



H-Environment

H-Environment Roundtable Reviews

Volume 10, No. 7 (2020)
<https://networks.h-net.org/h-environment>

Publication date: June 25, 2020
Roundtable Review Editor:
Melanie A. Kiechle

Christine M. DeLucia, *Memory Lands: King Philip's War and the Place of Violence in the Northeast*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018. ISBN: 978-0300201178.

Contents

Introduction by Melanie A. Kiechle, Virginia Tech	2
Comments by Joseph Hall, Bates College	4
Comments by Ashley Elizabeth Smith, Hampshire College and Amherst College	8
Comments by Maeve Kane, University at Albany-State University of New York	13
Comments by Thomas Wickman, Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut	19
Response by Christine DeLucia, Williams College	25
About the Contributors	34

Copyright © 2020 H-Net: Humanities and Social Sciences Online

H-Net permits the redistribution and reprinting of this work for nonprofit, educational purposes, with full and accurate attribution to the author, web location, date of publication, H-Environment, and H-Net: Humanities & Social Sciences Online.

Introduction by Melanie A. Kiechle, Virginia Tech

A good book starts a conversation, while a great book will start many. As you will read, **Christine M. DeLucia's *Memory Lands: King Philip's War and the Place of Violence in the Northeast*** is in the latter category. As the respondents in this roundtable engage DeLucia's work, they branch off into many exciting conversations. In part, this is because *Memory Lands* sets up so many directions for further exploration. By taking a place-based approach to the past, DeLucia eschews historians' dedication to chronology in order to explore how deeply the past and present are entwined. Similarly entwined are Native American and Indigenous Studies (NAIS) with environmental history. DeLucia's work is a welcome reminder of this key intersection and how it can animate histories of the Americas from the colonial period through the present day.

As DeLucia explains, historians have two scalar challenges: time and space. When we focus on a place, events are not discrete moments on a timeline but rather reverberate across generations and centuries. Such reverberations are especially important to understanding the violence of King Philip's War, which DeLucia encourages all to situate within "the *longue durée* evolutions of Indigenous geographies" (xvi). Of course, thinking with and about geographies challenges a local approach—King Philip's War did not occur in one or a few spaces, but radiated across the worlds of both Algonquian peoples and English colonists. Readers familiar with older accounts of this central event in New England's colonization may be surprised to read about Caribbean islands as well as Rhode Island, but DeLucia challenges us to see and understand how King Philip's War links these places.

The four respondents, all scholars in NAIS, have risen to DeLucia's challenges, and added some of their own, both for DeLucia and for the entire field of environmental history. All are deeply grounded both in this history, and how it animates the present. Writing from western Maine, **Joseph Hall** probes DeLucia's exploration of ecological violence to encourage all environmental historians "to recognize the ways that the ecologies that they study are often ecologies of violence." A fuller accounting of environmental history, Hall argues, would include diverse approaches to and ways of living within the places we study, and the places where we work—an insight that applies to universities' ongoing efforts at land acknowledgements.

Ashley Elizabeth Smith finds *Memory Lands* "a breath of fresh air" for the ways in which the text engages with the places of New England, where Smith also lives, teaches, and researches. Smith embraces DeLucia's focus on place as appropriate for writing and researching history. Smith encourages others to build from DeLucia's methods, especially those that move beyond written archives to incorporate the land itself and the people and objects that inhabit it—even if this method might trigger critiques of "presentism," a critique that Smith both rejects and warns us to be wary of as boundary policing rather than scholarly engagement.

From New York's Hudson Valley, **Maeve Kane** considers a different element of violence and erasure by asking about the presence or absence of gender and women's roles. Because of the central role that Algonquian and other Indigenous women have held as "leaders, knowledge keepers, and rightful owners," their absence from so many histories and archives is a stunning erasure that Kane pushes all scholars to recognize and address.

Finally, **Thomas Wickman** weighs in from Connecticut with a range of thoughtful questions. Wickman reflects on teaching the DeLucia's book in close proximity to some of the places about which DeLucia writes—places that his students had not considered or understood as historical before this moment. Such teaching and learning, Wickman notes, is eye-opening and helps achieve our highest educational goals by prompting deep reflection and engagement with landscapes and history. Given his experiences, Wickman reminds us that "The power to assign books in college courses should not be underestimated," and suggests numerous places and ways in which DeLucia's book can be productive for scholarship and learning. The question is if teachers are willing to "imagine a paradigm shift in which indigeneity is a leading topic." Wickman warns that this is not only a stumbling block for other fields, but especially in environmental history's current engagement, or lack thereof, with NAIS scholars, scholarship, and methods.

DeLucia's response warmly greets all these questions and pushes the conversations forward not only with her own thoughts, but also by incorporating the words and work of Indigenous people. As she addresses ecological violence, methodology, the role of women and gender, and campus politics of place-based decolonization, DeLucia identifies important and troubling continuities that challenge history's focus on change over time. She also joins her interlocutors in offering a deeply thoughtful primer to the latest work and debates in NAIS, and their relevance not only to environmental history but also to our lives: working on college campuses, grappling with climate change, and striving for a more just society. Finally, DeLucia introduces us to an exciting new concept; "terrapolitics," by which she uses country or place to refer to whole ecologies, is her answer to biopolitics' privileging of human populations and their reproduction over the world in which humans live.

In writing this introduction, I have noted the geographic place from which each scholar writes, to emphasize that the roundtable is very much from and about New England. This conversation underlines one of Wickman's questions about where local or regional studies fit and to whom they speak in our wider field of environmental history. It is a striking question that resonates, especially in contrast to the global concerns of climate change. I hope it will resonate with you as well, as you read this roundtable, consider your own scholarship within the field, and ponder our field as a whole. Before turning to the first set of comments, let me thank all of the roundtable participants for sharing their time and insights. In addition, I would like to remind readers that as an open-access forum, *H-Environment Roundtable Reviews* is available to scholars and non-scholars alike, around the world, free of charge. Please circulate.

Comments by Joseph Hall, Bates College

Christine Delucia has offered us a magnificent new perspective on memories of King Philip's War and the lands where those memories reside. The conflict devastated the region in 1675-1678, but its echoes still resound from stories told about swamps to signs placed on shopping malls. Delucia has traced these echoes through local archives, conversations with the region's historians, as well as visits to hundreds of sites on and off the beaten path. Because English colonists enslaved many of their Native enemies and allies, Delucia also follows lines of the Atlantic slave trade to places like Bermuda, where descendants of these captives still remember stolen homes, families, and independence. In the process of recovering so many memories, she adds her efforts to those of other New Englanders who seek "spots of critical reflection, ethical reckoning, political resistance, regathering, recovery, regeneration." (p. 23)

For Delucia, those who identify with various of the war's combatants, whether popular, or elite or scholarly, Indigenous or colonial, all participate in the debates over the meanings of the conflict. Sometimes the records are abundant, such as the late-nineteenth-century efforts by the Rhode Island Historical Society to memorialize the Great Swamp Fight, a massacre of Narragansetts in December 1675. Other times, as in her efforts to understand Narragansett efforts to remember this same community catastrophe, Delucia must piece together glimpses from community memory as well as the occasional but often forceful public statements that Narragansetts made at white historians' commemorative events. Through these stories, Delucia illustrates how a war now three centuries old is not a relic of the past. She further shows how the "remembrance of historical violence *takes place*: understandings of contested pasts take shape in relation to particular landscapes, material features of the world, and politically defined territories" (p. 2, emphasis in the original).

Delucia is a perceptive reader of this landscape. In addition to the historical markers and monuments that provide literal text to interpret, she explains how sewage treatment plants, waterfalls, commemorative canoe processions, and a variety of artifacts and stories all show how the land carries traces of English colonial efforts to erase Native peoples. Equally important, this land simultaneously carries legacies of Native peoples' immense suffering as well as spaces that they have claimed for their renewal.

For instance, Delucia helps readers see (including with her own helpful photographs) how the falls of Peskeomskut on the upper Connecticut River provided life-sustaining fish runs to generations of the region's Native peoples. She then describes how these same falls could become a treacherous trap during a colonial ambush in the early spring of 1676 and how they then became a site that colonial veterans and their families claimed on the basis of the violence they had perpetrated there. By the mid-nineteenth century these same falls powered industrial production in the new town

of Turners Falls. Even amid these dramatic reconfigurations of the region, Delucia identifies how Native peoples neither abandoned nor forgot this important part of their homelands. As a result, it should have been no surprise that Indigenous peoples asserted claims to the area in the early twenty-first century. Some of these claims included intense debates over expanding an airport runway into what many contended was a burial ground containing victims of the 1676 massacre.

This work has a number of lessons with which environmental historians need to contend. As Delucia has explained elsewhere, “Assessing environmental change ought to involve reckoning with how diverse peoples have believed and lived distinctive environmental realities.”¹ On the one hand, this kind of claim is not entirely new. Thinkers as varied as Simon Schama and Louise Erdrich, among many others, have also shown how landscapes carry memories of the past and visions for contemporary environments.² Delucia’s innovation comes from identifying violence as a component of those stories and of those distinct environmental realities.

Returning to the Connecticut River Valley, when nineteenth-century industrialists created Turners Falls, they recalled William Turner, the man who had led a decisive massacre. They simultaneously buried millennia of human relations to the fishing place Natives called Peskeomskut. But such burials did not lead to erasures. Later debates over the Turners Falls airport depended on Indigenous peoples’ memories of older communities and the devastating violence that created the burial ground in the first place. As historian Marge Bruchac (Abenaki) argued during the debate over the airport, “The war didn’t just float through here and move on somewhere else.... Some part of it got stuck here.” (pp. 281-282) The violence in this environment is part of both sets of stories, but it is more obvious and more painful only to some.

A history of memory is perhaps understandably more focused on the ways that people have “believed...distinctive environmental realities,” but Delucia also notes a few ways that people have lived these realities. Such insights are most apparent in the ways that the war unfolded at places like Peskeomskut, where a place of Indigenous sustenance became a place of Indigenous death. It also appears in more subtle ways in Delucia’s photographs of very real ecologies of violence. In one early image, a freeway bridge over the Merrimack River near the once vibrant fishing falls of Amoskeag (Manchester, New Hampshire), she includes in the foreground a sign: “No Swimming/No Fishing.” (p. 22) Not only have colonial people refashioned a river to support their transportation and power-generating needs, they have further regulated and polluted it to forbid fishing at a place called “Amoskeag”—“fishing

¹ Christine Delucia, “Locating Kickemuit: Springs, Stone Memorials, and Contested Placemaking in the Northeastern Borderlands,” *Early American Studies* (2015):470.

² Simon Schama, *Landscape and Memory* (New York: Knopf, 1995); Louise Erdrich, *Books and Islands in Ojibwe Country: Traveling through the Land of My Ancestors* (New York: Harper, 2014).

place” in Pennacook.³ The violence of this industrial environment is not simply an artifact of history. The sign repeats this violence every day.

I wish Delucia had explored this reality of ecological violence more fully. A variety of historians of North America have done so to a certain extent. Ned Blackhawk has powerfully demonstrated how Paiutes and Shoshones of the Great Basin had to adapt as a landscape that had formerly sustained them became a landscape of terror and violence as a result of colonization.⁴ Closer to Peskeomskut/Turners Falls, Zachary Bennett explains how English colonists established fortified garrisons at strategic waterfalls to control portages and food gathering. Thomas Wickman has shown how Wabanaki conflicts turned New England’s bitter cold winters of the late seventeenth century into seasons of anxiety for colonists who were not as capable of moving over the region’s deep snows. Lisa Brooks’s new history of King Philip’s War also outlines some of the ways that environments of sustenance became environments defined by war.⁵ Delucia’s ideas and her photographs glance towards what these authors also call us to notice. Given her unusually rich attention to landscape, there was an important opportunity here to add greater depth to these other insights.

I know that Delucia has other interests beyond what I emphasize here. This wonderfully written tour of land and history primarily demonstrates that lines of memory, while ever-changing, are continuous and consequential. My regret, particularly in the context of an environmental history forum, is not because of her failings but because environmental historians need to recognize the ways that the ecologies that they study are often ecologies of violence. Many study the environmental past in an effort to inform an environmentalist present. That present environmentalism needs to acknowledge the Indigenous peoples whose lands and waters these environmentalists seek to preserve or restore.

Allow me to explain with a story. In the past six months, at least four different offices at Bates College, where I work, have been considering how to properly acknowledge the Indigenous inhabitants of the land that the college occupies. None of the offices were aware of the others’ interest, and that fact suggests to me, in a very unscientific way, that questions of memory, place, and colonization are acquiring a new salience even among those who do not consider themselves students of Indigenous America. But as Kristen Barnett (Unangax), a Bates Assistant Professor in American Studies, emphasized in a statement she created in response to a request for a land acknowledgement for the Bates Dance Festival, no land acknowledgement is yet

³ John Charles Huden, *Indian Place Names of New England* (New York: Museum of the American Indian, 1962), 23.

⁴ Ned Blackhawk, *Violence over the Land: Indians and Empires in the Early American West* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008).

⁵ Zachary Bennett, “A Means of Removing Them Further from Us’: The Struggle for Waterpower on New England’s Eastern Frontier,” *New England Quarterly* 90, 4 (2017): 540-560, doi: 10.1162/tneq_a_00640; Thomas Wickman, *Snowshoe Country: An Environmental and Cultural History of Winter in the Early American Northeast* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018); Lisa Brooks, *Our Beloved Kin: A New History of King Philip’s War* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2018).

appropriate. “A proper acknowledgement will come as the result of relationship building between Bates and local tribes to determine how they would like to be represented, and engage in dialogue to determine how we best speak to, and of, those whose land we occupy.” As my colleagues and I at Bates or as we in other communities think about the ties between Native communities and the colonizing people who now occupy their lands, we would do well to remember that any kind of acknowledgement of that past depends on relationships in the present, and those relationships depend on a reckoning with the violence that has shaped our memories, our lives, and our ecologies.

Delucia’s book suggests how violence is part of these ecological relationships. It appears in memories of places but also in the very real ecologies shaped by dams, swamps, or other features that people have created according to what they remember (or refuse to remember). If environmental historians remain committed to understanding the land we walk on, the water we live from, and the air we breathe, then those who focus on colonized lands of the Americas and elsewhere should attend to the violence of their past and present. Doing so will help us all build more constructive relations with those environments—and with each other—in the present and future.

Comments by Ashley Elizabeth Smith, Hampshire College and Amherst College

M*emory Lands: King Philip's War and the Place of Violence in the Northeast* by Christine DeLucia is a rich and rigorously researched history of remembrance and place-making in New England, a region that is often seen as the origin of the United States as a nation. In some ways it is a history of King Philip's War, a violent conflict between Indigenous peoples and English settlers. While colonists and scholars alike have tended to focus on the years of active conflict between 1675-1676, *Memory Lands* expands beyond the limitations of this narrow temporal window to consider the sites of memory and acts of remembering that continue well into the present. DeLucia argues against "the idea that the colonial period and its violence are matters of the distant past" and "track[s] instead their enduring influence in modernity" (2). As a study of the "shadow" that the war casts (1),¹ *Memory Lands* recognizes in real ways that Indigenous histories, even "moments" like King Philip's War, are not just narratives of "encounter," but instead exist within extensive memoscapes that predate and persist well beyond these moments. DeLucia argues that "wartime happenings make little sense without deeper understandings of the places where they occurred and the *longue durée* evolutions of Indigenous geographies" (xvi). In some ways, then, *Memory Lands* is not a history of King Philip's War, but rather a history of the places and place-making work in which the war and its remembrances are embedded and participate. By tracing the legacies of the war and its reverberating repercussions *in situ*, DeLucia is able to directly link the past to the present and future, demonstrating how historical practices of place and memory-making have tangible social and legal-political impacts in the present. This extensive and dynamic approach to a history of war brings new methods of inquiry to bear on the war and the history of New England lands and peoples, offering a deeply refreshing and complex history that embeds understanding of a multifaceted conflict in a dynamic and living social and material landscape.

Memory Lands is a breath of fresh air to this Indigenous studies scholar who also works in New England. In my view, DeLucia has written a historical text that not only recognizes the humanity of Indigenous actors in the past but also attends to the politics involved in claiming that in-depth historical recovery of Indigenous perspectives cannot be done. DeLucia demonstrates that the claim that scholars cannot know or can only guess about Indigenous peoples' lives, motivations, and experiences in the past says more about how colonial memory and perception has shaped scholarly practice than it does about actual limitations to inquiry. She shows that, in a way, scholarship is itself a kind of remembrance. As a response to calls that Indigenous peoples and scholars have put to historians and other scholars of Indigenous pasts, *Memory Lands* is a powerful critical reorientation to doing historical research and telling historical stories that engage Indigenous and Indigenous-settler

¹ See also Colin G. Calloway, "Introduction: Surviving the Dark Ages," in *After King Philip's War: Presence and Persistence in Indian New England*, ed. Calloway (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1997), 4.

histories. The work contributes to and builds upon a growing paradigm shift in historical research and writing.

For years historians of colonial America claimed that recovery of Indigenous pasts was mostly impossible, as Indigenous voices and perspectives were absent from the historical record. In response to critiques of these assumptions, scholars have sought to read archival materials in new ways in order to fill some of these gaps. For instance, ethnohistorians developed methods for engaging anthropological and archaeological data to help them access Indigenous perspectives, producing narratives of the colonial past that showed interactions of different groups of people operating from different cultural perspectives.² While this work challenged many previously held assumptions about Indigenous peoples in the past and helped to fill in some gaps in historiography, it tended to continue to assume a sharp separation between past and present and the inevitable end of indigeneity.

In more recent years, historians engaged with Native American and Indigenous Studies (NAIS) have expanded these methodologies to confront dominant narratives of Indigenous ending(s) in two ways.³ Some have turned a critical lens back onto historiography to explain *how* Indigenous presence has been largely erased in both history and the larger American imagination despite the fact of ongoing Indigenous communities.⁴ Others have drawn on Indigenous sources and methods to help them locate Indigenous agency in their readings of documents, producing historical narratives that emphasize that agency in warfare, empire building, resistance, adaptation, world-making, and more.⁵ NAIS historians have engaged Indigenous languages to open access to new sources and archives,⁶ challenged our assumptions

² See for instance Kenneth Morrison, *The Embattled Northeast: The Elusive Ideal of Alliance in Abenaki-Euroamerican Relations* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984); William Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983); Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region 1650-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

³ In 1999, in her deeply impactful work *Decolonizing Methodologies*, Maori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith called on indigenous scholars to “revisit, site by site, our history under Western eyes” in order to “[transform] or colonized views of our own history (as written by the West).” Tuhiwai Smith outlined a two-pronged approach for this work; 1) to reexamine the histories of indigenous peoples to denaturalize their supposed truths by revealing the underlying (colonial) politics of their production; and 2) to “[center indigenous] concerns” and produce research from indigenous perspectives and for indigenous purposes. Scholars have followed her lead and done scholarship that engages with settler colonial studies or Native American and Indigenous Studies. Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* 2nd Edition (London: Zed Books, 2012), 34-39.

⁴ See for instance Jean O’Brien, *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010); Amy den Ouden, *Beyond Conquest: Native Peoples and the Struggle for History in New England* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005).

⁵ See for instance Ned Blackhawk *Violence Over the Land: Indians and Empires in the Early American West* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2008); Pekka Hämäläinen, *The Comanche Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

⁶ See for instance Noenoe Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham, Duke University Press, 2004).

about what counts as a source text for historical research,⁷ and encouraged us to rethink Indigenous space.⁸ While these scholars make clear that the past has significant impacts on the present, most historical work in NAIS maintains at least an analytic distinction between the past and the present. They also tend to retain a methodological focus on text-based sources for their research.

Here is where *Memory Lands* contributes most significantly to this field. DeLucia argues that historians need to get back into specific places.⁹ Noting the limitations of histories that “rely primarily on written records” (3), she argues that “by getting back into place, into specific terrain, rivers, swamps, islands, and cities of the Northeast, we can begin to better comprehend those secret, semihidden, or willfully forgotten contours of early America that still weigh so heavily on the present” (2). This place-based approach to memory-making enables DeLucia to do the work of both settler colonial studies and Indigenous studies in the same project, a deeply valuable contribution given that scholars tend to focus on one or the other.¹⁰

DeLucia’s approach is significant because histories of conflict such as King Philip’s War and its “shadow” are fundamentally about place. The war was fought over land and power, and as DeLucia convincingly shows, the remembrances of the war continue to make particular claims to land, power, and history. While this may seem obvious, her approach serves as a much-needed intervention on previous scholarship on this conflict, specifically Jill Lepore’s award-winning *The Name of War* (1998),¹¹ which focuses on text, language, and rhetoric of war at the expense of the material and lived aspects. With *Memory Lands*, DeLucia joins with other NAIS scholars, such as Lisa Brooks,¹² who understand the stakes of these histories for living Indigenous peoples and whose work is dedicated to Indigenous recovery in places like New England.

⁷ See Lisa Brooks *The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008).

⁸ See Coll Thrusch *Native Seattle: Histories from the Crossing-Over Place* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008), *Indigenous London: Native Travelers at the Heart of Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016); Josh Reid, *The Sea is My Country: The Maritime World of the Makahs* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015).

⁹ Edward Casey, “How to Get from Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time: Phenomenological Prolegomena,” in Steven Feld & Keith H. Basso eds, *Senses of Place* (Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1996) 13-52.

¹⁰ As Kanaka Maoli scholar J. Kēhaulani Kauanui has written, much of the work that scholars have done in settler colonial studies has tended to focus on settler colonialism at the detriment of indigeneity. She argues that because “settler colonialism is a structure and not an event, and because indigenous peoples are still subject to that structure – an ongoing genocidal project – NAIS must be engaged in relation to Settler Colonial Studies for any meaningful examination of the US.” J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, “‘A Structure, Not an Event’: Settler Colonialism and Enduring Indigeneity,” *Settler Colonialism* 5.1 (2016).

¹¹ Jill Lepore *The Name of War: King Philip’s War and the Origins of American Identity* (1998; New York: Vintage Books, 1999).

¹² Lisa Brooks *The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008); *Our Beloved Kin: A New History of King Philip’s War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018).

Furthermore, previous histories of King Philip's War have tended to grant attention to specific locales and "moments" of "encounter," for instance the massacre at Great Swamp in Narragansett country where English forces and their allies destroyed a village of refugees who had retreated into the safety of the swamp in the winter of 1675. While this is an absolutely critical place and event in both the history of the war and its remembrance, it is not the only one. Survivors of this attack relocated to other important places in the Indigenous landscape. DeLucia argues that failing to connect places like Great Swamp to the broader landscape facilitates the erasure of Indigenous survival. The land itself, then, can help a researcher access these stories when documents are uneven or lacking and can help scholars pursue questions that other approaches to history have inaccurately claimed to be impossible.

DeLucia's call for historians to get back into place is not only an appeal for how to write history, but also how to do historical research. Because King Philip's War is fundamentally about place and land, it is critical for any investigation into the war and its "shadow" to also begin with the land. DeLucia's methodologies take her both deep into particular places and across the connections between places as she traces the broader memoryscapes of King Philip's War. Using environmental history and ecology, she develops a deeper understanding of both the deep-time of the land and of people who live deeply and fully with the land, beyond the limitations of text-based documents. She traces kin networks of both Indigenous peoples and European-American settlers and locates their connections to particular places to show how relationships can shape actions in the past and how memory travels through families. She considers oral history and other archives of memory as well as material culture and archaeology. And, perhaps most strikingly, she travels the land, visits the many places she investigates, attends and participates in community memory events, and spends conversing with many people. As someone who weaves together engaged community research methods and early American archival research in my own work, I find it particularly useful how DeLucia's methods register Indigenous place and agency in the past and present and how she then juxtaposes these with the Euro-American remembrances that have marginalized or disavowed that agency.

DeLucia's methods for historical research of the past, then, begin with the premise that because Indigenous peoples survived, so did their perspectives and memories on the war, even if they were "seldom recorded in the documentary record" (136). Previous scholars of this time period have claimed that any understanding of how Indigenous peoples have remembered or engaged with these fraught and violent pasts is, as Jill Lepore writes, "sadly, mere speculation" (135).¹³ In contrast, DeLucia notes that the silences are indicative of the fallout of conflict as well as imbalance of power in the production of sources.¹⁴ Instead of taking the supposed silences and gaps in the archives as dead ends, DeLucia sees them as signaling the limitations of conventional methods and sources and thus the need for new approaches. DeLucia's

¹³ Lepore, *The Name of War*, 184, quoted in *Memory Lands*, 135.

¹⁴ For more information regarding how power and silence enter into historiography, see Michel Trouillot *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon Press: 1995).

starting point leads her to seek traces of these remembrances in the documentary record and elsewhere, both building on methods for engaging colonial archives and incorporating other engaged methodologies into historical research. As DeLucia shows, the descendants of Indigenous survivors of the war continue to remember this period in the present. They participate in their own acts of remembrance such as commemorative canoe journeys among the Nipmuc, statements by Indigenous leaders in local papers linking contemporary struggle to this deep history, gatherings in protest of problematic remembrances such as a King Philip's War board game, and more. DeLucia takes these acts of remembrance seriously as part of the historical narrative.

While DeLucia engages the same major documents and colonial archives as most historians of colonial New England, she expands her search beyond them. Her focus on place and sites of memory take her across the landscape to these sites, which often lead her to other archives including local historical societies, tribal museums, community research rooms, and more. In the archive, DeLucia's fieldwork informs how she reads familiar documents and narratives with new lenses and seeks out documents rarely consulted. For instance, she reads tribal members' testimonies in court records after the war for glimpses of how Indigenous peoples *did* remember and tell their perspectives on the war, albeit under duress and upon threat of death at the conclusion of the trials (136). She also highlights the traces of continuity that remain even in stories that proclaim Indigenous decline (76). Finally, in places where silences or gaps remain, she brings them into her narrative and considers what the silence might mean, opening up possibilities for future investigation into these gaps rather than proclaiming that engagement with these silences is impossible. Taken together, DeLucia's methods open up possibilities for bringing new questions to archives, for rethinking the limitations of the archive itself, and for developing complex mixed-methodologies that can enable new questions and new research pursuits.

The organization of *Memory Lands* into four sections, Boston, Narragansett Country, The Connecticut River Valley, and The Atlantic World, follows this mixed-methods approach to land, memory, and place-making. Each of these sections immerses readers in particular memoryscapes of the northeast, that is the "constellations" of these sites of memory "that have accrued stories over time" and the relationships between these sites across the land (3). In the place-worlds¹⁵ to which DeLucia introduces us, we meet people, Native and European alike, who are complex actors in, and agents of, history. We see the Indigenous landscape as actively known, storied, and lived in, rather than as *terra nullius* or "virgin wilderness." We see how English ways of relating to and relaying the past have also relied heavily on place and social networks and have been deeply oral and performative rather than only documentary. We see how the meanings and stories of some places come to receive more attention than those of other places, regardless of their lived importance. And we see how the

¹⁵ Keith Basso, *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996).

narrative shifts when those alternative, marginalized, forgotten, or disavowed stories and places are re-engaged.

DeLucia's work challenges us to reconsider the relationship between past and present in scholarly research, both method and narrative. What is useful about engaging the present in research about the past? What historical perspectives become visible when you take this approach that would not be visible otherwise? What new challenges arise and how do you work through those? As a historian, DeLucia engages the present in productive and compelling ways that I find deeply informative and satisfying as a reader.

This leads me to point to the striking provocation that *Memory Lands* makes about temporality and the study of history. DeLucia's place-based approach shifts the focus of the narrative away from the direct conflict years in the 1670s and to consider the broader story of the conflict over land and place, enabling readers to see how this conflict over claims to land does not end with King Philip's death in 1676 but continues into the present. By embedding the war in a more expansive timeframe than the immediate conflict years, *Memory Lands* disallows the possibility for interpreting the war as a sudden outbreak of violence or as the end of Indigenous connection with the region. Instead, *Memory Lands* brings readers into spaces that have always been and continue to be Indigenous space, thus challenging readers to critically examine the pervasiveness of claims that suggest otherwise. Even in the writing of *Memory Lands*, DeLucia begins to break down the implied separation between past and present so common in historical narratives. While DeLucia's narrative gestures toward more familiar chronologies to orient readers accustomed to this style, it also breaks out of this convention and moves through time in a non-linear fashion, making valuable connections across time periods. As a result, DeLucia challenges readers to consider the multitude of ways that the past of King Philip's War is always present in New England.

Yet, there are scholars who would call her approach too "presentist." I cannot help but think of my own experiences of when scholars trained in Early American History have informed me that because I talk to people or because I am trained as a cultural anthropologist, I do not do *real* history. This raises critical questions that require consideration in our fields. Why do some scholars in Early American History, especially of New England, become so invested in policing the boundaries of this field? Who gets left out due to this policing? What limitations does this policing impose on our scholarship? *Memory Lands* demonstrates that rigorous historical research need not be limited by specific years or time periods, nor need it take for granted a sharp distinction between "past" and "present." Indeed, DeLucia's *longue durée* approach to research on King Philip's War demonstrates the potential in stepping outside conventions of periodization and the artificial limitations that an aversion to the present might impose upon our scholarship.

DeLucia's work in *Memory Lands* makes a powerful case for the importance of engaged and place-based fieldwork as part of historical research. A close look at

DeLucia's footnotes reveals deeply multidisciplinary approach to research methods: in addition to remarkable and extensive archival research, DeLucia conducted on-the-ground field work, she talked to people, she traveled, she walked the land, she witnessed and participated in commemoration events, and more. We see glimpses of DeLucia's presence at many of the places and events that inform her inquiry, method, and narrative. Yet, despite this innovative approach to historiographic methods, the way that readers encounter the evidence for DeLucia's arguments in the book remains almost entirely textual. Furthermore, while it is clear that DeLucia spoke with many people and that individuals directed her research at multiple levels, these individuals appear in the book most directly through the archival traces they have left, that is, through their words that have been published or otherwise archived in textual ways, such as newspapers.

It strikes me as unusual that a scholar in Native American and Indigenous Studies would downplay the active engagement with individuals and communities on the ground and privilege the documentary and archival sources in this way. I cannot help but wonder what directed this decision. Of course, there are scholars who embrace methodological approaches that intermix archival and fieldwork research practices and those who do not. How is this reflective of certain disciplinary distinctions? In other words, is this where we see a disciplinary divergence between NAIS and Early American History? Are there other factors at play here? In what ways might traditions and expectations within our fields limit our pursuit of innovations in methods?

A great book opens a door and provokes us to walk through, it asks evocative questions, pushes at our expectations, and challenges us to revisit what we think we know. *Memory Lands* does all of this and more. The text demonstrates how intimate knowledge of place can help historians ask new questions of documentary sources, pursue new kinds of archives, and open up new ways of seeing histories that we thought we understood. Furthermore, we see how engaging with sites of memory and acts of memory-making can help us to understand how some narratives come to be more broadly salient while others are forgotten or disavowed. *Memory Lands*, then, does more than reopen and reengage a past that many have considered to be already fully understood. It challenges and encourages us to engage anew, to interrogate these fraught and difficult pasts with new methods and questions, and to take seriously the ways that these pasts are forever present. As former chief sachem of Narragansetts Matthew Thomas wrote in 2004, "we are still fighting King Philip's War" (187). The past is not settled; there is work to be done here, and with *Memory Lands*, DeLucia has joined a growing number of Indigenous studies scholars to show us that the work is necessary and difficult, but also full of possibility.

Comments by Maeve Kane, University at Albany-State University of New York

Since the publication of Christina DeLucia's *Memory Lands* in 2018, I have twice now assigned it in a graduate seminar on early modern knowledge making, and each time my students and I have found it both productive and challenging. Challenging, because the subtitle *King Philip's War and the Place of Violence in the Northeast* belies the complexity of DeLucia's goals and argument in situating the long-lasting echoes of colonial violence into the present. Productive, because it is precisely that slipperiness between past and present, between the seventeenth century internment of Indigenous refugees and the memorialization of that internment in the shadow of a modern wastewater treatment plant or a 1993 church arson on the anniversary of a 1675 massacre, that makes *Memory Lands* such a landmark volume. Besides DeLucia's lyrical prose and nuanced reexamination of one of the major "watersheds" of early American history, *Memory Lands* is both a scholarly pleasure and a challenge because of the way it crisscrosses many layers of history, oceans of time, and disciplinary conversations around space, environment, land, and sovereignty. The movement across time and space throughout the text helps underline the lingering and mutually reinforcing absences that have been created in history and memory, and also opens new lines of inquiry for other scholars, especially on the intersection of gender, reproduction, and constructions of space.

DeLucia builds on (and critiques) a long historiography of colonial violence in the Northeast generally and the memory of King Philip's War specifically, and she has insightfully identified lacunae of memory and archival practice in that literature that have accreted over centuries of academic and avocational historical practice. In reading these absences, DeLucia has "re-opened" the history of King Philip's War and colonial violence in the Northeast (to borrow a phrase she borrows from Narragansett Tribal Historic Preservation officer Doug Harris, 325). DeLucia's place-based narrative structure, in which she divides the volume into four sections that focus on a specific space but move back and forth in time, underlines the profoundly local nature of settler colonial violence and its construction of place. DeLucia is herself admirably present in the text as a witness to 2014 commemorations on Deer Island and as a settler-scholar realizing her own un-seeing of a Harvard Indian College memorial at a college dormitory, among other moments. This authorial presence helps situate DeLucia's decolonial methodology in approaching the past by relying extensively and thoughtfully on the knowledge of Mohegan, Narragansett, and other elders, historians, and medicine leaders. It also lends a sense of human scale to the movement through the large expanses of time and space the text navigates and helps materialize the archival and historical absences that DeLucia examines.

One of the lacunae that DeLucia's work opens for other scholars is the question of gender and women's roles in the feedback loop of history and memory creation that she identifies. In *The Gender of History*, Bonnie Smith argued that "the very naturalness of scientific [or objectivist] political history belied the omnipresence of gender (history was about men only, and distinctly not about women) and its

invisibility (history was about universal truth, not about men) in the nineteenth century."¹ DeLucia's *Memory Lands* is a powerful excavation of the ways in which the naturalness of supposedly objective settler histories belie the omnipresence of colonial violence and the invisibility of that continuing violence. The intersection of gender with those colonial histories raises important questions for other scholars. Women are far from absent in the volume, from *sunksquaws* (or female leaders) Wetamoo and Awashonks who led their people during King Philip's War (47, 129, 316), to Mashalisk, who sold land in the leadup to the war in order to pay her son's debts (210), to modern Mohegan historian and medicine woman Melissa Tantaquidgeon Zobel, whose knowledge frames DeLucia's critical rethinking of the New England landscape (xv). *Memory Lands* does not slight these or the other women who appear in its pages, but DeLucia's work raises the further question of what, if any, particularly gendered role these women may have played in protecting their communities in the past and present

In examining the early twentieth century Great Swamp Massacre memorialization work of Narraganset-Pokanoket Wampanoag activist Red Wing, DeLucia argues that Red Wing "worked to ensure a place for Native women in a space frequently coded as masculine by antiquarians (and their granite shaft, symbol par excellence of phallogocentric machismo)." (174) The tension between the masculine, colonial antiquarian memorialization and the gendered place making Red Wing sought to protect begs further examination. DeLucia occasionally observes colonial attempts to circumvent the authority of female *sunksquaws* (47), the colonial grants of appropriated Indigenous land to support English veterans' families who were left without a white male head of household (140), and the generational layering of settler and Indigenous claims to land (273, 291, 300). These are threads of gendered memory making and erasure that could be productively pursued in future work. Particularly given the tradition of land ownership and agriculture among many Algonquian and other Indigenous groups, the significance of land transference out of Indigenous women's hands alongside the colonial erasure of those women as leaders, knowledge keepers, and rightful owners is striking in the context of the other erasures and violence DeLucia details.

The reproductive and generational layering of claims to space come especially to the fore in the final two sections, "The Great River," on the Kwinitekw or Connecticut River and "The Red Atlantic," on Indigenous slavery and forced diaspora in Bermuda. One of the signal achievements of DeLucia's work is her careful examination of archival genealogies, offering a fine-grained reading of the way the very archival and material that record historians and other scholars of space rely on have been shaped by settler colonialism. Part of the way settler colonialism functions in re-writing the archive and inscribing a colonial past on space, DeLucia shows, is the creation of a heritage genealogy that naturalizes settler presence and pathologizes Indigenous presence. In the case of the Pocumtuck Valley Memorial Association (PVMA), early

¹ Bonnie G. Smith, *The Gender of History: Men, Women, and Historical Practice*. (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1998), 125.

nineteenth century antiquarianism that solidified the myth of a static Indian past laid the foundations for twenty-first century resistance to historical "revisionism" that seeks to reassess colonial myth-making. The strength of settler reproductive ties to the mythic colonial past is an essential component of this resistance: New England Euro-American descendants celebrate the colonial and colonialist past through family reunions and genealogy research, and object to public memorialization that attempts to decolonize celebratory narratives of their ancestors. DeLucia quotes one Euro-American descendant who placed descent at the heart of his objection to Narragansett exercise of national sovereignty: "If you're a Swamp Yankee, it means your family's been here for hundreds of years," (181) arguing that Euro-American ties to the landscape were more salient than Indigenous exercise of sovereignty for the purpose of economic development. Mirroring settler denial of "authentic" indigeneity to Indigenous people whose ancestors intermarried with African Americans or who did not fit stereotyped molds of Indians, this emphasis on settler family descent in an area was used to claim true ownership of a place. In a myriad of ways, the settler claims to place DeLucia examines are also claims about true or autochthonous descent in a place that serve to deny Indigenous groups as truly indigenous to a place by inscribing settler reproduction as more significant than Indigenous origins in a place.

If part of the way settler colonialism claims place is to naturalize settler reproduction in that space, another of its functions is to disrupt Indigenous reproduction and therefore claims to place. Part of the immediate legacy of King Philip's War DeLucia shows was the removal of Algonquian children into English homes as servants or slaves to perform household labor, much of it the reproductive work of washing, cleaning, and cooking. English overseers for these child indentures rationalized this as a benevolent act of supporting orphaned children who would be taught Christianity and English. This was a further attempt to not only appropriate Indigenous labor for the benefit of English households and strengthen English claims to space, but also to break generational lines of transmission of Indigenous knowledge and disrupt the ability of Indigenous nations to reproduce themselves demographically and culturally.

These breakages are especially salient in the final chapter on memory, absence, and memorialization of Algonquian slavery in Bermuda. Part of "the real damages inflicted upon individuals, kinship groups, and tribal nations" (291) through family disruption and Indigenous enslavement after King Philip's War was the dispersal of defeated Algonquians out of the Northeast specifically to prevent their return to their homelands. In tracing oral narratives of the seventeenth century sale of women and children who were related to Algonquian combatants to Bermuda and their memorialization in the present, DeLucia examines the remarkable absence of archival evidence for their presence. The construction—or non-construction—of Bermuda as a site of Algonquian bondage depends in part on the memory of reproductive kinship ties. These appear briefly in DeLucia's discussion of nineteenth century New Englander imaginings of traces of Algonquian biological descent marked in the faces of Bermudans, or the oral memory of the fate of King Philip's wife who was said to be sold into slavery alongside their son, or the mutual extension of community belonging

between Bermudans and Mashantucket Pequots in the present. Further examination of the function of gendered power and the memory of reproductive disruption or connection could productively complement DeLucia's already detailed and incisive examination of settler and Indigenous place making.

Comments by Thomas Wickman, Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut

Assigning *Memory Lands* in New England Classrooms in 2020 and Beyond

This is a breathtaking book. I bought a copy as soon it came out, and I couldn't wait to read each of the 330 pages. I assigned several chapters the very next semester in a historiography class, and I now have taught sections of *Memory Lands* in three different courses. It is a landmark text with the ambition and potential to influence a new wave of undergraduate and graduate students and to change the way history is produced more broadly in the Northeast and beyond. Delucia's central topic is King Philip's War, and she documents complex conflicts and dilemmas about commemorating the war over four centuries. With the 400th anniversary of Plymouth plantation in 2020 and the 350th anniversary of King Philip's War in 2025, how should this book influence classrooms and commemorations across the New England, and beyond? As a professor at a small liberal arts college in Hartford, I'd like to focus on how the book can be used in seminars, field trips, and public history events.

The book enlivens historiographical questions and makes them relevant in a way few books can.¹ Teaching chapters of the book in 2018 to history majors in their first-ever historiography class, I watched the book open students' eyes to a history they did not know existed all around them. They reckoned soberly with seventeenth-century colonial processes and events including war and enslavement, but they also realized how present settler colonialism still is in places where they have lived, worked, vacationed, and attended school. Not everyone was from the Northeast, but by junior or senior year, everyone had lived in Connecticut long enough to see connections to places they knew from activities outside the classroom. Perhaps because the sites that Delucia discusses are not currently in the national news, students did not rush to take sides. Just the exercise of centering their minds on places such as Great Swamp or Peskeomskut seemed to shift their consciousness about where they were. Some of them seemed to be willing to take responsibility in a more complicated and long-lasting way.

For me, Delucia's *Memory Lands* joins Jean O'Brien's *Firsting and Lasting* and Lisa Brooks' *Our Beloved Kin* in a 21st-century trilogy for a decolonial Northeast.² These authors might insist they stand with dozens of other works, some published and some not, which is true, but on syllabi this trio of texts can form the backbone of courses on Native New England—classes that don't just begin with a week on indigenous histories but that remain engaged with those histories for every week of the semester. I have taught parts of these three books together in a seminar called "Sense of Place in the Native Northeast," which prepares students to do digital mapping projects, to

¹ For a comparable example, see Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995).

² Jean M. O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010); Lisa T. Brooks, *Our Beloved Kin: A New History of King Philip's War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018).

piece together short articles from local newspapers, to re-read conventional histories of colonial wars, or to follow a lesser-known individual over time. As teachers and scholars of “New England” history, the rest of us may need some time to catch up to what Delucia, O’Brien, Brooks, and others have been doing, but the calls have been made for museums, college classes, and monographs to shift their paradigm and account for indigenous continuance in every chapter, in every semester, and in every display. In my experience, program planners, campus stakeholders, and public audiences have been receptive.

In 2019, I used examples from *Memory Lands* in a workshop on historical research to broaden students’ ideas about what kinds of sources to use in their own research. Delucia demonstrates how to find and interpret urban signage, something most students can do. Researchers of all backgrounds should find inspiration to visit the “‘minor’ archives of the Northeast, the hundreds or thousands of tiny public libraries, tribal museums, and local historical societies” across the region (13). Of course, Delucia also writes clearly about research ethics and underscores how she consulted with and listened to stakeholders. She credits tribal officers who have taught her about specific places, and she calls for particular sensitivity, discretion, restraint, and respect for federal law and tribal sovereignty when it comes to visits or scholarship related to death, burial, reburial, and repatriation (134, 271, 278). More broadly, the book walks readers through a series of questions about who participates in scholarship or ceremony and who might be possible or appropriate audiences (115).

Delucia’s book strikes me as a rare tour de force that invites everyone into the process of doing history. She began the project as an undergraduate thesis project and accumulated layer upon layer of evidence and interpretation for well over a decade. The book’s page-by-page accessibility and the author’s open discussion about how she knows what she knows should inspire researchers both within and outside of academia. No one may quite equal the prolific output: 13,000 photographs, tens of thousands of miles traveled, 140-plus site visits (13, 19). I wonder: what counsel does Delucia give young, ambitious scholars planning out projects like hers? In some ways, her book has a politics not unlike those who believe in canvassing and grassroots community organizing. Place-based historical engagement, she argues, cannot be realized only in an archive or through Google Earth—it “requires bodily exertion” (19). Clearly, that process is social and shared. If within the context of this roundtable Delucia would be willing to discuss her own courses, what kinds of field trips have worked best in inviting students or colleagues into this kind of place-based work? Academic conferences across the continent and the globe routinely offer guided site visits; has Delucia’s research for this book given insights into what such outings can offer?

Delucia’s book is much more detailed and sophisticated than a field guide, but it borrows some of the best qualities from that genre. Original maps at the beginning of each section show the thick historical and contemporary relationships between places within small geographic areas—and in some places could permit group visits to multiple sites by car, bicycle, canoe, or foot (27, 120, 202, 287-8). A four-section

organization of the book makes it possible for readers to use the book in a nonlinear fashion and for instructors to assign either the entire book or different combinations of the respective sections. The first three sections dedicate nearly a hundred pages each to three sites: Deer Island in Boston Harbor, Great Swamp in Rhode Island, and Peskeomskut along the Kwinitekw or Connecticut River. A shorter, evocative final section zooms out to trace connections to St. David's Island in Bermuda and other Atlantic world sites. Each place was significant in King Philip's War, yet by studying how people over the centuries remembered what happened there in the war and its aftermath, Delucia opens up something much bigger, a meditation about settler colonialism over four centuries and about indigenous survivance over a much longer period of time. Delucia makes no single place representative of the war or of the Native Northeast, and the decentered structure suggests that any number of sites could have rewarded study. What other sites did the author consider, and what factors would have made these other sites compelling or challenging?

There certainly are ways to think beyond the Northeast with Delucia's book. My historiography course examined four intersecting fields: climate history, environmental history, Native American and Indigenous Studies (NAIS), and the history of empire. Other books assigned in parts included Sam White's *A Cold Welcome*, Anya Zilberstein's *A Temperate Empire*, Lisa Brooks' *Our Beloved Kin*, John R. McNeill's *Mosquito Empires*, and Gregory Cushman's *Guano and the Opening of the Pacific World*.³ Together the books allowed us to discuss how war, coerced labor, colonialism, sovereignty, and diplomacy functioned across geographical scales. Yet when it came to reconciling the different methods employed in these texts, we faced difficult questions about divergent evidence (climate proxies, archaeological materials, handwritten documents, and oral tradition), about incommensurate time scales (seasons, entomological reproductive cycles, human generations, centuries, millennia, geological epochs), and about disconnects between scholars still not in sufficient communication with each other (historical climatologists, Science and Technology Studies scholars, NAIS scholars, military historians), partly because they define their ultimate audiences so differently.

Some authors might bristle at the suggestion that the primary audience for a book is local or regional, but is that the case for authors of a place-based work like *Memory Lands*? Delucia has advocated strongly that early American historians need to be much more conscious of contemporary Native communities who know and care about this history. In a critical review of Jill Lepore's *These Truths*, Delucia notes that in 900+ pages, "You will not find a single named indigenous person from the 20th or

³ Anya Zilberstein, *A Temperate Empire: Making Climate Change in Early America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016); Sam White, *A Cold Welcome: The Little Ice Age and Europe's Encounter with North America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017); Lisa Brooks, *Our Beloved Kin: A New History of King Philip's War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018); J.R. McNeill, *Mosquito Empires: Ecology and War in the Greater Caribbean, 1620-1914* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Gregory T. Cushman, *Guano and the Opening of the Pacific World: A Global Ecological History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

21st centuries.”⁴ Do such omissions partly result from a commercial publishing industry focused on a national audience? If so, what can readers and writers do to change incentives and reward place-based books? Why shouldn't authors feel most accountable first to local communities before broadening out to national or global audiences or vying for prestigious awards? How could regional and local audiences better use their power to demand scholarship that will help them make a difference on the ground where they live?

The power to assign books in college courses should not be underestimated. So far, I have assigned portions of the book only in required and upper-level courses, but it should help professors reconceptualize survey classes too. Can *Memory Lands* also help us imagine a paradigm shift in which indigeneity is a leading topic, or *the* leading topic, in flagship courses offered by departments of English, History, American Studies, or Geography? Texts on a decolonial Northeast by Delucia, Brooks, and O'Brien could be complemented by clusters of books or articles on other regions, such as scholarship on the Southwest by Keith Basso, Andrew Needham, and Marsha Weisiger; on the Northwest by Joshua Reid, Coll Thrush, and Julie Cruikshank; and Hawai'i by Kēhaulani Kauanui, David Chang, and Noenoe Silva.⁵ American Studies, Geography, and NAIS scholars might be more experienced organizing courses spatially and thematically, rather than chronologically. Certainly, this is an approach that has been suggested by scholars of #VastEarlyAmerica, but the grip of chronology is tenacious.⁶

Delucia's book represents a fitting example of how NAIS is well-equipped to lead North American environmental history into the future, and not the other way around. Environmental historians have been asking how NAIS scholarship and #NoDAPL activism could reshape the field, but the questions are sometimes framed in ways that assume that the field of environmental history is perfectly ready to absorb new methods. I have been present for conversations led by NAIS scholars in which people have asked more iconoclastically whether the term “environmental history” is useful

⁴ Christine Delucia, “The Vanishing Indians of ‘These Truths,’ *Los Angeles Times Review of Books*, January 10, 2019, <https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/the-vanishing-indians-of-these-truths/>.

⁵ Keith Basso, *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996); Andrew Needham, *Power Lines: Phoenix and the Making of the Modern Southwest* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014); Marsha Weisiger, *Dreaming of Sheep in Navajo Country* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009); Joshua L. Reid, *The Sea is My Country: The Maritime World of the Makahs, an Indigenous Borderlands People* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015); Coll Thrush, *Native Seattle: Histories from the Crossing-Over Place* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007); Julie Cruikshank, *Do Glaciers Listen?: Local Knowledge, Colonial Encounters, and Social Imagination* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2005); J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, *Paradoxes of Hawaiian Sovereignty: Land, Sex, and the Colonial Politics of State Nationalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2018); David Chang, *The World and All the Things Upon It: Native Hawaiian Geographies of Exploration* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016); Noenoe K. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).

⁶ Joshua Piker, “Getting Lost,” *Uncommon Sense*, January 21, 2016, <https://blog.oieahc.wm.edu/getting-lost/>.

at all, perhaps implying that NAIS scholars and indigenous communities have been asking questions about place, geology, ecology, environmental justice, and so on since well before “environmental history” coalesced as an academic field in the 1970s. Kitchen-table debates, proceedings at tribal headquarters, and conversations between activists have been interdisciplinary, applied, and transnational for generations.⁷

Memory Lands also employs American Studies methods, bringing together widely varying twentieth-century primary sources, reflecting on their relationship to earlier histories, and suggesting how their politics have endured into this century. Visual analyses, as of the 1910 *New Boston* pageant program or the 1937 mural at a Natick post office, exemplify how ever-present settler-colonial representations have been across the Northeast and how dearly students need to be equipped to critically encounter them (87, 89). Close readings of the poetry of Robert Lowell and Martín Espada show how poets wrote for particular places and times, to break open the silence about things that had happened there, not so that a poem would be inducted into a timeless canon (93, 275). Delucia’s selections from a bureaucratic archive associated with Deer Island in the 1990s and early 2000s reveal what a difference it made when Native leaders gave testimony and demanded revisions. For me, the quotations of specific line-by-line revisions addressing feedback from Native representatives were some of the most moving in the book, because the passages made clear how much potentially boring and thankless work went into showing up for hearings and explaining why word choices could shift public engagement (101-2). Delucia does so many different things well in this book that no single review could do it justice—this roundtable review might be just the format through which to insist to readers that they must experience the full book themselves.

Delucia writes history like a real, down-to-earth person following her curiosity to learn about where she lives. The author’s dry humor and visual wit bring joy to the theoretical passages of the introduction and to the thorough surveys within each section. Big points about historiographical privilege and environmental justice are stated clearly (“access to place hinges on social and environmental factors”) but also are illustrated vividly by her wry reference to “two ubiquitous New England signs: PRIVATE PROPERTY: NO TRESPASSING and CLOSED FOR THE SEASON. (Maybe FROST HEAVES as well.)” (21). The photograph of a plaque in Gorham, Maine, marking this northern New England community as one of the “Narragansett townships” created by land grants to veterans of the Great Swamp Massacre, is a more

⁷ Nick Estes, *Our History is the Future: Standing Rock Versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance* (New York: Verso, 2019); Alyssa Mt. Pleasant, Caroline Wigginton, and Kelly Wisecup, “Materials and Methods in Native American and Indigenous Studies: Completing the Turn,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 75:2 (April 2018): 207-36; Carla Cevalco, Review of Christopher Parsons, *A Not-So-New World: Empire and Environment in French Colonial North America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018), *The Junto: A Group Blog on Early American History*, May 28, 2019, <https://earlyamericanists.com/2019/05/28/review-christopher-m-parsons-a-not-so-new-world/>. On kitchen-table conversations, see Brooks, *Our Beloved Kin*, 13.

serious revelation of history hidden in plain sight—and it shows the promise of trekking out to far-flung places to see for yourself (140-1).

While “place” is a keyword in the title, “time” seems just as important to her work. For me, one clear takeaway from the book is that settler communities mobilize at big anniversaries. Delucia suggests subtly throughout the text that colonial time can be incongruous with generational time and with oral tradition spanning millennia. She alludes to ecological time running according to its own schedule, putting into bold relief how arbitrary it can be to fixate on units of time such as decades or centuries. Yet people keep returning to the history on anniversaries. Ezra Stiles felt compelled to visit Great Swamp a century after the massacre that occurred there (145-6). Another century later, 1876 became both the U.S. centennial and the year to mark two hundred years since King Philip’s War, leading to weird confluences in how people returned to the history (152, 246, 248). During the 1970s, red-power activists anticipated and responded simultaneously to Plymouth Plantation’s 350th anniversary at the beginning of the decade and to preparations for the U.S. bicentennial in the middle of the decade, redirecting public attention to the rights of indigenous peoples and the sovereignty of Native nations (96, 248).

The next cycle of New England centennials is coming, and there will be much at stake during these particular periods of intensive rewriting and commemoration. *Memory Lands* should be required reading for every town council and board of education in New England. With the quadricentennial of Plymouth Plantation in December 2020, and then countless other northeastern colonies’ and towns’ 400th anniversaries following over the next two decades, public officials and active attendees of town meetings have an invaluable opportunity to learn about how memory has been produced in the past. I would not be surprised to learn that young activists interested in national protests over monuments were embracing the book already. For teachers and students doing the hard work of challenging the status quo in their home communities, this book provides long-term context as well as insights from the very recent past. Some books require at least a full decade of work. Any activist or scholar intending to disrupt and positively influence some of New England’s big, upcoming quadricentennials may wish to start researching, writing, and planning now. December 2020 is just around the corner, and the innumerable anniversaries of the 2030s will be here sooner than we think.

Response by Christine DeLucia, Williams College

Within the last few weeks, Wampanoag tribal community members experienced repeated harassment while fishing at the annual spring herring runs. Certain non-Natives who observed them called the Massachusetts Environmental Police to report what they perceived as illegal harvesting of a protected resource and/or trespassing. This surveillance and antagonism demonstrated lack of awareness of important legal decisions that have unambiguously protected tribal members' longstanding rights to fish at customary times and places. It may have also signaled the pervasiveness of mythologies about Indigenous "vanishing" in the region, leading some non-Natives to be confounded by the active presence of tribal members and their exercise of sovereign rights. Since these initial confrontations Environmental Police have erected signage at fishing sites to inform the public about aboriginal fishing rights, attempting to build cross-cultural literacy about the continuance of traditional sustenance practices.¹

Incidents like these highlight the divergences or outright tensions between specific Indigenous understandings of place-relations and those promulgated among non-Native environmentalist, recreational, and other communities. I am heartened by my colleagues' willingness to enter into such a rich spirit of conversation about *Memory Lands*, giving broader contexts for "place" and its changing significances in the Northeast. Joseph Hall is right to emphasize violence as a foundational yet often overlooked component of environmental histories. I am glad for his invitation to reflect on the continuing "reality of ecological violence" in the twenty-first century. What may appear to one group as a "protected resource" to be kept apart from humans can, from other vantages, be an essential component of sustenance and cultural heritage. Furthermore, non-Natives' decisions to call law enforcement upon tribal members have created atmospheres of fear, hostility, and discrimination in places that ought to be locales of rejuvenation.²

¹ Jessica Hill, "Wampanoag tribal members harassed for pursuing aboriginal fishing rights," *South Coast Today*, May 26, 2020, <https://www.southcoasttoday.com/news/20200526/wampanoag-tribal-members-harassed-for-pursuing-aboriginal-fishing-rights>; Ryan Spencer, "Tribal Members Call For More Education on Aboriginal Rights to Prevent Harassment," *The Mashpee Enterprise*, May 15, 2020, https://www.capenews.net/mashpee/news/tribal-members-call-for-more-education-on-aboriginal-rights-to-prevent-harassment/article_1974db6b-c099-5b1d-95e5-9e9d719a7ecb.html; Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, "Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Aboriginal Rights," <https://mashpeewampanoagtribe-nsn.gov/aboriginal-rights>; Peter d'Errico, "Mashpee Wampanoag Fishing Rights," <https://people.umass.edu/derrico/wampanoag>.

² Access to traditional resources and exercise of Indigenous rights have been major issues across the Native Northeast. In Wabanaki homelands, contestations over elvers—baby "glass" eels whose market values have skyrocketed—in the saltwater fishery have been intense. Gale Courey Toensing, "Passamaquoddy Tribe Amends Fishery Law to Protect Its Citizens From State Threat," *Indian Country Today*, April 8, 2014, https://indiancountrytoday.com/archive/passamaquoddy-tribe-amends-fishery-law-to-protect-its-citizens-from-state-threat-yzYk5dIopke2Jdn_TFzqbg; Department of Natural Resources, Penobscot Indian Nation, <https://www.penobscotnation.org/departments/natural-resources>.

Hall's remarks also invite consideration of the disproportionate harms inflicted by settler colonial states and private interests upon the bodies and lands of Indigenous people and people of color.³ One harrowing description of this dynamic has been articulated by Ramona Peters, a Mashpee Wampanoag tribal member. Her family has long undertaken repatriation work in the region, bringing home ancestral remains and associated sensitive items that have been dislocated in roughly four centuries of contacts with Euro-American colonizers. In an essay about cultural heritage and caretaking work, she detailed the experience of "Archaeological Monitoring in Contaminated Homelands." Discussing events such as an oil spill in Buzzards Bay, she related how she and other community members were charged with monitoring the cleanup and ensuring that heavy mitigation equipment did not damage ancestral coastal sites, such as an "ancient fish weir" that they were able to protect.⁴ She also remarked on how two Superfund sites are situated in Wampanoag homelands, requiring tribal members involved in monitoring to undergo lengthy HAZMAT training. One is a military reserve impacted by contaminants and unexploded ordnance, presenting an existential hazard to anyone walking the land.

Peters' testimony bears witness to overlapping dangers that have reshaped tribal home-places, rendering certain lands and waters as toxic threats to the Indigenous people who aspire to care for them. It alerts us that while archaeology has been valued from certain perspectives as integral to knowledge-building and historical preservation, from other vantages excavations can be undesired intrusions into the integrity of culturally, spiritually charged places. Perhaps most important, her words attest to how these remain cherished grounds in Wampanoag territory.

Hall's questions present an occasion to think about where violence fits into experiences and narratives of resilience. I think it's important to acknowledge that in the face of extraordinary colonial pressures like the ones described above, Indigenous communities across the Northeast and North America have been envisioning, theorizing, and implementing returns to place-based Traditional Ecological Knowledge. These initiatives have arisen from grassroots community efforts and intertribal networks, and are flourishing in tribal communities like Narragansett and Mohegan, among many others. Participants are using place-based work to reclaim Indigenous foodways, as well as the wider systems of relationality that undergird them.⁵ As initiatives like these demonstrate, Indigenous conceptions of relationality have long extended across an expansive web of other-than-human

³ See, for example, Elizabeth Hoover, *The River Is In Us: Fighting Toxics in a Mohawk Community* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017).

⁴ Ramona L. Peters, "Consulting with the Bone Keepers: NAGPRA Consultations and Archaeological Monitoring in the Wampanoag Territory," Chap. 3 in *Cross-cultural Collaboration: Native Peoples and Archaeology in the Northeastern United States*, ed. Jordan E. Kerber (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006), 32-43, esp. 41-42.

⁵ Narragansett Food Sovereignty Initiative, <http://www.narragansettfoodsovereignty.org>; Eastern Woodlands Rematriation, <https://whyhunger.org/ewrematriation>; Devon A. Mihesuah and Elizabeth Hoover, eds., *Indigenous Food Sovereignty in the United States: Restoring Cultural Knowledge, Protecting Environments, and Regaining Health* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2019).

entities: animals, plants, birds, mountains, wetlands, fresh- and salt-water, the earth itself.

While I began reckoning with these concepts in *Memory Lands*, I have subsequently delved more deeply into the concept of “biopolitics” and the colonialist ways many theorists have used it to denote anthropocentric notions of valued life—assuming that human populations and their reproduction ought to be at the center. What if scholarship instead prioritized Indigenous conceptions of multilateral relationality, in which humans’ kinship with and responsibilities toward all other forms of beings are most salient? As I discuss in a recent article on “terrapolitics,” which uses “country” or place as an alternative organizing frame, Wampanoag and nearby tribal communities in the Northeast repeatedly sought to protect expansive, multi-species networks of relations and notions of thriving.⁶ Massive colonial disruptions to these relations occurred in the era preceding and following King Philip’s War, up to and including recent attempts by the Trump administration to disestablish the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe’s land-in-trust reservation. This ongoing struggle is a troubling bid to undermine the material basis of Mashpee Wampanoag sovereignty, and it threatens to alienate Mashpee people from the homeland in which they are so fully imbricated.

I’d now like to turn to Ashley Smith’s probing reflections on methodology. She raises superb questions about what interdisciplinarity looks like in theory and practice, and what is at stake in braiding together documentary/archival sources with other modes of knowledge, remembrance, and communication. While *Memory Lands* is profoundly indebted to interpersonal, oral, and embodied ways of knowing, the book does, as she notes, at times foreground Native voices and experiences as they have appeared in written formats—some penned *by* Native authors, others written *about* them by outsiders, and still more inhabiting a complicated gray area of multivocality. I envisioned this as a means of impressing upon readers the extremely long history of Indigenous writing, reading, and textual engagement, and the strategic uses that Native individuals and communities have made of the printed word and public-facing expressions. These modes challenge popular and scholarly presumptions that Native people rarely or never wrote. They help reclaim alphabetic writing as a deeply indigenized technology and speak to Jean O’Brien’s contentions about the “abundance of documentation” for Indigenous histories.⁷

I wanted readers to know that Dawn Dove, a Narragansett-Niantic elder and educator, has not only spoken about erasures of living Native people in the U.S.

⁶ DeLucia, “Terrapolitics in the Dawnland: Relationality, Resistance, and Indigenous Futures in the Native and Colonial Northeast,” *The New England Quarterly* XCII:4 (Dec. 2019): 548-583.

⁷ Lisa T. Brooks, *The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008); Phillip H. Round, *Removable Type: Histories of the Book in Indian Country, 1663-1880* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010); Jean M. O’Brien, “Historical sources and methods in Indigenous Studies: Touching on the past, looking to the future,” Chap. 1 in *Sources and Methods in Indigenous Studies*, eds. Chris Andersen and Jean M. O’Brien (New York: Routledge, 2017), 15-22, esp. 18.

educational system, but also that she has published about these issues in venues like *Dawnland Voices*, a pathbreaking multiracial anthology.⁸ I wished to spotlight how Pam Ellis, a Nipmuc organizer of the Deer Island Memorial in greater Boston, has discussed the significance of this commemorative event with those in attendance out on the water and land, and also with news reporters and media. Her words have accomplished important cross-cultural work about the legacies of forced removals and incarcerations of Indigenous people, in a city still strongly shaped by Freedom Trail and Revolutionary War narratives. To take the example of St. Clair “Brinky” Tucker who generously guided me on a driving, walking, and talking tour of St. David’s Island in Bermuda, helping me better understand the recent (re)connections forged with New England Native communities, I desired readers to be able to pick up the incredibly rich photo-illustrated book that he authored on these topics. In still other cases, I did not wish to intrude, however inadvertently, on aspects of closely held stories that community members might later desire to tell publicly on their own terms. This was particularly important to me as a settler scholar who endeavors to think and act carefully regarding who tells stories, how, and why. I know that other writers may situate their ways of knowing quite differently. I am also cognizant of being professionally located in History, a discipline that has shaped the narrative and publishing choices I have made, even as I have challenged the very hegemonic claims of History!⁹

Resonating with Smith’s queries is Maeve Kane’s engagement with the challenges of seeking Indigenous voices and experiences through colonially inflected archives. When I began researching, I was intrigued by the focus that had accrued around this conflict’s namesake. King Philip, also known as Metacom, was an influential Pokanoket-Wampanoag *sachem* (male leader) who helped mobilize the multi-tribal resistance movement. So much colonial historiography centered on Philip, who appears regularly albeit problematically in colonial documents. This has caused his wider networks of relations, counselors, allies, interlocutors, and adversaries to remain comparatively in the shadows. Furthermore, a spate of recent and forthcoming scholarly biographies focused on male Native figures such as Uncas, Tisquantum, Ninigret, and John Wompas seemed to provide only partial lenses on the seventeenth century and its aftermath.¹⁰ Undertaking a more complex history

⁸ *Dawnland Voices: An Anthology of Indigenous Writing from New England*, ed. Siobhan Senier et al. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2014); digital *Dawnland Voices 2.0*, <http://dawnlandvoices.org/collections>.

⁹ For discussion of the dynamics between History and NAIS, see “AHR Exchange: Historians and Native American and Indigenous Studies,” in *American Historical Review* 125:2 (April 2020): 517-551. In addition, my own approaches have shifted since this work began years ago. For example, see my recent piece “Indigenous Stories in Stone: Mohegan Placemaking, Activism, and Colonial Encounters at the Royal Mohegan Burial Ground,” *Native American and Indigenous Studies* 6:2 (Fall 2019): 74-109.

¹⁰ Michael Leroy Oberg, *Uncas: First of the Mohegans* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003); Julie A. Fisher and David J. Silverman, *Ninigret, Sachem of the Niantics and Narragansetts: Diplomacy, War, and the Balance of Power in Seventeenth-Century New England and Indian Country* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014); Jenny Hale Pulsipher, *Swindler Sachem: The American Indian Who Sold His Birthright, Dropped Out of Harvard, and Conned the King of England* (New Haven: Yale University Press,

required broader consideration of gendered identities, both historically and into the twenty-first century, along with recognition of the socially constructed, changeable forms that categories like “men” and “women” have assumed.

As Kane emphasizes, Indigenous women in the Northeast long held responsibilities for planting, for sustenance, for raising next generations. Some exercised political authority as *sunksquaws* (literally translated as “Rock Women”) across their homelands. These gendered formations contrasted with Anglo-colonial societies’ patriarchal norms and forms of governance, and created unevenness and elisions in key archives.¹¹ For example, Awonunsk, a seventeenth-century female leader in the Kwinitekw region (Connecticut River Valley), is clearly present in land negotiations with the Pynchon family and other settler-entrepreneurs pursuing the fur trade. Yet she is difficult to trace very far through documentary records, most of which were composed by male Euro-colonial scribes.¹² Close-reading land documents like the ones associated with Awonunsk helps surface how archives have variably foregrounded or subsumed Indigenous women’s agency, supporting more critical vantages on presence and absence in textual traces.

As Kane so rightly emphasizes, by seizing Native women and children as prisoners, rounding them up in centers of colonial confinement, then forcibly dispersing them into indentured servitude, slavery, or other forms of unfreedom, colonial leaders and everyday settlers attempted to undermine the cohesion of Native families and kinship networks. They worked to delimit future Indigenous thriving, reproduction, and political power. Colonists sought to physically dislocate Native people from traditional homelands, “clearing” the land for colonial claims; and to inculcate Native youth with Euro-colonial gender ideologies. Colonial legal systems granted few property rights to women, presenting major obstacles for Indigenous women who increasingly had to navigate English court systems.¹³ Taken together, these strands highlight just how intertwined gender, place, and power have been in the Northeast.

Violence against and marginalization of Indigenous women is not a bygone artifact of the seventeenth century. Not is forced child removal. The documentary *Dawnland* has traced how Wabanaki families right through current times have experienced removal of their youngest members, owing to Maine child welfare practices that privileged placements out into Euro-American homes. These removals dislocated Wabanaki youth from kinship networks and ways of knowing embedded in

2018); Andrew Lipman, *Squanto’s Odyssey* (under contract with Yale University Press); Todd Romero, *King Philip’s New England* (under contract with Oxford University Press).

¹¹ Lisa Brooks, *Our Beloved Kin: A New History of King Philip’s War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), especially her gendered analysis of Weetamoo and Mary Rowlandson.

¹² DeLucia, “Recovering Material Archives in the Native Northeast: Converging Approaches to Traces, Indigeneity, and Settler Colonialism,” *Early American Literature*, special issue on “Beyond Recovery,” 55:2 (forthcoming Summer 2020): 349-388.

¹³ Jean M. O’Brien, *Dispossession by Degrees: Indian Land and Identity in Natick, Massachusetts, 1650-1790* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), esp. 23-24.

traditional homelands.¹⁴ Moreover, as scholarship on coercive “residential” schools has attested, child removal was a continent-wide phenomenon that unfolded in tandem with reservation policies and settler colonial expansion.¹⁵ Community activists spearheading the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women movement have spotlighted Indigenous women’s continued experiences of abuses and disappearances, particularly in proximity to “man camps” associated with oil, gas, and other extractive industries.¹⁶

Gendered stories are never only or even primarily ones of loss and trauma. In the Mohegan Tribe, there has been a long line of Medicine Women charged with maintaining healing and medicine traditions, extending across multiple centuries: Lucy Occum, Martha Uncas, Emma Baker, Gladys Tantaquidgeon, and today Melissa Tantaquidgeon Zobel.¹⁷ The present-day Mohegan Chief is Mutáwi Mutáhash (Many Hearts) Marilynn “Lynn” Malerba.¹⁸ For communities engaged in Indigenous language revitalization, efforts to redress linguistic loss or dormancy caused by colonial suppression have been strongly grounded in intergenerational models that center collective learning in units beyond nuclear families. Among the Wampanoag communities of Mashpee, Aquinnah, Assonet, and Herring Pond, the Wôpanâak Language Reclamation Project has been fostering language learning in “Mukayuhsak Weekuw: The Children’s House,” building fluency among the most adaptive community members.¹⁹

In Euro-colonial communities women played influential roles organizing town celebrations, family reunions, public commemorations, museum projects, and related kinds of placemaking. To mention just one example, Sarah Orne Jewett grew up in South Berwick, Maine, where she repeatedly researched and wrote about local Native and colonial histories. Regional memoryscapes fascinated her, and she

¹⁴ *Dawnland*, prod. Adam Mazo et al. (Austin: Tugg EDU and Upstander Films, 2018).

¹⁵ Brenda J. Child, *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families, 1900-1940* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2012); K. Tsianina Lomawaima, *They Called it Prairie Light: The Story of Chilocco Indian School* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994).

¹⁶ Ashley Noel Mack and Tiara R. Na’puti, “‘Our Bodies Are Not *Terra Nullius*’: Building a Decolonial Feminist Resistance to Gendered Violence,” *Women’s Studies in Communication* (2019): 1-24.

¹⁷ “Biography” of Gladys Tantaquidgeon, Mohegan Tribe website, <https://www.mohegan.nsn.us/explore/heritage/memorial/medicine-woman-gladys-tantaquidgeon-memorial>; and “Our Ceremonial Leaders,” <https://www.mohegan.nsn.us/explore/heritage/our-ceremonial-leaders>. On Gladys Tantaquidgeon’s complicated relationship with anthropologist Frank Speck, see Margaret M. Bruchac, *Savage Kin: Indigenous Informants and American Anthropologists* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2018); Siobhan Senior, *Sovereignty and Sustainability: Indigenous Literary Stewardship in New England* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2020).

¹⁸ “Our Current Chief,” Mohegan Tribe website, <https://www.mohegan.nsn.us/explore/heritage/our-ceremonial-leaders/chief>.

¹⁹ On the Wôpanâak Language Reclamation Program, see <http://www.wlrp.org/immersion-school-information.html>; Tanner Stening, “Reclaiming a lost language: New school’s goal to teach children Wampanoag tribe’s native tongue,” *Cape Cod Times*, Jan. 8, 2018, <https://www.capecodtimes.com/news/20180107/reclaiming-lost-language-new-schools-goal-to-teach-children-wampanoag-tribes-native-tongue>.

intimately explored sites connected to King Philip's War in the Piscataqua area. These forays into "local color" writing helped contour settlers' senses of heritage in south coastal Maine in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.²⁰ Many writers like Jewett and antiquarians more generally issued colonial narratives of heroism and triumph over Indigenous adversaries. They legitimated colonial private property regimes and intergenerational conveyance of land through settler families, creating filiopietistic mythologies about exclusive ownership of place. When Wabanaki people seasonally moved through these areas, sometimes selling baskets and other handmade wares to Euro-colonial tourists in an era of escalating tribal land-loss, they were often depicted as wanderers, vagrants, shadowy and exotic presences who were *out of place*. In reality, Wabanaki families continued longstanding connections with homelands and strategic deployment of sustenance practices.²¹

I will conclude by taking up Thomas Wickman's and Hall's thoughtful remarks about the implications of pursuing place-based decolonizing work in campus settings. I would love to sit down with both—or even better, walk along a river—to discuss what forms place-based learning can take. As Wickman intuits, the locally oriented methodology that *Memory Lands* models as a research and writing practice has also shaped my teaching. In almost all of my courses I make a point of taking students on walks out on the land. We prepare for these walks by reading and watching an array of resources from Indigenous, Euro-American, African-American, and other thinkers that equip us to think critically about place and its shifting, contested meanings. Out on the campus greens and in the streets, we reflect on questions such as: In whose homelands are we located? What place names have existed here? What worldviews do they manifest or conceal? As we move through these seemingly familiar locales, we grapple with how they have not always been this way. What did this place look and feel like thousands of years ago? Hundreds? A decade past? What sources and forms of knowledge tell us about what came before? We pause in front of statuary and historical markers to discuss commemoration. Whose histories are visibly, tangibly memorialized? Which people and experiences are valued—literally elevated on marble pedestals? Which are harder to see, or actively excluded from the memorial terrain? How might these memoryscapes be different in the future?

These outings assist students in understanding that their campus exists not in a placeless bubble but in a specific ecological, human, and historical matrix of meanings and power. At Williams College we are located in Mohican homelands, close by Abenaki, Kanien'kehá:ka, Nipmuc, and other Native homelands. We are at a nexus of rivers, mountains, and valleys by the Hoosic and Housatonic watersheds, and between the larger rivers known as Kwinitekw and Muhheakantuck. This decolonial "sense of place" is typically very different than what even upperclassmen

²⁰ DeLucia, "The Memory Frontier: Uncommon Pursuits of Past and Place in the Northeast after King Philip's War," *The Journal of American History* 98:4 (March 2012): 975-997, esp. 991.

²¹ Alyssa Mt. Pleasant, "Sand, Salt, and Sweetgrass: Methodologies for Exploring the Seasonal Basket Trade in Southern Maine," *The American Indian Quarterly* 38:4 (Fall 2014): 411-426.

have previously encountered. I try to build students' capacities for working through uncertainty or discomfort in order to create longer-term possibilities for reorientation.

What does it mean to not only tell stories about Indigenous communities and histories but to substantively act upon and build relationships? What roles can institutions of higher education play in these processes, and what may be the constraints of such undertakings? I am reminded by Hall's comments on land acknowledgments of a panel I attended at Brown University. Several Native students and Lorén Spears, a Niantic-Narragansett member who directs the Tomaquag Museum, reflected on the topic, and it was powerful to hear testimonies about what a land acknowledgment can accomplish.²² It can set a tone of respect, recognize past and present tribal nations, and counter pervasive erasures and disparagements that students and community members have regularly experienced. When spoken aloud at orientation, commencement, or similar campus events, a land acknowledgment can affirm the centrality of Indigenous people, lands, and sovereignties in a manner that is empowering and pride-instilling. At the same time, panelists drew attention to the limits of merely going through the motions of performing decolonial rhetoric. They urged listeners to conceptualize land acknowledgment as an active process involving meaningful actions and relationship-building, and as a long-term commitment entailing substantive responsibilities and reciprocities.

Part of what made this panel discussion so resonant was its hosting at a university whose place-claims directly engage King Philip and the conflict that bears his name. As I discuss in *Memory Lands*, Brown is located at a crossroads of Wampanoag and Narragansett homelands. The colonial settlement of Providence, Rhode Island emerged here as a result of seventeenth-century diplomacy as well as later violence, including the burning of much of the town by a Native coalition during King Philip's War. Brown also asserts ownership over lands at Mount Hope at the northern end of Narragansett Bay. These Pokanoket Wampanoag homelands were the fertile home grounds of King Philip himself, where the Indigenous leader was assassinated in summer 1676. Plymouth Colony laid claim to this area after the war's conclusion by way of "conquest."²³ The violence of this era has remained present throughout the

²² "Beloved Kin and Memory Lands: Panel Discussion," hosted by Theresa Warburton and the Center for the Study of Race and Ethnicity in America (April 11, 2019), video posted May 13, 2019, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nVZCn2ZKuhM&list=PLTiEfrOcz_5PzYleQWH3l-MMgkklsetx&index=31. I also recognize Debbie Reese (Nambé Pueblo) and her piece "Are you planning to do a Land Acknowledgement?," shared on her blog, *American Indians in Children's Literature*, May 9, 2019, <https://americanindiansinchildrensliterature.blogspot.com/2019/03/are-you-planning-to-do-land.html>.

²³ DeLucia, "Locating Kickemuit: Springs, Stone Memorials, and Contested Placemaking in the Northeastern Borderlands," *Early American Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, special issue on early American environments, 13:2 (Spring 2015): 467-502. On the recent occupation, see John Hill, "Members of Pokanoket tribe, supporters occupy Brown University land in Bristol," *Providence Journal*, Aug. 21, 2017, <https://www.providencejournal.com/news/20170821/members-of-pokanoket-tribe-supporters-occupy-brown-university-land-in-bristol>; Beatrice Dupuy, "Native Americans Win Victory at Brown University After Pokanoket Tribe Protest," *Newsweek*, Sept. 26, 2017,

local landscape (e.g., the main thoroughfare is named Metacom Avenue). In summer 2017 a coalition aligned with Indigenous groups and interests took over these grounds and set up camp. The occupation sparked intense discussion among tribal and non-tribal communities and at the university level about necessary next steps. As all of this headline-grabbing turmoil unfolded—too late-breaking for me to incorporate into *Memory Lands*, regrettably—I was reminded of how vital historical understandings were to making sense of the twenty-first century resurgence of Indigenous voices, presences, and actions on these specific grounds.²⁴

When I was composing *Memory Lands*, I hoped that the book would open productive avenues of thinking and action related to Indigenous communities, places, and settler colonialism. Thomas Wickman, Maeve Kane, Joseph Hall, and Ashley Smith have offered such generous as well as generative readings. I thank Melanie Kiechle for creating this space for exchange, and I look forward to continuing these conversations in the years to come.

<https://www.newsweek.com/brown-university-native-americans-protests-agreement-671354>.

²⁴ Institutions of higher education in the U.S. and Canada are beginning to reckon with their entanglements with settler colonialism and Indigenous homelands. See Robert Lee, Tristan Ahtone, et al., “Land-Grab Universities: How the United States funded land-grant universities with expropriated Indigenous land,” *High Country News*, April 1, 2020, <https://www.landgrabu.org>.

About the Contributors

Christine DeLucia is Assistant Professor of History at Williams College, and was formerly Associate Professor of History at Mount Holyoke College. Her first book, *Memory Lands: King Philip's War and the Place of Violence in the Northeast*, won book awards from the Berkshire Conference of Women Historians, Massachusetts Historical Society, New England American Studies Association, and honorable mention from the National Council on Public History. She was recently a long-term fellow at the Newberry Library in Chicago, working on a second book about Native communities' entanglements with Euro-Americans and African-Americans in the eighteenth century, material culture, and decolonizing methodologies.

Joseph Hall teaches history at Bates College, where he focuses mostly on North American, Indigenous, and environmental history before 1800. He is currently working on a history of the ways that Wabanaki place names in western Maine reveal changing Wabanaki claims to these homelands.

Maeve Kane is an assistant professor of early American history specializing in Indigenous and digital history. Her book *Shirts Powdered Red: Haudenosaunee Women's Work 1600-1850* is forthcoming from Cornell University Press. Her work has previously appeared in *Ethnohistory*, *The Journal of Early American History*, and *H-Diplo*.

Melanie A. Kiechle, Associate Professor of History at Virginia Tech, studies the nineteenth-century United States. She is the author of *Smell Detectives: An Olfactory History of Nineteenth-Century Urban America* (University of Washington, 2017) and is currently exploring the origins and impacts of the gendered and raced sensorium.

Ashley Elizabeth Smith is an Assistant Professor of Native American Studies and Environmental Justice at Hampshire College, and a fellow at the Center for Humanistic Inquiries and a visiting lecturer in American Studies at Amherst College. Smith's research interests include indigenous decolonization and revitalization, especially in northern New England; indigenous-settler relations past, present, and future; and the politics of knowledge production in settler colonial societies. She is working on her first book, entitled *Re-Membering Norridgewock*.

Thomas Wickman is Associate Professor of History and American Studies at Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut, and author of *Snowshoe Country: An Environmental and Cultural History of Winter in the Early American Northeast* (2018), now in paperback from Cambridge University Press, within the series *Studies in Environment and History*. He is currently working on a history of environment and power at Suckiaug/Hartford, along the Kwinitekw, or Connecticut River.

H-Net permits the redistribution and reprinting of this work for nonprofit, educational purposes, with full and accurate attribution to the author, web location, date of publication, H-Environment, and H-Net: Humanities & Social Sciences Online.