claims Commission n.d.) identifies the dockets keyed by number to the territories shown on Map 29-2, and other published indices (Ross 1973a, 1973b) serve as guides to Commission findings and to the expert testimony presented to the Commission.

Between 1946 and 1978, six hundred dockets were filed, two hundred dockets were dismissed, and three hundred forty two received "favorable discussions" (Sutton 1994:305; United States Indian Claims Commission n.d.). However, the resulting compensations were paid out largely in per capita payments to individual tribal members (in the 1970s) and were generally quite small. The Indian Claims Commission was empowered only to make monetary awards; no Indian lands were restored. For this reason, many of the cases were appealed (e.g., the Black Hills case) to the U.S. Court of Claims (up to 1983) or the U.S. Court of
The Poncas, Santees, and Yanktons were all beneficiaries of the Indian Claims Commission proceedings. However, in most cases, the eventual per capita payments received were exceedingly small relative to the losses endured. For example, in 1972, the Indian Claims Commission eventually awarded the Poncas $1,878,500 for the 1858 cession of their hunting grounds and an additional $1,013,425 for the taking of their reservation in 1877 (Wishart 1994:243). After the attorney's fees and the Southern Poncas' portion was subtracted, the per capita share of the award amounted to roughly $1,500 for each of the terminated Northern Ponca tribal members.

In historical context the termination era was pivotal in many regards. The threat of withdrawal of federal services and the severing of the treaty-obligated "trust" responsibility acted as a catalyst to forge new pan-Indian movements and to strengthen existing pan-tribal organizations dedicated to stopping termination, e.g., the National Congress of American Indians. Eventually, particularly after witnessing the turmoil experienced by the terminated tribes, the Congress and Administration came around to viewing tribal termination as a flawed policy. As early as 1960, John F. Kennedy voiced his opposition to the continuation of termination policy in a campaign speech. Unfortunately for the Poncas, who were terminated in 1962, the Bureau of Indian Affairs continued to pursue termination during the Kennedy Administration. It was not until 1988, that Congress officially "repudiated" termination policy (Grobsmith and Ritter 1992).

Deloria has suggested that perhaps too much emphasis has been placed on termination:

While they were tediously attempting to terminate a few Indian tribes, the back door to the treasury was being pried open by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the tribal councils and a good deal of money was transferred to Indian Country. The shift in perception of Indians is all-important in this instance. Indians were fading from public view as 'domestic dependent' nations, but they were emerging as one of a number of deprived racial minorities who had at least a moral claim on American society. (Deloria 1985:251).

Regardless of the reason, federal Indian policy was shifting once more to favor self-determination and to honor the federal tribal trust relationship.

SELF-DETERMINATION

The turbulent decades of the 1960s and 1970s proved to be
among the most productive in bringing about change in federal Indian policy. The "Red Power" movement, represented by organizations such as the National Indian Youth Council, American Indian Leadership Conference, National Congress of American Indians, American Indian Movement, etc., became a force to be reckoned with during this era (Josephy 1971). Socially and philosophically, the time was right to attempt lasting reforms in Indian policy.

Peaceful as well as militant Indian activism increased through the 1960s with well-publicized "fish-ins" (demonstrations staged to exercise the treaty-guaranteed fishing rights of various tribes) and protests. Eventually the more militant approach, led by the American Indian Movement (AIM), gained considerable media and public attention. AIM organized the 1971 "Trail of Broken Treaties" caravan to Washington, D.C., and the occupation of Wounded Knee, South Dakota, in 1973. Americans were generally sympathetic to the messages of the Red Power activists, which included demands on the federal government to honor treaty obligations, reform the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and to enhance tribal sovereignty.

The climate was right to encourage the reforms the "Red Power" movement sought and they were further aided by the strong support of President Richard M. Nixon (Gross 1989). President Richard M. Nixon's Special Message of July 8, 1970 (Nixon 1970) set the standard for the new federal/tribal relationship:

The time has come to break decisively with the past and to create the conditions for a new era in which the Indian future is determined by Indian acts and Indian decisions.

This new era was to be one of tribal self-determination.

The list of important legislative and administrative decisions brought to fruition in the 1970s is impressive:


The Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (P.L.93-638) was a cornerstone in this new era. The Act was designed to enable tribes to carry out federal programs for their own benefit:

To assure maximum Indian participation in the future, Congress directed the secretaries of the Departments of the Interior and Health, Education, and Welfare, upon the request of any Indian tribe, to enter into contracts to
design, carry out, and evaluate programs and services previously provided by the federal government. (Danziger 1994:223)

Tribal governments and members were the direct beneficiaries of numerous "War on Poverty" programs during this period as well. Between 1968 and 1976, Congress increased the BIA budget from $262 million to $777 million (Danziger 1994:223). The federal government currently spends nearly $3 billion annually on Indian programs (Danziger 1994).

In the spirit of the Self-Determination Act, 370 agreements (i.e., so-called "638" contracts, after the number of the law) were signed by 1980, providing nearly $200 million in services directly to tribal governments and members (Danziger 1994:224). By 1988, nearly one-third of the Bureau of Indian Affair’s $1 billion budget was contracted out to various tribes (Danziger 1994:225). This trend will accelerate with the implementation of the Tribal Self-Governance provisions of Title IV of the Indian Self-Determination Act Amendments of 1994 (P.L. 103-413).

After having built up tribal infrastructure and governments with federal dollars during the 1960s and 1970s, "Indian Country" was in for a rude awakening in the 1980s. Indian programs were the subject of considerable budget cuts during the early Reagan administration, resulting in severe unemployment and cessation of services (Wilkins and Ritter 1994). For this reason, President Reagan’s Indian policy has been labelled, "termination by accountants" (Morris 1988).

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, landmark Indian legislation was passed which further enhances Indian self-determination. After several years of disputes and court cases, Congress passed the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. § 2701-2721). The act has cleared the way for Indian tribes to negotiate gaming compacts with the state(s) in which their reservation or trust lands are located. Under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, tribes are allowed to develop gaming activities on their lands if the activity is not prohibited by state or federal law (Wilkins and Ritter 1994). For many tribes, the casinos sanctioned under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act have provided considerable employment and economic development opportunities (Wilkins and Ritter 1994). The Yankton Sioux Tribe is one of the tribes fortunate to have secured a gaming compact (with the state of South Dakota) and now runs a profitable casino (Ft. Randall Casino) at Pickstown, South Dakota (see Chapter 7). The Ponca Tribe of Nebraska and the Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska have been unable to secure gaming compacts with the state of Nebraska and are currently precluded from the gaming revenues and opportunities enjoyed by many of their neighbors.

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act
of 1990 (P.L. 101-601) is also landmark legislation in terms of asserting Indian sovereignty. The Act is designed to provide a framework for the systematic repatriation of Native American ancestral remains and objects of cultural patrimony from federally-funded institutions back to lineal descendants and/or tribal representatives.

CONCLUSIONS

Today, "Indian Country" represents approximately four percent of land area of the continental United States (Sutton 1994). In roughly 200 years, the transfer of the vast majority of the tribal landbase into the United States' public domain and its subsequent disposition has been responsible for chronic poverty, dependency and the political subjugation of the "First Americans." The historical underdevelopment (Clow 1989) of "Indian Country" can be placed within the context of federal Indian policy which has consistently sought to dispossess the tribal landbase and/or control tribal natural resources (e.g., water, coal, uranium, oil, timber) (Ritter 1994; Barsh 1988; Jorgenson 1978). The treaties of cession, destruction of the bison, the "Civilization Programs," removals, allotment in severalty, and tribal termination all demonstrate the federal government's intent to control the political economies of the "domestic dependent nations" (Ritter 1994).

Within the legal framework of English common law and later, American law, the American Indian nations resident within the borders of the United States have been systematically dispossessed of nearly 2 billion acres of aboriginal territory (Sutton 1994). The vast majority of this land was transferred via Congressionally-ratified treaties, Executive Agreements, and allotment due to surplus land cessions. In this light, federal Indian policy and the evolving tenets of Indian law reflect political and economic hegemony, commonly characterized as "internal colonialism" (Jorgenson 1978):

If we accept the idea that modern society expresses its rights in land through polity and, in turn, that polity governs law and justice, we find that the body of federal Indian law—which embraces the whole of Indian real property as well as tribal and personal property rights—may be characterized as a species of colonial law. (Sutton 1975:4)

The control of the tribal landbase is fundamental to questions of sovereignty, self-determination, and economic development.

The remaining tribal territory (some 55 million acres) known as "trust" land, is plagued with considerable bureaucratic oversight (from the BIA—the "trustee") regarding development,
management (e.g., leasing), or alienation of Indian land. Therein lies the rhetoric versus the reality of self-
determination for contemporary Indian nations. The Courts have consistently supported the "right" of Indian tribes to exercise self-determination, but without the resources to enforce those rights, self-determination rings hollow.

Jurisdictional issues have been compounded by complex patterns of land tenure in "Indian Country" (Sutton 1991). "Indian Country" has been used as a toponym in legal discourse and historic reference for more than a century (Sutton 1991:3). The current legal definition of "Indian Country" reflects the complexity of land tenure inherent in this concept,

(a) all land within the limits of any Indian reservation under the jurisdiction of the United States government, notwithstanding the issuance of any patent, and, including rights-of-way running through the reservation, (b) all dependent Indian communities within the borders of the United States whether within the original or subsequently acquired territory thereof, and whether within or without the limits of a state and (c) all Indian allotments, the Indian titles to which have not been extinguished, including rights-
of-way running through the same (63 Stat. 94).

Of particular importance is the inclusion of "all land within the limits of any Indian reservation," irrespective of ownership. Despite the erosion of the Indian-owned landbase since the passage of the Dawes Act of 1887, this phrase reinforces the perceived authority of individual tribal governments to exercise jurisdiction within the external boundaries of their reservations—despite land tenure patterns and state jurisdictional authorities. This right has been seriously challenged by the state of South Dakota, which has refused to recognize the Yankton reservation (see Chapter 7). The Santee Sioux have also had to battle the state of Nebraska over the regulation of hunting and fishing rights on their reservation.

Complicating the matter further is the pattern of land tenure in Indian Country, i.e., "checkerboarding." On contemporary reservations (including the Yankton and Santee Sioux reservations) numerous categories of land tenure lie contiguous to one another within the external boundaries of federally-recognized reservations. For example, on a single reservation the following legal categories of land tenure are possible, 1) individually-owned Indian allotments (trust status), 2) tribally-owned land (trust status), 3) Indian-owned fee patent land (non-trust status), 4) non-Indian owned fee patent land, and 5) public domain.

The recent Self-Determination legislation and administrative
2180 modifications have spawned an era of greater self-governance and
2181 expression of sovereignty by tribal governments. Self-
2182 determination, however, is a matter of degree (Nelson and Sheley
2183 1985). Contemporary tribal governments are highly aware of the
2184 history and consequences of federal Indian policy for their
2185 people. They are ever vigilant and cognizant that the self-
2186 determination rhetoric of one age may be quickly replaced by
2187 policy reversals which attack the very core of tribalism. In the
2188 current political climate, tribal governments will continue to
2189 lobby for enhanced sovereignty and commitment by the federal
2190 government to uphold and strengthen the trust obligations.
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Table 29-1. The Northern Poncas, Santees, and Yanktons: Population as of January 1, 1940.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Total Pop.</th>
<th>Male/Female</th>
<th>On Res.</th>
<th>Off Res.</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Ponca</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>184/200</td>
<td>151(39%)</td>
<td>198(52%)</td>
<td>35(9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>625/572</td>
<td>554(46%)</td>
<td>434(36%)</td>
<td>209(20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yankton</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>1019/1009</td>
<td>1,411(70%)</td>
<td>432(21%)</td>
<td>185(9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: U.S. Department of the Interior, Statistical Supplement, 1940, pp.10, 14)

Table 29-2. The Northern Poncas, Santees, and Yanktons: Lands under jurisdiction of the Office of Indian Affairs (1940).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Trust/Allotted</th>
<th>Tribal</th>
<th>Used By:</th>
<th>Non-Indians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Ponca</td>
<td>3,633</td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>2,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>6,282</td>
<td>3,508</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td>4,777</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yankton</td>
<td>42,086</td>
<td>40,256</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>12,674</td>
<td>22,407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Department of the Interior, Statistical Supplement, 1940, pp. 33, 36).

Table 29-3: The Northern Poncas, Santees, and Yanktons: IRA tribal status as of June 30, 1940.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Pop.</th>
<th>Constitution Approved</th>
<th>Charter Ratified</th>
<th>Loans</th>
<th>Lands Purch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Ponca</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>4/3/36</td>
<td>8/15/36</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>691.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>4/3/36</td>
<td>8/22/36</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>2,544.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yankton</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>4/24/63</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sources: Department of the Interior, Statistical Supplement, 1940, p.94; Amended Constitution and By-Laws of the Yankton Sioux Tribal Business and Claims Committee, 1963, p.109)
Table 29.4 Summary information on "Royce areas" in the NIH region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Royce area&quot; no.</th>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Land Cession (C) or Reservation (R) and Date</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Royce 1899 page ref.</th>
<th>Royce 1899 map ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>C &amp; R; March 16, 1854</td>
<td>Treaty</td>
<td>790-791</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Pawnee</td>
<td>C &amp; R; Sept. 24, 1857</td>
<td>Treaty</td>
<td>818-819</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Ponca</td>
<td>C &amp; R; March 12, 1858</td>
<td>Treaty</td>
<td>818-819</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Yankton Sioux</td>
<td>C; April 19, 1858</td>
<td>Treaty</td>
<td>820-821</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Yankton Sioux</td>
<td>R; April 19, 1858</td>
<td>Treaty</td>
<td>820-821</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Ponca</td>
<td>C; March 10, 1855</td>
<td>Treaty</td>
<td>836-837</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>Ponca</td>
<td>R; March 10, 1855</td>
<td>Treaty</td>
<td>836-837</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Santee Sioux</td>
<td>R; Feb. 27, 1866</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>838-839</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Santee Sioux</td>
<td>R; July 20, 1866</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>840-841</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>Santee Sioux</td>
<td>R; Nov. 16, 1867</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>846-847</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>Santee Sioux</td>
<td>R; August 31, 1869</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>852-853</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>Santee Sioux</td>
<td>R; Dec. 31, 1873</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>868-869</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>Sioux</td>
<td>R; Jan. 24, 1882</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>904-905</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 29-1a. "Royce areas" in the NIMI region. Information about each "Royce area" is summarized in Table 29-4.
Figure 29-1b. "Royce areas" involved with the establishment of the Santee reservation in Nebraska. Information about each "Royce area" is summarized in Table 29-4.
Figure 29-2. Aboriginal territories in the Nimi region, as established by judgments of the Indian Claims Commission. For the key to numbered tracts, see the final report of the Indian Claims Commission (United States Indian Claims Commission n.d.). The hachured area was not covered by any final judgment of the Commission.
CHAPTER 30

CONSULTATION WITH THE PONCA TRIBE OF NEBRASKA, Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska, and the Yankton Sioux Tribe of South Dakota

Beth R. Ritter

INTRODUCTION

Proactive National Park Service consultation with American Indian tribes potentially affected by National Park Service management, interpretation, or planning activities is mandated by numerous federal laws and directives (see Chapter 2), including a Presidential Memorandum signed on April 29, 1994 (published in the Federal Register, Vol. 59, No. 85 [May 4, 1994], pp. 22951-22952), and an earlier order of the Secretary of the Interior (No. 3175, November 8, 1993). These directives substantially strengthen the present Administration’s commitment to enhance "government-to-government" relationships in dealing with federally-recognized tribes, and to respect the rights of sovereign tribal governments (see Chapter 29 for discussion of federal/tribal "trust" relationships). In planning the Niobrara/Missouri National Scenic Riverways (NIMI), these responsibilities have been interpreted as a mandate to "communicate" and "collaborate" with appropriate tribes throughout all phases of the planning process, which has been jointly undertaken by Park staff, Denver Service Center (DSC) personnel, and anthropologists compiling the Cultural Anthropological Overview and Assessment (CAOA). The discussion that follows will document consultation with the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska, Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska, and Yankton Sioux Tribe of South Dakota that has occurred in the context of compiling the CAOA document. Specifically, this discussion will identify tribal concerns learned through that process, and will offer recommendations for further communication by NIMI planners and personnel.

BACKGROUND

The focus of the CAOA consultation efforts has been the three "resident" tribes of the NIMI region, which are considered to be most potentially affected by evolving NIMI planning efforts— the Northern Poncas, the Nebraska Santees, and the Yanktons. The Yankton Sioux, Santee Sioux, and Ponca Tribe of Nebraska have considerable political, geographical, jurisdictional, economic, and cultural stake in the NIMI planning process. All three tribes own "trust" land (protected and regulated by the Secretary of the Interior) in the study area and have appreciable cultural, spiritual, and historical ties to the...
non-Indian owned landscapes as well. In addition, future
recreational and economic development of this region could have
profound impacts on local tribal economies. Also, an increased
federal presence could potentially affect the exercise of tribal
sovereignty and jurisdiction over current tribal properties (as
well as those yet to be acquired) which are managed by these
three Indian Nations.

Tribal consultations (as outlined in the CAOA scope of work)
were conducted by the ethnographic team of the Midwest
Archeological Center between August of 1993 and February of 1994
(see Table 30-1). Field contacts and consultations were
initiated and conducted by Beth Ritter, Anthropologist. The
following data and descriptions were compiled from field visits
and dozens of hours of phone conversations and correspondence
with various tribal representatives.

Initial contacts were made with tribal representatives
sitting on the NIMI Planning and Advisory groups. To reflect the
interests of the "resident" American Indian tribes, the National
Park Service has included representatives from each of the three
tribes as members of the formal NIMI Planning Team; in addition,
the Secretary of the Interior appointed representatives from the
Santee Sioux and Yankton Sioux tribes to sit on the NIMI Advisory
Committee. Other NIMI Planning and Advisory Team members include
local non-Indian landowners, representatives of state and local
governments, technical experts from the states of Nebraska and
South Dakota, and National Park Service personnel.

In August of 1993, a scope of work outlining the goals and
methods of the CAOA study was submitted to the respective tribal
councils of the Santee Sioux Tribe and Ponca Tribe of Nebraska
for tribal council endorsement. Permission was subsequently
granted by both tribal councils to carry out the proposed CAOA
research among tribal members. Consultation with the Yankton
Sioux tribe was delayed until early 1994, because recent
elections had resulted in the ouster of seven of the nine
Business and Claims Council members and the ethnographic team was
advised to wait until the new council members had had time to
become familiar with Tribal affairs.

PONCA TRIBE OF NEBRASKA

Background

The Ponca Tribe of Nebraska, headquartered in Niobrara, is a
tribe whose status as an organized, federally-recognized tribe
was recently restored by Congress. The Northern Poncas were
terminated by an act of Congress (P.L. 76-429) in 1962. Although
they were eventually successful in petitioning Congress to
restore their federal recognition (effective October 31, 1990),
the political and cultural existence of the Ponca Tribe of
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Nebraska lapsed for nearly three decades. Since Tribal restoration in 1990, the Poncas have been involved in reconstructing Tribal government, formulating long-term economic development plans, and seeking to regain Tribal culture and language lost as a result of assimilation policies and Tribal termination (see Chapters 7 and 29).

Currently, the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska has approximately 1,500 enrolled members. Tribal members are widely dispersed geographically, for a number of reasons (see Chapter 7). A socio-economic survey, initiated by ASW Associates to collect baseline data to formulate the Congressionally-mandated Tribal economic development plan, received 250 completed questionnaires from Ponca respondents in 18 states. The 1989 socio-economic survey, initiated by the Northern Ponca Restoration Committee (NPRCI) to support the Tribal restoration effort, documented Tribal members in 37 states (Grobsmith and Ritter 1992).

However, the majority of Northern Poncas are still clustered in the three-state region of Nebraska, South Dakota, and Iowa (Grobsmith and Ritter 1992).

As a restored Tribe, the Poncas are unique in many ways. Unlike other tribes, who were not terminated/restored, the Poncas are constrained by the language contained in Public Law 101-484, which restored their federally-recognized status. Public Law 101-484 precludes the Poncas from ever establishing a residential reservation; it delimits 1,500 acres as the amount of land eligible to be taken into "trust" in Knox and Boyd counties, Nebraska; it defines the service delivery areas eligible for federal services (Knox, Boyd, Madison, Lancaster, and Douglas counties in Nebraska and Charles Mix County in South Dakota); and allows for the submission of a Tribal economic development plan for Congressional funding (see Appendix I for additional provisions of P.L. 101-484).

Although the Poncas did not expressly seek to establish a residential reservation in their former homeland (they will petition Congress to fund an economic development plan instead), the Ponca Restoration Act (P.L. 101 484) precluded the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska from ever re-establishing a residential reservation. This constraint is contrary to the wishes of Tribal members who, in a 1989 NPRCI socio-economic survey, indicated that 90 percent of the surveyed households felt that a reservation should be established; of those who supported establishment of a reservation, 97 percent indicated that the vicinity of Niobrara, Nebraska, was the appropriate place for the reservation (Grobsmith and Ritter 1992:10). Interestingly, the land that they are eligible to take into trust will have many of the same protections and regulations as "reservation" trust land, including the right of the Tribe to build Tribally-owned and privately-owned housing units (including HUD housing) on the trust property if they so choose. Currently, the Poncas have
purchased 160 acres of land in Knox County, Nebraska, near Niobrara (see Map _), and are considering several other purchases, pending the availability of funding and approval by the Secretary of Interior.

Tribal members who reside within the six service areas (Knox, Boyd, Madison, Lancaster, and Douglas counties in Nebraska and Charles Mix County in South Dakota) are eligible to receive health care services (from the Indian Health Service), social services, and housing assistance (from HUD), as well as educational assistance and access to other federal and Tribal programs. Tribal members who reside outside the service delivery areas are currently ineligible for services. However, the Tribal Council is currently negotiating to extend the service delivery areas to counties adjacent to the current service areas, which would extend coverage to an estimated additional 130 Tribal members.

Because securing political support from the Nebraska Congressional delegation for Tribal restoration was contingent upon not re-establishing a reservation, the NPRLC emphasized the option of formulating an economic development plan in P.L. 101-484. The goal of formulating a viable Tribal economic development plan is to provide employment opportunities for Tribal members as well as economic self-sufficiency for the tribe as a whole. Additionally, it was felt that an economic development plan would better serve the needs of a widely-dispersed, urban-based Tribal membership (who would be unlikely to return to a rural reservation). The interim Tribal Council hired ASW Associates to compile this plan, which was submitted to Washington in October, 1993, and was reviewed initially by the Bureau of Indian Affairs before subsequent approval by Congress.

The new Tribal Council has been granted an extension of time in which to modify and reformulate the original plan for resubmission in the Fall of 1995.

Under the Tribal constitution (ratified in June of 1994) and P.L. 101-484, the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska has no blood quantum membership requirement (see Appendix I for the 1994 Tribal constitution and P.L. 101-484). Individual tribes have the sovereign right to determine their own membership criteria; however, the Bureau of Indian Affairs frequently exercises considerable "oversight" on these criteria. The Ponca Tribe of Nebraska is one of the only tribes in the United States which has successfully negotiated the right to drop blood quantum requirements (Ritter 1994). In order to qualify for enrollment, an individual must demonstrate that he or she was enrolled (or entitled to be enrolled) on the 1965, 1936 or 1934 Northern Ponca Tribal roll, or that he or she is a lineal descendant of a Tribal member enrolled on these rolls. Many Tribal members were inadvertently omitted from the final Tribal roll compiled in 1965 at the time of termination. Tribal enrollment has been growing
steadily as new members are born and eligible members activate their membership status. In addition, some eligible Tribal members who were enrolled in other tribes (e.g., the Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska), but met the membership criteria for Ponca enrollment, have opted to transfer their tribal enrollment to the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska (an individual may only be legally enrolled in one tribe, although conceivably they might simultaneously meet eligibility requirements for enrollment in two or possibly more tribes).

Government: Ponca Tribe of Nebraska

At the time of Tribal restoration (1990), responsibility for the administration of Tribal government was vested in the Northern Ponca Restoration Committee, Inc. (NPRCI) board of directors. The NPRCI was a grass roots, non-profit organization (chartered in the state of Nebraska) responsible for organizing the successful Tribal restoration bid (see Chapter 7). Many of the current Tribal Council members were actively involved with Tribal restoration efforts through the NPRCI, particularly Fred LeRoy, Tribal Chair, and Council members Gloria Chytka and Mario Peniska. Under P.L. 101-484, the interim Tribal Council was responsible for conducting all of the administrative affairs of the Tribe until the first Tribal election. The interim Tribal Council was composed of the board of directors of the NPRCI (whose composition changed frequently). The CAOA consultation was concluded before the first Tribal election in October of 1994; thus this consultation was effected with the interim Tribal Council of 1993/1994. It is highly advisable to initiate and/or continue consultation with the first duly-elected Tribal Council.

The first (current) Tribal Council of the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska was inaugurated on October 31, 1994; four years to the day after their Tribal restoration. The 1994 Tribal constitution provides for a representative electoral system which divides the electorate into four districts (based on county and/or state of residence). Each of the four districts elects two representatives to serve four-year terms. In the first election, each District elected one representative for four years and another for two years, to establish a "staggered" term process. The Tribal Chairman is elected at large to a four-year term. Under the constitution, officers of the Tribal Council are elected bi-annually by the Council members. The Tribal Chair is a non-voting member, except in the event of a tie vote. The next Tribal election will be held in October of 1996; one seat from each District (four seats of a total of eight) will be open at this time. The Tribal Chair and the remaining four seats of the Council will be open in the 1998 election. All enrolled Tribal
members, 18 years of age and over, are eligible to register and vote in Tribal elections.

The Ponca Tribe of Nebraska has established three field offices in Nebraska, at Norfolk, Omaha, and Lincoln, to provide services and assistance to Tribal members. Contact with the Tribal Chair and Council should be initiated through the headquarters in Niobrara. The executive secretary for the Chair and Tribal Council is located in Niobrara. The Tribal Business Manager is also located in the Niobrara headquarters. Various Tribal department heads are scattered between sites, as need and personnel dictate; e.g., the Economic Development Director is located in Lincoln.

Consultation: Ponca Tribe of Nebraska

Consulting with the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska is important to the successful future of the NIMI planning process for many reasons. Firstly, the Poncas are long-term residents of the entire study area (see Chapters 3 and 7 and Map __ [of Ponca aboriginal territory]). The "cultural landscape" of the modern Ponca Tribe of Nebraska is, thus, inextricably bound up in a Tribal identity rooted in religion, folklore, place names, ancestral graves, and an often painful past. Despite brutal federal policies designed to separate the Poncas from their ancestral home and strip them of their traditional culture (see Chapters 7 and 29), the Poncas have persisted and have returned time and again to their ancestral homeland. This pattern will undoubtedly persist and intensify in the future. Potential recreational development and interpretation should be carefully planned and coordinated with sensitivity to the history and future revitalization of the Poncas' culture and traditions. There is a high probability that culturally significant sites may be identified and re-acquired, and potentially nominated for National Register status. Many of these sites (some are yet to be identified) will no doubt lie contiguous to the Niobrara and Missouri Rivers, within the Recreational River designation; e.g., the Poncas have actively discussed the possibility of re-acquiring the Ponca Fort site.

Secondly, as the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska evolves and develops politically and economically in the NIMI study area, the necessity of dealing with the Tribal government in a "government to government" capacity will increase. Within the next several years, the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska will acquire at least 1,500 acres of trust land in Knox and Boyd counties, Nebraska. In addition, the Tribe may be allowed to acquire additional properties in the service delivery areas for economic development purposes. Under the currently proposed Tribal economic development plan, both the Tribe and individual Tribal members may put forth economic development plans which may eventually include industrial, agricultural, recreational, or "ethnographic
tourism" components in the NIMI study area. Potentially, for
NIMI planning and management purposes, the Ponca Tribal presence
could be highly significant politically, economically, and
jurisdictionally.

Thirdly, the opportunity exists to forge mutually-beneficial
recreational/interpretive opportunities for the Tribe and the
National Park Service. This ideal can only be accomplished
through a strong commitment to the on-going consultation process
and the provision of technical and financial assistance on the
part of the National Park Service and other federal agencies,
where feasible. This kind of cooperative arrangement would
fulfill the "trust" mandate envisioned by the Department of the
Interior as well as perpetuate good will in future federal/Tribal
interactions.

At the time of consultation, the interim Tribal Council
expressed the opinion, with a formal resolution, that they did
not wish to have any Ponca-affiliated cultural sites included
within Park boundaries. Currently, the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska
has very limited property ownership (160 acres) in the study
area, consequently, most traditional sites associated with the
Poncas are currently on privately-owned or public land. The
interim Tribal Council expressed some interest in entering into
"cooperative" agreements with the National Park Service to
develop and/or manage various sites which might lie adjacent to
or within currently proposed NIMI boundary alternatives. With
the recent establishment of the first elected Tribal Council, it
is highly advisable to discuss the NIMI boundary alternative
studies and planning processes with the entire Tribal Council and
Tribal Chair.

There are numerous documented Ponca cultural sites within
the NIMI study area; including protohistoric and historic
earthlodge villages, camp sites, Ponca agency locations, lairs of
mythological beings, natural resource acquisition sites,
ancestral cemeteries, and others (see Chapter 28). One
potentially problematic issue (from the perspectives of the
Tribal Council, Tribal elders, and some family members) has been
the effort to identify Chief Standing Bear's unmarked gravesite.
An initial meeting between NPS officials and family members and
others of the Northern Ponca community was held at _____ on
____, 199_; proposed plans and methods to locate the gravesite
were explained at that meeting. Initially, Standing Bear's
descendants and the interim Tribal Council expressed interest in
locating the gravesite, in order to erect a suitable monument or
historical marker to honor Standing Bear. A Midwest
Archeological Center archeologist, Bob Nickel, subsequently
performed a non-intrusive, preliminary proton magnetometer survey
of a small area suspected to be the gravesite on Standing Bear's
former allotment lands. The results were inconclusive. NIMI
staff continued the effort by engaging the efforts of Glen
Bowker, a local journalist and amateur historian, to scour archival documents for clues about the location of the burial. To date, these efforts have also proven largely inconclusive. In the meantime, the sentiments of some family members (as well as the opinions of many prominent elders) have shifted somewhat about the wisdom of continuing to seek the precise location of Standing Bear's grave. Future efforts to locate the gravesite must be closely and explicitly coordinated with the family of Standing Bear and the Tribal Council, and should not be pursued if either the family or the Council does not concur with the objectives of the search. The Ponca Tribe of Nebraska has a Repatriation Coordinator, a Cultural Committee, and a Cemetery Committee, all of which could also be helpful regarding Ponca burial practices and traditional values regarding burials. In addition, it would be wise to seek a solicitor's opinion regarding the application of Nebraska statute L.B. 340, which protects unmarked burials, before proceeding with further search efforts.

Despite the fact that the Ponca tribe of Nebraska does not and will never have a residential reservation in Knox County, Nebraska, the Poncas believe they have retained hunting and fishing rights under the Ponca treaties of 1858 and 1865 (personal communication from Mr. Fred LeRoy, Tribal Chairman, June 22, 1995). As a terminated (and subsequently restored) Tribe, the Poncas never relinquished these rights. Termination severed the federal obligation to the Tribe, but it did not abrogate the Ponca treaties (see P.L. 101-484 and 1994 Tribal constitution in Appendix I). While the Poncas have no current plans to regulate hunting and fishing within the external boundaries of their former 96,000-acre reservation (see Map ___), that right could be asserted at any time in the future. If these rights are valid and are exercised by the Tribe, hunting and fishing within the external boundaries of the former reservation would be regulated by the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska, not the State of Nebraska, for Ponca and non-Ponca sportsmen alike. The authority would be the same as that which the Santee Sioux and Yankton Sioux tribes exercise within the external boundaries of their respective reservations.

By the same token, the Poncas contend they have also retained their residual water rights on the Niobrara and Missouri rivers under the Ponca treaties of 1858 and 1865 (see Appendix II). These residual water rights are particularly significant for NIMI planning purposes because the former 96,000-acre reservation was situated squarely within the core of the 39-mile NIMI recreational river designation, between the Missouri and Niobrara rivers.

Future Consultation: Ponca Tribe of Nebraska

Future consultation with the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska should
be attentively pursued. In the spirit of Government-to-
Council to request a formal meeting. As Tribal Chair, Mr. Fred
LeRoy, is the appropriate Tribal spokesperson with whom to
coordinate. The (current) Ponca representative on the NIMI
Planning team is Tribal Council member, Gloria Chytka. In her
capacity as a NIMI Planner, she is an appropriate liaison with
the Tribal Council as well. However, it is desirable to continue
meeting periodically with the entire Tribal Council to be
available for questions and concerns which might arise. It is
also highly advisable to secure the Secretary of the Interior's
approval for a Ponca representative to sit on the NIMI Advisory
Committee.

Finally, in light of the possibility that the Ponca tribe of
Nebraska will choose at some time in the future to assert their
treaty rights with regard to hunting, fishing, and water rights
in the heart of the recreational river designation, it will be
essential to consult with the Ponca tribal government about the
timetable in which they may exercise these rights within the
former Ponca reservation lands.

SANTEE SIOUX TRIBE OF NEBRASKA

Background

The Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska is a federally-recognized
tribe headquartered in Santee, Nebraska. The Santees were
relocated from their Minnesota reservation to Crow Creek, South
Dakota, and eventually to a reservation in Knox County, Nebraska;
the latter was established by four consecutive Executive Orders
between 1866 and 1869 (see Chapters 6 and 7 and Appendix 1).
While the NIMI study area is generally not considered to lie
within the recognized Santee aboriginal homeland, the Santees are
documented as having ranged into this region before their
relocation to the Nebraska reservation (see Chapters 6 and 28).

Since their relocation to Nebraska in 1866, the reservation
boundaries have been adjusted three times by Executive Order,
resulting in today's 115,000-acre reservation. Roughly 20,000
acres is "trust" land, either Tribally-owned or in individual
allotments (Meyer 1993). Currently the Tribal roll includes
approximately 2,260 persons (Meyer 1993), of which nearly 760 are
resident on the Santee reservation. Many Santees are anxious to
return to the reservation; however, lack of housing and economic
opportunities force many to continue to live away from their
homeland and kin.

Employment, Education, and the Reservation Economy

Employment opportunities for Santees living on the
reservation are limited. The 1990 U.S. Census indicates that
American Indian males (age 16 and older) on the Santee
reservation have an unemployment rate of 49 percent; American
Indian females have a 24 percent unemployment rate. The overall
rate of unemployment on the reservation (American Indian and non-
Indian, both sexes) is 22.9 percent. Knox County, Nebraska, has
a rural, agriculturally-based economy. Consequently, given the
degree of dispossession (nearly 95,000 acres are in non-Indian
ownership) on the reservation, relatively few Santees are able to
make a living in the agricultural sector. The Tribe does operate
a cattle ranch which runs about 600 head and employs five people.
Recently, the Tribe has been pursuing the possibility of
developing a commercial bison operation which would also provide
additional employment and Tribal income, as well as meat and
other bison products for the local Tribal community.

The Tribal housing authority is one of the major employers
on the reservation, employing 37 people. In 1993, the Santee
Tribal housing authority, one of the top five in the Bureau of
Indian Affairs' Aberdeen area, was responsible for the
construction of fourteen new housing units (through HUD) and was
also involved in the construction of the new health clinic. The
health clinic is viewed as both an essential service and a
potential economic development tool. A $400,000 FMHA loan was
obtained from First Dakota Bank, Yankton, South Dakota, to build
the facility. The clinic employs a physician and dentist as well
as other health professionals. The clinic contracts with the
Indian Health Service (IHS) to provide health care services for
enrolled members of federally-recognized tribes (see discussion
of the Self-Determination Act in Federal Indian Policy in Chapter
29). Eventually, the clinic plans to accept non-enrolled
patients (who are presently ineligible for IHS services) on a
fee-basis. Given the general lack of access to health care in
this rural area, hopes are high for the success of this venture.
The clinic is constructed on the former site of the Santee Normal
Training School in Santee, Nebraska.

The Becton-Dickinson company operates a pharmaceutical
supply manufacturing facility on the reservation which employs
approximately 16 people (Meyer 1993). Additional employment
opportunities are provided by various Tribal administrative and
educational jobs. The Santee reservation has a Headstart program
and also has a campus of the Nebraska Indian Community College.

In the course of consultation, the Tribal leadership voiced
concerns about economic opportunities, employment, and education.
The 1990 U.S. Census data reveal that a significant proportion
(37.3 percent) of reservation residents fall below the poverty
line. Particularly striking is the profile of female-headed
households with children under the age of five, for which fully
100 percent lie below the poverty line. Also according to the
1990 U.S. Census, nearly 45 percent of all adults lack a high
school diploma or equivalency (GED).
The Santee Sioux are attempting to negotiate a gaming compact with Governor Nelson of Nebraska. If successfully negotiated, the Santees would build a casino on the eastern edge of their reservation. Gaming is an attractive economic development option for many federally-recognized tribes like the Santees, who lack natural resources, an adequate landbase, and the capital to pursue other economic development options (see discussion of Indian Gaming in Chapter 29). Employment opportunities afforded by the casino would allow many enrolled Santees to return home and would also benefit the local Indian and non-Indian economy. However, at this point in time, there is no indication that the State of Nebraska will approve a Class III casino gaming compact anytime in the near future with any of the Nebraska Indian Tribes.

The Tribal Council is actively pursuing economic development strategies to improve the overall security and autonomy of the Santee Sioux. However, economic issues are not the only focus of the Santees. Prominent leaders and elders are committed to strengthening and revitalizing the community through a return to spiritualism. Because of the history of the Santee relocation (see Chapter 7), various Indian agents and missionaries assigned to the reservation effectively repressed traditional religious expression for nearly 100 years. Beginning in the 1970s, a small number of Santees began building sweatlodges and relearning their traditional religious ceremonies. Many credit the activism of the American Indian Movement (AIM) for encouraging this spiritual and cultural revitalization on the Santee reservation. Over the past 20 years, this spiritual renewal has grown steadily and become an important focus for many of the younger Santees (many elders continue to favor the practice of Christianity). The first Sun Dance was held on the Santee reservation nearly eight years ago; there are now three annual Sun Dances conducted on the reservation. In addition, Dakota language and culture classes are now offered through the school system at Santee, particularly through the Santee campus of the Nebraska Indian Community College. Many Santees expressed pride and optimism about the future because of these opportunities for the youth to experience their traditional culture.

Government: Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska

The Santees have an IRA-chartered constitution (approved in 1936--see Appendix I) which provides for the election of a 12-member Tribal Council. The Tribal Council is comprised of three members from each of the four districts of the reservation (Santee, Hobu Creek, Howe Creek, and Bazile Creek); the Council members are elected for three-year terms, on a staggered basis. There is an annual election on the last Tuesday of September, with a potential turnover of no more than four Tribal Council seats per year (e.g., in 1994, only two Council seats of four were "turned over"). The Tribal Council Chair is elected by
secret ballot in an annual vote by the seated Council, after the
general election. The Tribal Chair is a non-voting member of the
Council, leaving an 11-member voting Council (the Chair may vote
in the event of a tie). The current Tribal Chair is Richard
(Rick) Kitto, who has considerable experience in Santee Tribal
government. Community support and sentiment is apparently
positive regarding the Tribal Council. Recently, there has been
some consideration of rewriting the Tribal constitution to better
reflect the needs of the contemporary community. For example,
the four districts are severely malapportioned because the Santee
district has by far the largest numerical population but is
allowed only three Council seats under the current constitution.

Bureau of Indian Affairs oversight for the Santee Sioux Tribe
emanates from the Winnebago Agency on the Winnebago reservation
in northeastern Nebraska. The Omahas and Winnebagos are also
administered through the Winnebago Agency, which also has an
Indian Health Service Hospital.

Consultation: Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska

Initial consultation with the Santees was coordinated
through Butch Denny, Tribal Council member and designated Tribal
representative for the NIMI Advisory Board. Mr. Denny and Mike
Crossley, Tribal representative on the NIMI Planning Team, met
with Beth Ritter and Roberta D'Amico (NIMI park office) and
agreed to take our scope of work to the Tribal Council for
approval. Approval was granted in August of 1993.

During the course of the on-going consultation, formal and
informal interviews were conducted with six of the Tribal Council
members, including Rick Kitto, Chair. In these meetings, it
became apparent that the Santee leadership was strongly opposed
to any increased federal presence on reservation land that could
affect Santee resources (water, wildlife, wildlife habitat, land,
cultural, etc.). Questions of jurisdiction were of the greatest
concern, the perception being that any increased federal presence
would undermine Tribal jurisdiction, and would be "unacceptable"
to the Tribe. An additional concern voiced was that there was
no consultation with the tribe before the Recreational River
designation was made in 1991.

The National Recreational River area study includes Santee
reservation lands contiguous and/or adjacent to the Missouri and
Niobrara rivers. A considerable number of cultural and sacred
sites as well as residential and economic facilities lie within a
quarter-mile of the Missouri River on the Santee reservation.
The general consensus was that the Santees wanted to be "left
alone" to pursue their own recreational and/or economic
development plans. It was suggested that if they were not
allowed to be "left alone," they would pursue other avenues
(legal and political) to maintain their sovereign integrity.
CHAPTER 31

OVERVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Robert K. Hitchcock

INTRODUCTION

This report has demonstrated that the NIMI area is culturally rich and historically diverse. The archeological, ethnohistoric, historic, and ethnographic evidence underscores the fact that the NIMI area was used extensively over a substantial period by a variety of groups, including American Indians, Europeans, and African Americans (Ludwickson et al. 1981; Blakeslee and O’Shea 1983; Hartley 1983; Smith 1983; Franklin et al. 1994; Vawser and Osborn n.d.). The three Native American tribes with the greatest stake in the evolving NIMI planning process, the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska, the Santee Sioux, also of Nebraska, and the Yankton Sioux of South Dakota, were consulted in order to gain insights into their experiences and perspectives and to obtain their views on the NIMI area and its future (see Chapter 30). Decisions about land tenure status in the region will have significant effects on these tribes and their non-American Indian neighbors. Most of the discussion that follows is directed to concerns that Native Americans may have about the planning and development of NIMI.

In addition to implications for the economies of people living in the NIMI region, an expanded federal presence could also affect land use, recreation, jurisdiction over property in both American Indian and non-Indian hands, and the exercise of tribal sovereignty. It is for these reasons that decisions about the future of the region should be carefully considered and should be based on consultation with and participation of all interested parties as well as scientific experts and government and non-government agencies and individuals.

Some of the information upon which this overview and set of recommendations is based was obtained from representatives of the NIMI planning and advisory bodies, the National Park Service, the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission, and the Nebraska Department of Economic Development. It was also obtained from various stakeholders in the NIMI area, including private land owners, local business owners, and the Nature Conservancy, as well as from the three "resident" tribes in the area (the Poncas, Santees, and Yanktons; see Chapter 30 for information about consultation with Native Americans).

The conclusions presented herein are based on information
This chapter is broken down into several parts. First, a background on general issues relating to conservation and development as a means of enhancing natural and cultural resources is provided. Then there is a discussion of the impacts of various actions that have taken place already in the NIMI area, with comparative information on similar situations elsewhere in the world. After that there is a discussion of specific areas of concern for the NIMI area populations, including land use and land tenure; water rights; consultation and participation; community-based and regional natural resource management; economic development; tourism and recreation; sites of archeological, historical, and religious significance; human resource development; and public information and interpretation. The chapter concludes with a set of specific recommendations for action and suggestions on topics that require further study.

**BACKGROUND**

Over the past two decades there have been significant changes in public attitudes towards conservation and land management. The establishment of national parks and reserved areas was seen for a century as a primary means by which habitats and resources, both biological and cultural, could be preserved (Fitzsimmons 1976; McNeely and Miller 1984; Machliss [spelling?--see RC] and Tichnell 1985; Anderson and Grove 1987; LeDec and Goodland 1988; Kiss 1990). Calls have been heard from local people for the implementation of conservation efforts aimed at enhancing their livelihoods without reducing their access to the land and natural resources necessary for their survival. Striking a balance between conservation and development is the key to ensuring the long-term survival of both people and wild species. (Brown and Wyckoff-Baird 1992; Wells and Brandon 1992; West and Brechin 1991; Kemf 1993; World Wildlife Fund 1993; Munasinghe and McNeely 1995).

In some parts of North America, including the Great Plains and the NIMI area specifically, biodiversity is on the decline as habitats are altered by a combination of human and environmental factors. A major worry of biologists is that the ability of ecosystems to carry out vital functions such as maintenance of soil fertility, water retention, and cycling of nutrients will be reduced by the loss of biodiversity (Wilson 1988 [---NRCC or WRI ex
There are several reasons for this situation. First, the expanding number of people using and visiting many of these areas is putting pressure on resources. Second, the diversification of local economies is leading to greater impacts on the environment. Third, outside agencies, including government organizations and private companies, have increased their efforts to exploit both biological and cultural resources. Fourth, scientific discoveries, some of them drawn from indigenous knowledge, have resulted in expansion of the uses to which resources are put (Wilson 1985, 1988 [--NIRC]; World Conservation Monitoring Center 1992; World Resources Institute et al. 1992).

In response to rising concerns about biodiversity losses, government agencies, American Indian tribes, natural resource districts, non-government organizations (NGOs) such as the Nature Conservancy and the National Audubon Society, scientists, and local communities have attempted to re-think some of the approaches in order to come up with strategies that are sustainable over the long-term. Many efforts are being made to frame policies and put into place a variety of projects aimed at integrating conservation and development. The basic assumption behind these projects is that people will attempt to conserve resources when they can see the economic and social utility of doing so. In other words, if people are able to derive both direct and indirect benefits from the consumptive and non-consumptive use of resources, they are more likely to engage in efforts to enhance the well-being of those resources (McNeely et al. 1990; Associates in Rural Development 1992; World Wildlife Fund 1993).

In the past, a major problem with biodiversity conservation programs was that they tended to dispossess people or to prevent them from pursuing resource procurement activities. As one Lakota man put it, "The federal government first took away our right to hunt and then they removed us from our traditional territories." The passing of legislation to control hunting, the resettlement of American Indian peoples in places away from their ancestral lands, and the overexploitation of important resources such as the buffalo served to exacerbate problems of poverty and resource stress among local communities.

One approach included killing of game as a way of "taming" American Indians and getting them to settle on reservations. The destruction of the buffalo meant not only the loss of a primary source of food and other basic requirements (e.g., clothing, shelter), but also the loss of culture. Buffalo were a crucial part of the economies and belief systems of Plains Indians (McHugh 1972; Foster et al. 1992; Hodgson 1994). The Lakota, who ranged into the NIMI area in the past, were known as the Pte Oyate, the Buffalo Nation. From the viewpoint of the Lakota and other Great
Plains indigenous peoples, the killing of the buffalo was part of a general process of ethnocide, the deliberate and systematic destruction of their cultures.

The history of the NIMI area reveals that the development and conservation actions taken in the past had significant impacts on the resident populations and on groups and individuals that used the area. This was particularly true of federal Indian policy (Ortiz 1984; Deloria 1985; Deloria and Lytle 1983, 1985; Prucha 1990; Wunder 1994) (see Chapter 29). It was also true of federal land policy, which, from the standpoint of indigenous peoples, was tantamount to dispossession (McDonnell 1991; Jaimes 1992; Wishart 1994). Water development projects also had major impacts on northern Plains peoples, some of whom lost not only land but also livelihoods and social well-being (Lawson 1982) (see Table 31-1).

Local communities, organizations, and tribal governments in the NIMI area are involved in planning natural resource management, economic development, and educational activities. These activities have had a variety of impacts on the livelihoods and resource use patterns of local people. A number of organizations are involved in programs that are aimed at promoting sustainable resource management and development that are relevant to the NIMI area. These include the Center for Rural Affairs, the Land Institute, the Land Stewardship Project, and the Center for Holistic Resource Management. Others are concentrating their efforts on specific activities, such as promoting wildlife breeding, as is being done by the Inter-Tribal Bison Cooperative (ITBC), or managing water resources, such as Mni Sose, the Missouri River Basin water rights coalition (Table 31-2 contains a list of these and other organizations that are doing work that is relevant to the NIMI area). This chapter addresses many of the concerns of local communities and attempts to provide some suggestions for ways in which these concerns might be dealt with.

LAND USE AND LAND TENURE

A primary concern of American Indian communities in the northern Great Plains is land. Traditionally, Plains Indian societies managed their land on a communal basis. Under these systems of tenure, land could not be bought or sold, nor could it be pledged as collateral for a loan. Under common property management regimes, individuals have rights to land and property insofar as they are members of a specific social group. Land is held in the name of the group, and every individual in the various Native American societies theoretically had the right to sufficient land to support himself or herself. Land was held in common by the community and individual households were allotted portions of that land for their use. In some cases, people had to demonstrate continued usage of that land in order to maintain their rights of access to it.
Property in the form of land in native North America consisted of what one might describe as a bundle of rights. In many cases, the same piece of land can have a variety of claims on it for various purposes. It is not unusual, therefore, to have complex systems of land and resource rights which are spread widely throughout local communities. Overlapping rights and obligations are by no means uncommon in American Indian systems of land tenure. Landlessness was not a major problem in most Native American communities, in part because of the distribution mechanisms that existed.

Land is part and parcel of American Indian sociopolitical systems. It is often perceived as a territorial dimension of Native American society, and segments of Native American societies were associated with discrete territories. Local entities had rights over blocks of land (e.g., a band in the case of a foraging society, a clan or other kind of descent group in the case of a pastoral or agricultural society). Rights to territories were handed down from one generation to the next, and people generally were aware of who had what rights to specific areas.

Two of the primary factors in land-related matters among Native American communities are kinship and social alliances. People are allocated land rights on the basis of group membership or, in some cases, through provision by a tribal authority (e.g., a chief, a clan elder). Methods of obtaining rights to land include a) inheritance (birth rights); b) marital ties; c) borrowing; and d) colonization, the movement into an unutilized area and the establishment of occupancy. Land and resource rights can also be attained through the investment of labor (e.g., in clearing of a field, construction of a fence, digging of a well, planting of a tree). There were also cases in the past where territorial acquisition occurred through conquest.

Land is allocated to Native American people for a number of purposes: a) residence; b) arable agriculture; c) hunting; d) collection of fuel wood, building materials, wild foods, medicinal plants, and specialized resources (e.g., clay for pots); and e) grazing. After changes occurred in the land tenure system, Native American land was also allocated for purposes of establishing social services (e.g., schools) and for private businesses.

American Indian peoples on the northern Plains in the past had de facto (customary) but not de jure (legal) rights to land until changes occurred in land tenure resulting from federal government efforts to establish reservations, make treaties with American Indian tribes, facilitate homesteading by white settlers, and pass the General Allotment (Dawes) Act (McDonnell 1991; Wieland 1994; Carlson 1994). Traditionally, a land market did not exist in Native North America. Plains Indian tribes did not recognize the right of individuals to barter or sell land, although there were situations in which land was transferred from one person to another.
(Sutton 1985 [---NIRC]; Olson 1990). There were also instances where people exchanged land for cash or some other good prior to allotment, though this was usually frowned upon by other group members.

A key approach to agricultural and economic development in the United States was the privatization of land, a process which, it was argued, would provide individuals with the incentive to invest more labor and capital and at the same time encourage people to exercise good stewardship and conserve resources. Individual (private) systems of tenure were established, in part to provide legal claims to land and to simplify the systems of land holding. It was also believed that the allotment system would "break the hold of the chiefs over individual Indians" (Carlson 1994:27). Native Americans generally opposed these attempts at land reform because they were all too aware of the likelihood of their losing control of their land and that many people would be forced off the land completely.

This report and the work of both American Indian and non-Indian scholars has outlined the changes which federal Indian policy and land reform brought about on the northern Plains (Ortiz 1984; Deloria 1985; Sutton 1985 [---NIRC]; McDonnell 1991; Wishart 1991, 1994; Carlson 1994; see Chapter 29 of this volume). In general, the United States acquired some two billion acres of Indian land, primarily through treaties of land cession or, in some cases, by use of force. Compensation for the land that was taken was far below fair market value (Wishart 1990, 1994).

Following World War II, Congress set up the Indian Claims Commission to resolve the various land claims made by American Indian tribes that had not been dealt with by the U.S. Claims Court. According to many of the people interviewed and written materials assessed during the life of the Commission (1960-1978), the practice of the federal government to pay off claims in cash rather than in kind (i.e., in the form of land) was a major factor in impoverishment of Native American communities, and it contributed to a loss of a sense of place and social well-being for a number of tribes. Some tribes never accepted the federal government's offers of cash compensation; this was the case, for example, with the Lakota, who refused to take the cash offered for the Black Hills in South Dakota (Mathiessen 1984; Lazarus 1991). The problems facing American Indians today have brought about greater awareness of the urgent need to address questions relating to land tenure, land use, and natural resource management.

American Indian communities in the NIMI area and the northern Plains generally experienced a loss of land and resource access over time, in part because of both government and private development and conservation efforts. Water development projects had significant effects on the indigenous peoples of the northern Plains, especially those along the Missouri itself (Lawson 1982;
Franklin et al. 1994:92-95). Early developments along the Missouri River were aimed at improving its navigability for large traffic and not primarily for flood control. American Indians and later, European settlers, who had homes and fields close to the river lost them periodically when the Missouri overflowed its banks. As population grew in the region, the desire for flood control increased as a means of preventing property destruction and enhancing the movement of goods.

In the early part of the twentieth century it was decided that a series of dams along the upper Missouri would solve many of the problems faced by people along the river as well as those downstream. The dams and associated facilities were to have several benefits, including flood control, improved navigation, irrigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and resource conservation (Lawson 1982). The Pick-Sloan Plan, the joint water development program that was drawn up by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for the Missouri River Basin, was authorized by Congress in 1944. This development program had major effects on the ecology of the region, and as Lawson (1982:xxix) notes, it "caused more damage to Indian lands than any other public works project in America." The dams in the Pick-Sloan Plan flooded the rich bottomlands of much of the upper Missouri, resulting in the loss of wildlife habitat, timber, and other valuable resources, and causing the relocation of substantial numbers of people (Lawson 1982). The ponding effect of the dams has altered the movement of silt, reducing agricultural fertility in the region. At the same time, increased water turbidity has reduced the viability of some of the river's fish populations. Vegetation along the river, so important to wildlife and to livestock seeking shade, was inundated or was affected negatively by the fluctuations of the newly created reservoirs. The erosion of the riverbanks, which was accelerated by the creation of the dams, has had major impacts on agricultural land, as well as on cultural resources, including important archeological sites (Ebert et al. 1989).

The dams along the Missouri that were built as part of the Pick-Sloan Plan destroyed over 550 square miles of Indian land in North and South Dakota and dislocated more than 900 American Indian families. Like most water development projects, the Missouri dams had negative effects on both local people and the environment (see Table 31-2 for a summary of the effects of the five multipurpose dams along the Missouri, with comparative information drawn from other cases of water projects that had impacts on indigenous peoples). Two of the tribes in the NHR area, the Santee and the Yankton, were directly affected by the Fort Randall and Gavins Point dams. It is not surprising, therefore, that they are concerned about the possibility of additional land being declared off-limits and people potentially being relocated as a result of further actions by the federal government.
has had significant effects on the Sioux and the Three Affiliated Tribes (Mandan, Arikara, and Hidatsa). There are concerns that changes in the land tenure status of the Niobrara and Missouri river areas will result in native people losing additional assets. Although the Yanktons and Santees were never relocated from their lands in South Dakota and Nebraska, they and the Poncas are aware that the compensation payments for the previous federal projects along the Missouri were less than adequate in most cases. For example, the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe recently sought and received legislative redress for the impacts of the Oahe Dam project. The Tribe received $90,600,000 as additional cash compensation under Title XXV of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-575) along with a 2,380-acre irrigated area on the reservation and nearly $5,000,000 to develop it. Reestablishment of tribal jurisdiction over much of the land in the Oahe project area on the Standing Rock reservation that had been "taken" by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for creation of the reservoir, is also under consideration (Lawson 1993:xx-xxi). These gains are heartening for the other tribes along the Missouri who feel that their rights have been infringed upon by the establishment of the dams.

A major issue that arose during the course of implementation of the water projects along the Missouri was that of water rights (Lawson 1982:45-45). Ever since the propounding of the Winters Doctrine in 1907 in the case of Winters vs. United States, American Indians have had the right to use water flowing through their areas for their own purposes. The basic principle was that Native Americans had a right to all the water they could put to "reasonable use," and non-Indians could use the surplus waters, if any, not required by the Native Americans (Hundley 1985:95-96; see also Morris 1985; McCool 1987; Burton 1991). Native Americans, including the Poncas, Santees, and Yanktons, maintain that they have the right to use waters for any purpose they see as significant, including fishing, irrigation, recreation, and tourism. The problem in the case of the Pick-Sloan Plan was that the government took away Native American water rights without their consent and generally without having consulted them beforehand.

Another, related issue is that of residual treaty rights to regulate not only water use, but also hunting and fishing on reservation and former reservation lands. The two tribes that have a substantial land base at present--the Yanktons and the Santees--have tribal officials charged with the management of game and other natural resources (it is possible that the Poncas will in time also have similar officials, as the tribe acquires more land). Treaties that created reservations typically gave the Native American inhabitants of these reservations the right to regulate hunting and fishing activities within reservation boundaries. The Yanktons and the Santees exercise this right within their reservations. The Poncas, although terminated as a federally-recognized tribe in the 1960s and lacking a reservation at present, once had an extensive
reservation in the heart of the NIMI area. Termination of the tribe's federal recognition did not abrogate the treaties which the U.S. government made with the Poncas in the nineteenth century, which means that the Poncas still retain residual treaty rights to regulate hunting and fishing on the lands of their former reservation. Although they do not exercise this right at present, this may become an important jurisdictional issue in the future.

The Pick-Sloan Plan experience and the residual treaty rights issue serve to reinforce the need for special attention to be paid to careful Native American consultation and participation in decision-making about development planning that has the potential to affect the present and former land base of native peoples in the NIMI region.

CONSULTATION AND PARTICIPATION

The issues of community empowerment and local participation in rural development and conservation projects are receiving more and more attention from researchers and development organizations (Midgley 1986; Paul 1987; Kiss 1990; Cernea 1991; Associates in Rural Development 1992). Participatory development has become a catchphrase for the kind of approach that many agencies and policy analysts are advocating. Various means of bringing about local participation have been suggested, including provision of training and education (investment in human resources) and assuring that local people have control over their own land and natural resources.

Two areas where the community empowerment and participatory development approaches of the agencies working in the NIMI area differ from that of other models are 1) the degree to which local communities have been able to exert control over land and the full array of natural resources, and 2) the types of institutions that serve as the focal points for development activities.

Local people have participated in NIMI planning activities to a large extent. Local landowners and businessmen, as well as representatives of local governments, an environmental organization, and one of the three American Indian tribes resident in the area, hold seats on the NIMI advisory commission at present. The 1991 law which authorized much of NIMI (P.L. 102-50) directs the establishment of an advisory group known as the Niobrara Scenic River Advisory Commission. This body is comprised of 11 members appointed by the Secretary of the Interior; presently, the members are six local landowners, one canoe outfitter, one person selected by the Governor of Nebraska, two from affected county governments or natural resource districts, and one from a conservation organization (the Nature Conservancy). In addition, two planning teams exist (one for the Niobrara and one for the Missouri portions of NIMI), comprised of National Park Service personnel, state and local governmental representatives, local landowners, and tribal
The participation of local people in these planning and advisory bodies provides a excellent foundation for generating local participation in the NIMI planning effort. However, representation of the three NIMI residential Native American tribes on the advisory commission is uneven at present. Only the Santee Tribe of Nebraska is represented on the advisory commission at present. The Yanktons formerly had a representative on the commission but are not represented at present, and the Poncas have never had a seat on the commission (or either of the planning teams). In the interest of furthering government-to-government relations with these tribes, as required by Secretarial and Presidential directives (see Chapter 2), it would be advisable to consider expanding Native American representation on the commission to include all three of the NIMI residential tribes.

As was noted in Chapter 30, the Poncas, Yanktons, and Santees were not informed beforehand of the proposed declaration of the Niobrara and Missouri as part of the Wild and Scenic River system. Since then, the degree to which Native Americans have been involved with the NIMI planning process has increased markedly. Appointment of Yankton and Ponca representatives, plus formal direct contacts with the governments of all three tribes, would considerably enhance the effectiveness of communication between the National Park Service and the the Ponca, Santee, and Yankton residents of the NIMI area.

Federal land already exists in the NIMI area in the form of the Fort Niobrara National Wildlife Refuge (19,122 acres) and the Valentine National Wildlife Refuge (71,500 acres), both of which are under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Forest Service in the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) manages the McKelvie division of the Nebraska National Forest (116,000 acres). The Bureau of Land Management has a relatively small parcel of land in the Niobrara area (280 acres), most of which has been leased out to private users, one of them the Nature Conservancy. The Nature Conservancy owns the 54,500-acre Niobrara Valley Preserve, which is used for resource preservation, environmental education, and ecological research.

The State of Nebraska has 12,791 acres of school trust land in the area which is leased out for grazing. The Nebraska Game and Parks Commission oversees Smith Falls State Park adjacent to the Niobrara River (244 acres) and Niobrara State Park at the mouth of the Niobrara where it runs into the Missouri. The Middle Niobrara Natural Resource District has a two-acre plot of land at Brewer Bridge which is managed for recreational purposes. There are also plans for recreational trails in the area, including one along U.S. Highway 20 that will be used for the "Cowboy Trail" (Nebraska Energy Office and Nebraska Department of Economic Development 1994; U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Denver
Given that there is already a fairly sizable amount of public-use land in federal, state, and private hands, a logical concern of the Native Americans in the NIMI area (as well as non-Indian residents of the region) is the possibility of additional land being taken over for public purposes. While many Native American in the area agree that the land should be managed and protected, they feel that they themselves are capable of taking care of the resources. They would like to see lands along the Missouri River be managed by natural processes, such as natural flooding which would provide the floodplain with nutrients and have beneficial effects for the riverine vegetation, fish, and wildlife. In general, many Native American and non-Indian residents of the NIMI region would also like to see greater efforts devoted to ecological restoration in the Missouri and Niobrara river areas.

Many of the significant Native American archeological and historical sites in the NIMI area are located close to the rivers, particularly the Missouri. Many Native Americans in the NIMI region would like to see greater protection of those sites, which they would prefer be off-limits to tourists and other visitors. They believe that while the benefits of cultural tourism and ecotourism are potentially significant, they would like to have greater control over the actions of tourists in their areas.

The concept of participation is one that is not easy to define. It can mean the right to make decisions about development action. Participation can also mean the process whereby local communities take part in defining their own needs and coming up with solutions to meet those needs. In addition, participation can refer to situations in which local communities and individuals share in the benefits from development projects and are fully involved in generating those benefits. As Chambers (1983:140) notes, "Rural development can be redefined to include enabling poor rural women and men to demand and control more of the benefits of development."

It is important to remember that the degree of willingness of individuals to take part in development action and to take responsibility for decision-making often varies tremendously not only within specific areas but frequently within the same community and the same household. In order to determine the various goals and objectives of local people, concerted efforts should be made to collect information and seek feedback at the local level. What this means is that an investigatory program must be built into all conservation and development projects and policies. It also means that continuous monitoring and consultation has to be done during the course of project identification, design, implementation, and evaluation. If it is found that local people do not agree with the ways in which the projects are designed or being put into practice, then changes or new approaches should be considered.
Some governments and non-government organizations have developed what they term a participative extension approach to rural development (e.g., the Boscosa Project of the Conservation Foundation and World Wildlife Fund on the Osa Peninsula in Costa Rica; see Wells and Brandon 1992:88-91). This kind of approach places emphasis on community involvement in all aspects of project design and execution. In some instances, this strategy results in the formation of local organizations (e.g., farmers associations or women's multi-purpose development groups). It also contributes to situations in which efforts are made to provide local communities with rights over land, water, and other resources. Agroforestry projects, for example, are being done more and more at the household level, and tenure rights are being defined in such a way that individuals and groups have de jure (legal) rights rather than simply de facto control over the resources, which is potentially insecure.

One strategy taken by the National Park Service to promote public involvement in NIMI has been to appoint local people to NIMI planning and advisory bodies. By having these people at the "grassroots" level of planning, it has been possible for trust to be built up and for detailed knowledge about local situations to be considered in the planning process. These individuals have effectively served as facilitators, advisors, and information-disseminators. These individuals often serve as a link between community organizations and outside agencies. In this capacity, they have provided a kind of communication function.

Other forms of public outreach used by NIMI staff to increase public participation in the planning effort have included public meetings and public review of planning documents. Efforts to use these approaches to obtain greater feedback from local American Indian populations could be increased (see the discussion of recommendations below).

Another strategy of empowerment and promotion of participation that is often employed is institution-building or institution-strengthening. Most, if not all, local communities have formal or informal associations of people who have common interests and/or who cooperate on various tasks. These institutions can be used as the basis for promoting development at the community level (Chambers 1983; Cernea 1991; Durning 1992). In the case of Native Americans who reside in and near NIMI, the most appropriate institution to deal with in NIMI planning and development is the tribal governments of the Poncas, Yanktons, and Santees.

It has sometimes been said that local elites or extant authority structures often get in the way of participatory development. One way of getting around this problem is to consult local leaders, representatives of local institutions, and other people at all phases of project identification, formulation, planning, and implementation. Such a strategy ensures that both
communities and development organizations can obtain needed data and feedback.

The building of capacity for local decision-making can be done in a number of ways. It can be brought about through the holding of workshops or community discussion sessions in which ideas about democratic processes of public policy formation are addressed. It can be promoted through training of various kinds (e.g., in how to form committees, draw up constitutions, and run meetings). It can also be facilitated through problem-solving exercises, case studies, and role plays about situations in which communities find themselves. These kinds of strategies have been very effective in Central and South American rural communities, among women's groups in Africa, and among farmers' associations in Asia (Cernea 1991; Associates in Rural Development 1992). Considerable effort has been made in discussing the status of NIMI planning at public meetings and other public fora, though more advantage could be taken in the future of other forms of bolstering community involvement in NIMI decision-making, such as the formal workshops and training sessions mentioned above.

There are relatively few examples of truly participatory development and community empowerment programs and projects in which local people have been fully involved in processes of change. One reason for this situation is that often development projects have short life spans, whereas institutional development and community empowerment require long periods of time and a great deal of patience. Another reason is that often the development or conservation programs being advocated do not lay the groundwork necessary to ensure that the local people have a stake in the projects.

Another issue is that easily definable project outputs such as infrastructure construction or agricultural yield increases are given preference over less precisely quantifiable indicators such as institutional strength and resource management capacity. Finally, greater emphasis, funding, and technical support frequently are given to outside agencies (e.g., contractors, non-government organizations) than to community-based organizations (CBOs). If local communities are to be empowered and participatory development actually carried out, then there will have to be a significant change in the way that development agencies, donors, and voluntary organizations deal with local people and their concerns. In order to achieve Native American participatory development and planning for NIMI, it is critical that discussions with tribal governments, tribal representatives, and other local native Americans be viewed as open and frank, with no hidden agendas or predetermined decisions perceived by locals as being promoted by the National Park Service. Discussions should be kept low-key and on as much of a one-to-one basis as possible in order to gain the confidence of individuals and prevent them from feeling overwhelmed by the formality or size of the Service's presence.
It has become a truism that the success of many conservation and development projects is contingent on direct and indirect participation and support from local people who theoretically are often supposed to be beneficiaries. In some cases, implementing agencies take a "top-down" approach in which local people are not consulted before, during, or after the implementation of the project. In other cases, people may be asked whether they agree with project goals, but they do not have any say in the ways in which the project is implemented. The most effective development projects are those which incorporate local people in decision-making at every stage of the development process. Consultation alone, however, is insufficient. Local people must play a role in the identification of problems and constraints; they must assist in designing interventions to address those factors; and they must be part of the management of whatever programs or projects that are established. It is important for the success of NIMI planning efforts that local American Indian and non-Indian people perceive themselves as having the ability to influence the course of NIMI planning by participating in advisory and planning bodies and public meetings, and not merely being asked to approve of planning decisions already made by the National Park Service or promoted by other non-local organizations that may have an interest in NIMI.

NATIONAL PARKS AND RESERVES, LAND ISSUES, AND THE NIMI REGION

An important issue identified during the course of this investigation is that of the future status of the land in and adjacent to the NIMI region. We believe that the Poncas, Santees, and Yankton Sioux all feel that the federal government is required to consult with them about all actions on land, economic development, and natural resource conservation and exploitation issues that may affect the interest of the tribes. Because of the special relationship that exists between American Indian tribes and the U.S. government, they see themselves as more than simply another land holding group or set of stakeholders in the NIMI region.

The question of who controls the land has long been of tremendous concern to American Indian peoples in the northern Plains and throughout the United States (Olson and Wilson 1984; Sutton 1986; Olson 1990; McDonnell 1991; Wunder 1994). Because of the reality of historical precedent, Native Americans are generally concerned about the possibility of the federal government taking over tribal land. In the case of NIMI, a particular issue is whether the National Park Service has the right to take away tribal land for purposes of establishing a national park, an action which would be tantamount to abridgement of tribal sovereignty. On the basis of a solicitor's opinion on this question (see Chapter 30), it appears that the National Park Service as a federal agency can not declare tribal land as park land, which likely means that the Service must seek tribal concurrence before any changes could be made in land zoning and use.
The powers of tribal government are issues of significant concern to Native American communities not only in the northern Great Plains but in the United States as a whole (O'Brien 1989). Tribal control of land and the management of natural resources on Native American land are particularly crucial areas in the eyes of many tribal governments and members of Native American communities, including those in the NIMI area. The Santees Sioux acquired nearly 4,000 acres of land in Knox County, Nebraska and in 1992 along with the Winnebagos sought a $414,000 Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) loan to acquire additional land. One of the reasons for the Santees' wanting additional land is for grazing purposes since the Santees have a herd of several hundred cattle. Land acquisition is also a major objective of the Poncas, who have acquired some 160 acres since they were restored in 1990 and are actively purchasing additional land purchases.

The participatory development and community empowerment models that are most effective are those which not only promote the involvement of local people in decision-making but which also ensure that those people have control over their own resources and receive direct economic benefits. This kind of approach is advocated relatively frequently but rarely put into place in an effective way. As a consequence, many local communities remain dependent, at least to some extent, on external assistance in the form of funding or technical expertise. Few communities have complete control over all of their resources, in part because most states retain the rights to valuable assets such as minerals and timber or code over those rights to private companies in exchange for a portion of the profits.

Many of the environmental projects in and adjacent to national parks and reserves that have been initiated have been done relatively little in terms of providing employment and income-generating opportunities for local people (see Table 31-3). They typically do even less in the area of providing access to management-level positions in the projects and the agencies involved in implementing them. There are relatively few examples of projects in which management authority has been ceded over target areas by government agencies to non-government organizations or other kinds of agencies. As a result, there is concern among many people about the degree to which they will benefit from the establishment of a national park in the area where they live (Anderson and Grove 1987; West and Brechin 1991).

There would be a number of potential benefits to NIMI-area residents from having greater protection of resources and increased numbers of tourists in the area. Establishment of a national park in the region could have some obvious benefits, especially if the park was run in such a way that people continued to have access to resources and were able to play a significant role in park decision-making and management. The recently-enacted tribal Self-Governance Act (see Chapter 2) offers the potential for the U.S.
government and the Native American tribal governments in the NIMI area to establish co-management arrangements that would involve Poncas, Santees, and Yanktons as full-fledged participants in land and resource management activities in the NIMI region.

Tourism

New forms of culturally and environmentally sensitive ecotourism could have positive impacts on local economies and on the scenic river area, similar to the successful tourism activities of Southern Utes in southwestern Colorado and the Navajos in northeastern Arizona. Establishment of NIMI could result in greater emphasis on ecotourism or cultural tourism, but planning in this area should be carefully consulted with the three tribal governments so that they have a say about how that tourism is managed. The Yanktons are reaping economic benefits from their gaming casino and marina on the Fort Randall reservoir, but do not desire an increase in tourism on their reservation land that borders the Missouri River below Fort Randall Dam. While the Santees are seeking the cooperation of the State of Nebraska to establish a gaming casino on their reservation, which could potentially boost tourist visitation to the reservation, they do not promote tourism and do not wish tourist visitation to increase ta present. In general, they see little benefit to the tribe from increased tourism. Tourism promotion would probably generate additional employment for tribal members in low-income, service-sector jobs, but would not provide inducement for the tribe's youth to attain educational goals that would be of greater benefit to the tribe over the long term. Construction of the Niobrara-to-Springfield bridge over the Missouri--long planned but underfunded at present--would be an important factor in promoting tourism in the general NIMI region.

Tourism has been recommended as a strategy for sustainable development by numerous governments and international development agencies (Boo 1990, 1992; Smith and Eadington 1992). According to the World Tourism Organization (WTO), greater emphasis is being placed on "responsible tourism," recreational activities which pose little threat to the habitats or the societies that are visited. This kind of tourism is supposed to be designed in such a way that it actually enhances the quality of life for the hosts while providing educational benefits to the guests (Smith 1989).

Smith (1989:3) notes that tourism can be a significant factor in bringing about cultural change. This is particularly true of what Smith (1989:2) defines as "ethnic tourism," visits paid to traditional or indigenous populations. While tourism may provide income and employment opportunities for local people, it can also cause social difficulties.

Ethnic tourism pose a number of dilemmas for local people. On the one hand, they have the opportunity to get jobs and generate
some cash. On the other hand, tourists sometimes interfere with
local peoples' daily activities and can seriously disrupt local
lifestyles over the long term.

A frequent problem for many Native Americans and other
indigenous groups is that tourists are not always aware of
appropriate ways to behave. They take pictures of dances and
ceremonies when they are not supposed to, and they walk on sites
that local people consider sacred. Ethnic tourists often come in
to remote areas with preconceived notions of what to expect. Not
always finding what they hoped for, they occasionally resort to
bullying tactics.

If tourism is likely to increase in the NIMI region because of
the establishment of NIMI, the Native American tribal governments
and communities in the region should be carefully consulted so that
they can have extensive input into any planning and decision-making
about recreation and tourism on and near their lands. If tourism
development is to be initiated which may affect tribal jurisdiction
over tribal land or tribal members, there needs to be much more
intensive ethnographic field work done to document and map out the
various traditional and contemporary uses of land and resources on
reservation land, trust land, private land, and on the public
domain. Collective Ponca knowledge about places of traditional and
religious importance in the NIMI region is particularly subject to
change because of the fact that the Poncas were once displaced from
the region. With the recent symbolic reunification of the northern
and southern segments of the tribe, and increasing return to the
area by tribal members who are dispersed throughout the United
States, it is highly likely that individual tribal members will be
able to identify places of historical, traditional, and religious
importance. As many, if not most, of these will occur on non-
Indian-owned land (for the simple reason that there is so little
tribal land at present), they should be taken into consideration
for NIMI planning efforts as they become collective knowledge.

It must be kept in mind that there is a tremendous diversity
in opinions about tourism at the individual, group, and sectoral
level in the NIMI area. Some of the outfitters in Valentine are
anxious to see tourism expand. Others are more cautious, believing
that a rapid rise in tourism could have negative effects, including
greater pollution and overexploitation of riverine resources. The
Yanktons would like to see tourism increase for their Fort Randall
Casino and for their new marina and resort on the reservoir, but
they would prefer not to have tourism expand along the Missouri
River itself. One reason for this position is that many of the
culturally significant sites of the Yanktons (as well as the Poncas
and Santees) are close to the Missouri, and they would prefer that
these sites not be visited by outsiders or affected by the
construction of campgrounds, marinas, and other facilities. The
Santees would prefer not to have tourism development on or adjacent
to their reservation, although this situation is somewhat fluid
because of their efforts to develop a gaming casino on the reservation in the future.

The Poncas have expressed a desire to establish a cultural museum and perhaps a kind of living history exposition, and they, too, desire the protection of Ponca sites. Development and promotion of a Ponca heritage center would appear to offer the potential for a cooperative partnership between the tribe and the National Park Service. The Service possesses considerable expertise in planning interpretive facilities and exhibitory, and a cooperative precedent has already been established through a recent National Park Service tribal historic preservation grant to the tribe for the purpose of reroofing the Ponca Self-help Community Building near Niobrara.

The economic and environmental impacts of tourism have been considered in detail both by the Department of the Interior and other agencies and organizations involved in promoting conservation and development (McNeely and Miller 1984; U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service 1988; U.S. National Park Service and Colorado Historical Society 1989; Munasinghe and McNeely 1994). The federal government and other agencies are well aware of the dictum noted by Boo (1990:30) that "Tourism destroys tourism" and are deeply committed to coming up with management systems that both protect the resource base and enhance the social and economic well-being of people using park and buffer zone areas. Trying to meet the needs of visitors, local people, tribal interests, concessionaires, personnel working for government agencies, environmental groups, and other institutions and individuals is by no means easy, and the National Park Service is intent on coming up with equitable and beneficial policies and programs. One way to do this is to establish zoning, land management, and administrative systems that are both adaptable and highly responsive to public opinion.

Buffalo Ranching

Considerable research has been done in the past two decades on indigenous methods of natural resource management (Williams and Hunn 1979; Vescey 1982 and Venable 1980; McCay and Acheson 1987; Oldfield and Alcorn 1991 for 1992; Klee 1990; Durning 1992). As O'Brien (1989:221) notes, "conservation and environmental protection lies at the heart of Indian culture." Virtually all of the American Indian tribes in the northern Plains oversee their own natural resources, and most, if not all, have natural resource departments that administer fishing, hunting, and other types of resource use activities.

Game management, afforestation, and grazing management programs are being considered by the Santees and the Yanktons, and the Poncas are considering assessing the resources in the area over which they had control in the past (i.e., their former reservation
land). Many northern Plains tribes are in the process of setting standards and working out quotas for resource use. They are also considering carefully some of the lessons learned from other Native American communities about mineral resource use and management (for some of these lessons, see Ambler 1990).

One area of particular interest to many Plains Indian tribes is wildlife management, including the reintroduction of the buffalo (Bison bison). Buffalo, which once numbered in the millions throughout the vast Plains region of North America, have a special significance and deep importance to all of the American Indian tribes who once lived in the Plains, and particularly to those who still reside there. Buffalo have been the source of sustenance and spiritual power to Native Americans for thousands of years. Currently there are 140,000 buffalo in North America, up from as few as 3,000 at the turn of the century (Hodgson 1994). As was mentioned previously, buffalo were a crucial part of the economies and belief systems of northern Plains Indians (McHugh 1972; Foster, Harrison, and McLaren 1992; Simonelli 1993). According to Lakota informants, if you eat buffalo meat after having made the appropriate ritual sacrifices, you get a kind of spiritual power which heals the body and the spirit. Buffalo are also seen as a way of counteracting contemporary Native American dietary and health problems (Simonelli 1993; Hodgson 1994).

While the raising of buffalo is not an important economic consideration for the three NiMi residential tribes for reasons that are explained below, buffalo ranching could become important in the future as other tribal and intertribal bison-raising ventures succeed elsewhere.

The value of buffalo is wide-ranging. Buffalo can be raised in low rainfall areas with little water input. They also tend to have less of a negative effect on the range range than do domestic livestock. One reason for this is that generally they tend to be less tied to specific localities and thus have lower degrees of impact on the vegetation and the soils.

In addition to their increasing economic value as a commercially-harvested food, buffalo are also a major tourist attraction and potential income generator. Buffalo are favored tourist photographic objects at Custer State Park and Wind Cave National Park in the Black Hills of South Dakota and at the Fort Niobrara National Wildlife Refuge near Valentine in Nebraska. There are over 4,000 buffalo in Yellowstone National Park, in an area of 2.2 million acres. Many of the tourists who visit Yellowstone indicate that part of their reasoning for visiting the park was to see wildlife. Similar kinds of statements are often made by people visiting national parks and reserves in other parts of the world, as well (West and Brechin 1991; Munasinghe and McNeely 1994; Munasinghe and Cruz 1995).
It must be kept in mind that buffalo also have some disadvantages. First, there is the safety factor for people either working with or viewing buffalo. Buffalos can run over 30 miles an hour, and large bulls weigh over a ton. Since 1983, some 50 tourists have been gored, two of them fatally. They have been known to overeat if there is too much food around (e.g., if they are placed in an alfalfa field or have access to a bin of food). One problem for game ranchers is that in some areas the numbers of animals have exceeded local carrying capacity, requiring culling excess animals from the herd or selling them to private game ranchers. Buffalo are also a source of disease, including brucellosis which causes domestic livestock to abort spontaneously. It is the disease factor which is of concern to ranchers in the vicinity of parks and wildlife reserves. Another of the problems in game ranching is that rising costs will drive the smaller producers out of the market, something that is a concern for many of the family farmers in northern Nebraska and southern South Dakota. This could be particularly problematic for Native American game ranchers, who generally lack large capital assets and have had less experience in market-oriented game ranching than non-Indian game ranchers. This situation is changing quickly, so some of the Native American communities will be in a positive position to move into large-scale production and marketing systems.

Nevertheless, raising buffalo is an emerging industry on the Plains. Modern-day management techniques include the use of fencing, drugs, and the promotion of standardization of the animals. Ranchers tend to cull males, usually at about the age of three when they get somewhat unruly. Systematic culling in order to obtain desirable characteristics such as docility, horn-length, and build could potentially have effects on genetic diversity. Contemporary beef ranchers who raise buffalo tend to engage in practices which include feeding them on corn and other high-protein foods in order to increase their fat levels and to make them more palatable to the American public's taste. There has also been a tendency to use growth hormones, something which concerns some members of the public in terms of potential health risks.

The commercial game ranching strategy aims at placing the animals on fenced ranches. By concentrating the animals, a process is set in motion which results in increased environmental impacts. In small, fenced-in areas, there tends to be greater trampling and more intensive grazing, something which creates bare soils. Bare soils lead to increased surface albedo (reflectivity) which causes soil temperatures to rise. Higher soil temperatures can contribute to reduced local rainfall and set in motion a localized drought cycle which has negative effects on the vegetation and wildlife in the region. Another problem with bare soils is that they can attract prairie dogs. To counteract prairie dog infestation, people often set poison out, which goes into the food chain. The poison can affect animals who prey on prairie dogs, including coyotes, falcons, hawks, and eagles. Eagles, like the buffalo, are
crucial to many Native American religious beliefs. Poison also has had impacts on the well-being of the black-footed ferret, which is an endangered species under the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) of 1973.

Buffalo are being reintroduced to American Indian lands for cultural, economic, and nutritional purposes through the work of the Inter-Tribal Bison Co-operative (ITBC), an organization comprising 28 tribes at present. Fred DuBray, a Lakota who raises buffalo on the Cheyenne River reservation in South Dakota, was the founder of the ITBC, and Mark Heckert is currently the organization's Executive Director. The ITBC wants to maintain buffalo herds on open, unfenced lands, in a kind of "buffalo commons." The members of the cooperative also want to ensure that the animals are treated well. They do not wish to engage in animal breeding which potentially could cause genetic problems.

The ITBC members are fully aware of the fact that virtually all of the buffalo alive today are descended from 77 animals in five founding herds. A century ago, the Bronx Zoo and other zoos ensured that there was substantial interchange between herds. Bulls were acquired from different herds, thus increasing potential genetic variation. The ITBC is fully cognizant of its debt to zoos and wishes to maintain close working relations with them. They are familiar, for example, with the efforts of the Henry Doorly Zoo in Omaha to freeze embryos and to do genetic (DNA) work on various species. They appreciate the fact that tourism related to zoos helped maintain the variation in the buffalo population which, in turn, made it possible to reintroduce the animal to the Great Plains.

Besides the ITBC, there are a number of other associations involved with buffalo, including the National Buffalo Association and the American Bison Association (ABA). The ABA, established in 1975, was formed to promote the production, marketing, and preservation of bison. Today it has a membership of over 1,100, and is the largest association in the buffalo business. These organizations differ from the ITBC in several ways. First, their membership is primarily non-Indian. Second, their goals tend to be commercial, and most of their members employ intensive management techniques. The ITBC feels that buffalo, as much as possible, should be maintained in their natural state rather than in what they perceive to be an unnatural state of fenced ranches and high amounts of inputs. ITBC members believe that herds should be called randomly and that efforts should be made to keep aggressive animals and ones which are not necessarily physically appealing.

Native Americans have reaped social benefits from the raising of buffalo as well. There is an alcohol treatment program that employs buffalo-watching among the Kalispel, an eastern Washington tribe. People who have been arrested have been required by courts to be "buffalo watchers" for 30 days after their release from
treatment centers. People do this by living in tipis in buffalo areas. Other similar buffalo-related programs teach young women how to be mothers and care for the young. These kinds of programs also teach people how to get along with one another in the face of conflict (Simonelli 1993).

In recent years, the concept of a huge "buffalo commons" or gigantic preservation area has received much discussion (Popper and Popper 1987; Knack 1990; Matthews 1991; Mann and Plummer 1993). The idea of the Buffalo Commons is to make a huge common use area, an open-range region where there will be buffalo instead of cattle and rolling plains instead of towns. If implemented along the lines recommended by the major proponents of the idea, Frank and Deborah Popper, the Buffalo Commons would be the world's largest natural and historic preservation effort, covering some 139,000 square miles (Popper and Popper 1987; Matthews 1991). Frank Popper has noted that the Buffalo Commons idea is part proposal, part metaphor, for a long-term series of land use changes and an appeal for rethinking Great Plains possibilities.

Not surprisingly, the reaction to the Buffalo Commons concept has not been very positive among residents of the Great Plains, many of whom have reacted strongly to the notion that people should be resettled out of the Plains so that it can be turned into a national park or rangeland (Matthews 1991). There was strong disagreement locally with the notion that people on the Plains were using their resources in unsustainable ways and were thus inadvertently destroying the land. The Buffalo Commons concept was opposed by Chambers of Commerce, Midwestern Governors, and by many business people. On the other hand, some Native American groups, tourism agencies, and environmental organizations have been supportive of the idea (Matthews 1991).

Frank Popper argued in a Lincoln address in 1993 that The Buffalo Commons amounts to an opportunity for Indians, through a freak of history, to be on the right side, the favorable side of national economics, in a way that truly has never happened in the history of Indian-white relations in the U.S.

It is clear that there are both proponents and opponents of the Buffalo Commons on the Great Plains. Property rights proponents argue that the ultimate result of the Buffalo Commons would be economic devastation and famine. Members of some of the tribes on the Plains believe that they already had suffered the consequences of resettlement as a result of the establishment of reservations and the dispossession that occurred over time on the Plains. Several writers have pointed to research that illuminates the negative impacts of resettlement, whether the causes of that resettlement are large infrastructure projects, establishment of
At present, the Yanktons and Santees) have little capability of re-establishing sizeable herds of buffalo on rangeland within their reservations, although they continue to hold buffalo in high regard, as do other Plains Indian tribes. They simply lack sufficient tribal land for this purpose, and the present "checkerboard" pattern of tribal, Indian, and non-Indian land ownership within their reservations do not readily permit the creation of buffalo rangeland. The Poncas do not have any reservation, and presently hold very little tribally-owned land (160 acres). However, some of the Plains tribes in North and South Dakota that do possess sufficient landbase for buffalo rangeland are actively pursuing the re-establishment of buffalo herds on their reservations, and cooperation among them has resulted in the formation of the Inter-Tribal Bison Cooperative. As their efforts continue to grow, and as the Poncas, Yanktons, and Santees continue to pursue their goal of acquiring more land, it is possible that the three NIMI-resident tribes may in the future become involved in substantial bison management programs in the NIMI region or elsewhere.

INTEGRATED CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

A number of government agencies, tribes, and NGOs, with the support of government environmental agencies, are engaged in promoting projects that increase local incomes and raise standards of living while also carrying out biodiversity conservation. The World Wildlife Fund (WWF), The Nature Conservancy, and other environmental organizations are involved in projects that are aimed at coming up with a balance between conservation and development. These projects, which are termed integrated conservation and development projects (ICDPs) or community-based natural resource management projects (CBNRMPs), are found in a wide variety of ecological zones, from tropical forests to savannas and from mountain habitats to coastal marine regions (Kiss 1990; Wells and Brandon 1992; Brown and Wyckoff-Paird 992).

Various community-based natural resource management projects are found in a variety of areas, some of them protected as national parks and equivalent reserves and others which are zoned as communal or private land (Machlins et al., 1992; see references below). They are engaged in various kinds of activities that can be carried out in the different types of protected areas, depending on the kind of designation that the region has. Examples of various types of protected areas are presented in Table 31-4.
can be seen that there are a variety of types of these areas. Some of them have full protection which limits the kinds of developments that can occur there; this is the case for national parks, for example, and in the United States it is also the case for wilderness areas that are designated under the Wilderness Act of 1964 (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service 1993 [---NIRC]). There is a fair degree of uncertainty among local people about the implications of the various kinds of federal designations for protected land in the region. Judging from the diversity of opinions concerning the establishment of a national park in the NIMI area, it is clear that many people would oppose such a strategy if it limits their options in terms of land use or if it meant that they would lose land and resource access.

In sum, the Santees, Poncas, and Yanktons share a concern that establishment of NIMI will pose a threat to their tribal or Native American-owned land base, as well as to their tribal sovereignty. They fear that the National Park Service will take land away from them, and/or thwart their land acquisition plans for the future, and infringe on areas they perceive as their jurisdiction. They are also concerned about the potential impacts of park establishment outside the boundaries of their land, such as the Santees' concern about possible NIMI boundaries within a half mile of their reservation boundary (see Chapter 30).

Some of the integrated conservation and development projects that have been implemented in various parts of the world are in protected areas, while others are located on the peripheries of these places in what are sometimes referred to as buffer zones. Buffer zone community projects have had a certain amount of success in a number of regions, including Africa, South America, and southeast Asia. Several projects are being implemented in specially designated reserve areas (e.g., extractive reserves) that allow for multiple uses such as hunting, collection of medicinal plants, firewood, and building materials, small-scale cultivation of domestic crops, and ecotourism. These projects generally are aimed at enhancing living standards of local peoples and conservation of natural resources (Brown and Wyckoff-Baird 1992; Associates for [---in---] see references cited] Rural Development 1992).

The Management Policies of the National Park Service require that the natural, cultural, and/or recreational resources in an area be "nationally significant" in order for an area to be protected (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service 1988; U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Denver Service Center 1995:6). The Park Service has outlined in detail the significance of the various resources in the Niobrara-Missouri Scenic Riverways region (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Denver Service Center 1995).
This report has concentrated primarily on the ethnographic resources, with particular emphasis on the diversity of indigenous populations that utilized the region over time.

The archeological and cultural remains in the NIMI region are diverse, indicating long-term utilization for a number of different purposes, including hunting, gathering, stone material procurement, and residence (Ludwickson et al. 1981; Hartley 1983; Osborn and Vawser n.d.). Some of these sites are potentially rich in terms of the information that they can provide and merit protection. Virtually all of the American Indian communities in and adjacent to the region would like to see that the archeological sites are managed carefully, and that any decisions about research on those sites be cleared with them first. They also do not want to see sites that they consider sacred or spiritually significant harmed either by tourists or development.

Given the various findings about the use of the NIMI region and the various ideas about what its potential future could be based on interviews, discussions, and consultations, some recommendations relevant to future planning are offered, as follows:

Recommendation 1. The NIMI advisory commission presently has only one seat for the Santee and none for the Yanktons or the Poncas, even though the Poncas were federally restored at the time of the passage of the 1991 Niobrara Scenic River Act. The commission and the planning teams should be expanded to include representation from all three NIMI residential tribes and expanded efforts should be made to ensure that Native American views are sought from these representatives. Formal contacts with all three tribal governments should also be increased (see recommendation 2 below), and the tribal representatives on the commission/teams should be able to facilitate contacts with tribal governments.

Recommendation 2. The Poncas, Santees, and Yankton Sioux should be consulted carefully prior to the initiation of revisions of land zoning, expansion of infrastructure, changes in economic development activities in the NIMI project area, and generally in all NIMI-related matters that have the potential to affect tribal interests. NIMI staff should meet frequently and regularly with the tribal governments of the Poncas, Yanktons, and Santees in order to brief them on NIMI matters, and to solicit tribal cooperation and feedback when needed. Tribal elections are held every one or two years and often result in high turnover of tribal council members (see Chapter 30), so consultation with tribal governments is a continuing necessity in order to inform newly-constituted tribal councils about the status of NIMI and to solicit their adherence to cooperative commitments that may have been made by previous councils. National Park Service officials should, however, be careful not to become involved in tribal
political affairs or appear to align with particular intratribal factions. The long-range objectives of this are to a) establish a clear government-to-government relationship with the tribes, as required by Secretarial and Presidential directives; b) expand both formal and informal contacts with tribes; and c) establish tribal confidence in the National Park Service.

Recommendation 3. Expand the number of public meetings on American Indian reservations and in areas where Native Americans reside (e.g. Niobrara, Yankton). This will increase the effort to ensure that Native American people are informed of NIMI matters, and will permit them the opportunity to provide feedback. Meetings on reservations should be held only with tribal council permission. In addition to arranging for meeting to be held by the National Park Service, it may be possible for the Service to request time on the agenda of community meetings which all three tribal councils sponsor from time to time, as well as at the Yankton general council meetings (see Chapter 30).

Recommendation 4. Continuing efforts should be made by the NIMI staff to monitor and keep abreast of the latest developments in tribal affairs, both of the three NIMI residential tribes and of Native American affairs elsewhere that may bear on NIMI. Systematic perusal of the Plains edition of Indian Country Today would be very useful, as would subscriptions to newspapers published by tribal communities, receipt of tribal newsletters, attendance as observers at tribal council and other meetings.

Recommendation 5. Develop targeted strategies to recruit, hire, and retain Native Americans as employees of the National Park Service and add them to the NIMI staff. Once in place, these individuals should receive equal opportunities to advance within the Park Service. As NIMI develops and staffing needs increase, upward mobility positions could be established and filled as much as possible by applicants from the Ponca, Yankton, and Santee tribes.

Recommendation 6. Continue to pursue on-going opportunities for NIMI staff to participate in cross-cultural experiences and training. Special emphasis should be placed on training in Native American world views and concepts regarding land use and stewardship. This training should have a clear direction and purpose and the curricula should have learning objectives that are reviewed periodically. Classes should be taught in community centers and not at government offices. Incentives could be offered to Park Service employees who develop multicultural skills that are of use in furthering communication with Native Americans.

Recommendation 7. Explore ways whereby tribal governments as well as non-Indian communities can have some say about the actions of tourists in the buffer zones around their lands. This
would likely involve the Service to some degree as a mediator and facilitator of communication between tribal governments and their non-Indian neighbors in the NIMI region.

Recommendation 8. Using appropriate Native American languages, develop bilingual videotapes on the Niobrara/Missouri Scenic Riverways such as those created for use in the Shoshone community in Wyoming. With tribal government permission, these could be circulated for viewing at reservation communities and at the Ponca Tribal Self-help Community Building. English appears to be the primary language used by the Santees and Poncas, but many of the Yanktons continue to speak the Nakota dialect. While a videotape of this type would be most useful at present only for the Yanktons, Native Americans in general have shown great interest recently in perpetuating and expanding the use of their native languages. For example, Lakota was recently declared to be the official language on the Standing Rock reservation, and many tribes are seeking to include native languages in school curricula. Consequently, the Ponca and Santee languages may come into greater use in the future.

Recommendation 9. Additional efforts should be made to facilitate the protection of sacred sites in the region. Close consultation should be done with the Santees, Poncas, and Yanktons prior to making any decisions about nominating sites for the National Register of Historic Places or for tourism or other development purposes. Tribal concurrence and cooperation for such nominations should be sought, especially for properties which are tribally-owned or owned by tribal members. The information presented in Chapter 28 is based on available written sources, which often reflect incomplete or inaccurate information. With tribal government permission, ethnographic field work should be undertaken to identify and document sacred sites and other places of traditional importance to the Poncas, Yanktons, and Santees; this should be done after NIMI boundaries are defined, in order to provide a clear geographic focus for this work and to minimize the cost.

Recommendation 10. Special workshops should be held with National Park Service personnel and Native Americans from the NIMI residential tribes to explore the ramifications of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (Public Law 101-601) and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act. Consideration should be given to the sentiments of Native Americans concerning the ways in which they would like to see sacred sites and religious freedom issues handled. The workshops thus should be highly participatory and should incorporate group discussions, problem-solving exercises, and feedback systems. An objective of these workshops could be the forging of memoranda of agreement between the tribes (individually or collectively) and the Service to spell out the procedures to be followed in the event of inadvertent discoveries of human remains on NIMI land in
the future.
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National Research Council
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O'Brien, Sharon

Oldfield, Margery L., and Janis B. Alcorn (editors)

Olson, James L., and Raymond Wilson (editors)

Olson, Paul (editor)

Ortiz, Roxanne Dunbar
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Publisher/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1507</td>
<td>The Great Plains: From Dust to Dust. Planning 53(12):12-18</td>
<td>Prucha, Francis Paul (editor)</td>
<td>University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510</td>
<td>Documents of Federal Indian Policy. Second Edition.</td>
<td>Simonelli, Richard</td>
<td>University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1514</td>
<td>Education and Opportunity 8(4):16-23</td>
<td>Smith, John S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>Historical Background: The Norden Reservoir Area, Nebraska.</td>
<td>Smith, Valene L.</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>Report 82-07. University of Nebraska, Department of Anthropology, Division of Archeological Research, Lincoln, Nebraska.</td>
<td>Smith, Valene L., and William R. Eadington (editors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td>U.S. National Park Service and Colorado Historical Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Denver
Service Center


Vawser, Anne M., and Alan J. Osborn

Vecsey [or Vescey?], Christopher, and Robert W. Venables

Wells, Michael, and Katrina Brandon, with Lee Hannah

West, Patrick C., and Steven P. Brechin (editors)

Wilkins, Beth M., and Beth R. Ritter

Williams, Nancy M., and Eugene S. Hunn (editors)

Wilson, Edward O.

Wishart, David J.


1586 World Conservation Monitoring Center (WCMC)

1590 World Resources Institute, World Conservation Union, and United Nations Environment Program

1597 World Wildlife Fund

1600 Wunder, John R.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bend Dam</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Lower Brule Sioux affected, with 14,609 acres flooded (15% of the tribe’s land base) and 62 families displaced; Crow Creek Sioux lost 6,417 acres, 27 families relocated and one fourth of tribe’s remaining farms inundated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Randall Dam</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Flooded 22,091 acres of Yankton and Crow Creek Sioux land, dislocated 136 Indian families, loss of bottomland and forest areas, movement of BIA headquarters, communities and social service facilities moved, reduction of grazing land for people and the Tribal Livestock Enterprise of the Lower Brule Sioux; Yankton Sioux lost 3,349 acres, 19 families relocated, 1,231 acres of Rosebud Sioux land inundated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavins Point Dam</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Inundated portion of Santee Sioux land in Nebraska; loss of foraging and grazing resources, agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oahe Dam</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Destroyed more Indian land than any other public works project in the U.S., Standing Rock and Cheyenne River Sioux lost 160,689 acres, including rangeland, agricultural land, timber resources, wild plant resources, wildlife habitats, movement of communities and social service facilities, 180 Cheyenne River Sioux families were resettled, as were 170 Standing Rock Sioux</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Water-Related Development Projects That Have Had Negative Impacts on Indigenous Peoples
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garrison Dam</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>dispossession, livelihood loss, reduced environmental quality, cultural disruption of the Three Affiliated Tribes (Mandan, Arikara, Hidatsa) of the Fort Berthold Reserve, loss of 152,630 acres, a quarter of the land base, 325 families relocated, 94% of agricultural land lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Peck Dam</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>reduction of resource access and loss of land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowtail Dam</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Crows lost 6,846 acres of land and had to fight in court for compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted Rock Dam</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Papago land lost and village flooded, families dislocated, compensation provided late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narmada Valley Dams Project</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>dispossession, impoverishment, beatings, and intimidation of residents, loss of agricultural land, lack of appropriate resettlement and compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico Dams</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>forced relocation, non-payment of compensation, oppression of local people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manantali Dam</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>dispossession, provision of land to outsiders resulting in warfare and conflict, malaria increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grande Ca ajas Project and Turari Dam</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>dispossession, loss of natural resources, expansion of land conflict and competition, local people impoverished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bay Hydroelectric Project</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Cree and Inuit forced off land and loss of caribou and other wild animals, fish resources, mercury release due to land inundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kariba Dam</td>
<td>Zimbabwe and Zambia</td>
<td>flooding of lands, 50,000 Tonga dispossessed, social and economic disruptions, health problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayano Dam</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>80% of Kuna Indians land flooded, loss of livelihood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batang Ai Dam</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Iban uprooted, deforestation and loss of wildlife resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aswan High Dam</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>increased bilharzia, loss of agricultural land, siltation, erosion, and salinization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahaweli Dams</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>30,000 Sri Lankans relocated, loss of land, livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volta</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>bilharzia, river blindness increased, 70,000 people lost resources, dispossessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kainji Dam</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>dispossession, fishing effects and loss of agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batang Ai Dam</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Iban uprooted, reduced access to resources, impoverishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantaro Dam</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>water quality problems, loss of agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guavio Project</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>low compensation payments to local people, outmigration of people prior to project; land taken, worsened socioeconomic situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B  Organizations Involved in Sustainable Development, Conservation, and Legal Issues Relevant to Groups in and Adjacent to the NIMI Area

Bureau of Indian Affairs
Branch of Acknowledgement and Research
1849 C Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20240
(202) 208-3592
((202) 219-3008 (fax)

Center for Holistic Resource Management
P.O. Box 7128
Albuquerque, NM 87194
(505) 242-9272

Center for Rural Affairs
(Rural Enterprise Assistance Project, REAP)
P.O. Box 406
Walthill, NE 68067-0406
(402) 846-5428
(402) 846-5420 (fax)

First Nations Development Institute
The Stores Building
11917 Main Street
Fredericksburg, VA 22408
(703) 371-5615
(703) 371-3505 (fax)

International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN)
Avenue du Mont-Blanc CH-1196
Gland, Switzerland
phone: (022) 611-71-81

The Land Institute
2440 E. Water Well Road
Salina, KS 67401
(913) 823-5376
(913) 823-8728

Land Stewardship Project
3724 12th Ave. South
Minneapolis, MN 55407-2705
(612) 823-5221

Minwest Archaeological Center
National Park Service
160 Centennial Mall North
Room 474
Lincoln, NE 68508
(402) 437-5392
Mni Sose Intertribal Water Rights Coalition, Inc.
P.O. Box 226
516 Mt. Rushmore Rd.
Rapid City, SD 57709
(605) 343-6054
(605) 343-4722 (fax)

National Audubon Society
950 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 546-9100

National Park Service
Niobrara/Missouri National Scenic Riverways
P.O. Box 591
O’Neill, NE 68773-0591
(402) 334-3976
(402) 325-3981

Native American Rights Fund (NARF)
1506 Broadway
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 447-8760

The Nature Conservancy
1815 North Lynn St.
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 841-4860

Rights and Resources, Inc.
2253 North Upton Street
Arlington, VA 22207
(703) 524-0092

The Rodale Institute
611 Siegfriedale Road
Kutztown, PA 19530
(215) 683-6383
(215) 683-8548 (fax)

Rosebud Reservation Enterprise Center
(Loans available to small businesses)
P.O. Box 205
Mission, SD 57555
(619) 856-2955

Selfhelp Crafts of the World
704 Main Street
P.O. Box 500
Akron, PA 17501-0500
(717) 859-4971 (phone)
(717) 859-2622 (fax)
Seventh Generation Fund
P.O. Box 2550
McKinleyville, CA 95521
(707) 839-1178
(707) 839-5223 (fax)

Sierra Club
530 Bush Street
San Francisco, CA 94108
(415) 981-8634

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
401 M Street, SW
Washington, DC 20640
(202) 382-2090

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Department of the Interior
Washington D.C. 20240
(202) 343-7445

World Conservation Monitoring Center
239c Huntington Road
Cambridge (C 01)
England

World Resources Institute (WRI)
1709 New York Ave. NW, Suite 700
Washington DC 20006
(202) 638-6300

Worldwatch Institute
1776 Massachusetts NW.
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 452-1999

World Wildlife Fund (WWF)
1350 Twenty-fourth St. NW
Washington DC 20037
(202) 778-9630
Table 1. National Parks and Indigenous Peoples, with Projects and Activities Aimed at Assisting Them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amboseli National Park</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>some of the benefits from use of the area by tourists go to Maasai, some of whom have title to land nearby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapurna Conservation Area</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Nepali farmers benefit from hunting, forest product collection, use of visitor fees for local development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chobe National Park</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>a community-based natural resource management project involving buffer zone villages, including tourism, fishponds, and crafts marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everglades National Park</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>heavy visitation to the park has economic implications for buffer zone populations, who fish and use other natural resources in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Florida)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exmoor National Park</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>populations reside in the park and commercial agriculture and moorland draining is done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates of the Arctic National Park</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Inuit groups in native corporation adjacent to the park benefit from tourism, Inuit participate in park management discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Alaska)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gir National Park</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Maldhari pastoralists in the wildlife graze stock and use forest resources in the adjacent wildlife sanctuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kafue National Park</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>local fishermen in the Kafue area are involved in training and marketing of fish, crafts, and wild plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khao Yai National Park</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>the Sup Tai Rural Development for Conservation Project is aimed at promoting conservation through education, agroforestry, tourism, loans, and agricultural extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maasai Mara National Park</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>use of national park by pastoralists for grazing, tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA)</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>use of region's grazing resources by Maasai permitted, benefits provided from tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------Adam J.  
| Parc National France des Cevennes | France          | French farmers reside in and use the park which protects cultural as well as natural resources.                                                                                                                                       |
| Richtersveld National Park | South Africa   | Nama groups allowed access to the park for grazing, get revenues from tourism, park receipts, employment.                                                                                                                                    |
| Rwenzoris National Park | Uganda          | Bakonjo and Batoro communities excluded from the park are provided with technical assistance in the development of alternative resource use and sustainable agriculture.                                 |
| Uluru National Park     | Australia       | Park is co-managed by Aboriginals and Australia National Parks and Wildlife Service; Aboriginals utilize resources in the area; receive tourism benefits, and jointly control tourist activities. |
| Volcanoes National Park | Rwanda          | Tourism related to gorillas in the mountains; local people work as guides and guards and get a portion of the economic benefits, craft sales.                                                                                                   |
| Wood Buffalo National Park | Canada       | Local Indians can hunt and trap in the park and are involved in joint management through a wildlife advisory board; they also have rights of first refusal over park economic activities.                                      |

Table 1: Types of Protected Areas

I. Scientific reserve/strict nature reserve. To protect nature and maintain natural processes in an undisturbed state in order to have ecologically representative examples of the natural environment available for scientific study, environmental monitoring, and education, and for the maintenance of genetic resources in a dynamic and evolutionary state.

II. National Park. To protect outstanding natural and scenic areas of national or international significance for scientific, educational, and recreational use. These areas are relatively large natural areas not materially altered by human activity, and where commercial extractive uses are not permitted.

III. Natural monument/natural landmark. To protect and preserve nationally significant natural features because of their special interest or unique characteristics. These are relatively small areas focused on protection of specific features.

IV. Managed nature reserve/wildlife sanctuary. To ensure the natural conditions necessary to protect nationally significant species, groups of species, biotic communities, or physical features of the environment when these require specific human manipulation for their perpetuation. Controlled harvesting of some resources may be permitted.

V. Protected landscape. To maintain national significant landscapes characteristic of the harmonious interaction of resident people and land while providing opportunities for public enjoyment through recreation and tourism within the normal life-style and economic activity of these areas.

VI. Resource reserve. To protect the natural resources of the area for future designation and present or contain development activities that could affect the resource pending the establishment of objectives based upon appropriate knowledge and planning.

VII. Natural biotic area/anthropological reserve. To foster the way of life of societies living in harmony with the environment to continue little disturbed by modern technology, resource extraction by indigenous people is conducted in a traditional manner.

VIII. Multiple-use management area/managed reserve area. To provide for the sustained production of water, timber, wildlife, pasture, and outdoor recreation, with the conservation of nature primarily oriented to the support...
of the economic activities (although specific zones can also be designated within these areas to achieve specific conservation objectives.)

IX. Wild and Scenic River. To protect selected rivers which with their immediate environments, possess outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural, or other similar values in free-flowing condition for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations, to protect water quality of such rivers, and to fulfill other vital national conservation purposes.

APPENDIX I.

Tribal constitutions for the Poncas, Yanktons, Santees, and the Ponca Restoration Act

Constitution of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska, approved April 3, 1936

Constitution of the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska, submitted August 12, 1993 (ratified 1994)

Public Law 101-484

Amended Constitution and By-Laws of the Yankton Sioux Tribal Business and Claims Committee, South Dakota, approved April 24, 1963

Constitution of the Santee Sioux Tribe of the Sioux Nation of the State of Nebraska, approved April 3, 1936
APPENDIX II.

Treaties, Executive Orders, etc.

Treaty with the Sioux; Sept. 23, 1805 (ratified April 16, 1808) (Santees)

Treaty with the Sioux of River St. Peter's (7 Stat. 127); July 19, 1815 (Santees)

Treaty with the Sioux of the Lakes (7 Stat. 126); July 19, 1815 (Santees)

Treaty with the Yankton Sioux (7 Stat. 128); July 19, 1815 (Yanktons)

Treaty with the Sioux (7 Stat 143); June 1, 1816 (Santees)

Treaty with the Ponca (7 Stat. 155); June 25, 1817 (Poncas)

Treaty with the Ponca (7 Stat. 247); June 9, 1825 (Poncas)

Treaty with the Teton, etc., Sioux (7 Stat. 250); June 22, 1825 (Yanktons)

Treaty with the Sioux, etc. (7 Stat. 272); August 19, 1825 (Santees)

Treaty with the Sauk and Foxes, etc. (7 Stat. 325); July 19, 1830 (Treaty of Prairie de Chien) (Santees, Yanktons)

Treaty with Oto, etc. (7 Stat. 524); October 15, 1836 (Santees, Yanktons)

Treaty with the Sioux (7 Stat. 527); November 30, 1836 (Santees)

Treaty with the Sioux (7 Stat. 538); September 29, 1837 (Santees)

Treaty with Yankton Sioux (7 Stat. 542); Oct. 21, 1837 (Yanktons)

Treaty with the Sioux--Mdewakanton and Wahpakoota Bands (10 Stat. 954); August 5, 1851 (Mendota Treaty) (Santees)

Treaty with the Ponca (12 Stat. 997); March 12, 1858 (Poncas)

Treaty with Yancton Sioux (11 Stat. 743); April 19, 1858 (Yanktons)

Treaty with the Sioux (12 Stat. 1031); June 19, 1858 (Santees)
Senate Resolution regarding the right and title of certain bands of Sioux Indians (12 Stat. 1042); June 27, 1860 (Santees)

Treaty with the Ponca (14 Stat. 675); March 10, 1865 (Poncas)

Treaty with the Sioux Nation... (15 Stat. 635); April 29, 1868 (Ft. Laramie Treaty) (Santees, Yanktons)

Agreements and Acts to Diminish the Great Sioux Reservation:

Agreement between the United States and the Sioux for the Relinquishment of Hunting Rights in Nebraska, June 23, 1875 (Poncas)

Agreement with the Sioux of Various Tribes, 1882-1883 (Yanktons)

An Act to Divide the Great Sioux Reservation, 1889 (Poncas, Santees)

Articles of Agreement with the Yankton Sioux, 1892 (ratified 1894) (Yanktons)

Executive Orders establishing the Santee reservation in Nebraska (February 27, 1866; July 20, 1866; November 16, 1867; August 31, 1869; December 31, 1873)