

We Are Still Here: Frank Speck and the Continuing Presence of American Indians in the Eastern  
Woodlands

By

Laura A. Hazeltine

A Project in American Studies  
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for a Master of Arts Degree  
in American Studies  
The Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg  
August 2020

## Abstract

We Are Still Here: Frank Speck and the Continuing Presence of American Indians in the Eastern Woodlands

Laura A. Hazeltine

M.A., American Studies; August 2020

The Pennsylvania State University, Harrisburg

Anne Verplanck, Ph.D., First Reader

This thesis will argue the importance of Speck as a scholar who forged his own path. He was a precursor to the more politically inclined anthropologists today. Speck not only studied American Indians, he advocated for them politically and legally as well as thought their then-present lives were worthy of note, too. Not all Boas trained anthropologists felt this way. Recording the traditional cultures of the tribal nations was more paramount to them. To illustrate this, I analyzed two of Speck's largest collections, the Cherokee collection and Innu (Naskapi/Montagnais) collection, at the Penn Museum along with his papers held at the museum's archives and the library of the American Philosophical Society. I will also review one of his earliest works, *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware* (1915) to learn his method then compare and contrast him to other collectors and anthropologists working at the same time, George Heye and Alfred Kroeber, respectively. Speck's advocacy work was a precursor to the more politically inclined anthropologists of today. He helped the Six Nations at Grand River, Ontario secure stolen wampum belts. While many anthropologists studied the Indigenous west of the Mississippi River Speck stayed in the eastern half of the United States and Canada to research the tribal nations. Through the Cherokee, Innu, and Nanticoke collections one can see his nonjudgmental attitude and how much respect Frank Speck had for the Indigenous as well as his work to help tribal nations gain recognition and get stolen property back. This is why Speck is an important anthropologist to study

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Chapter 1. THE RELATIONSHIP.....	16
History of the Relationships between American Indians and Anthropologists ....	18
History and Evolution of Museum Collections and Collecting Policies .....	24
Chapter 2. THE ADVOCATE SCHOLAR .....	28
Chapter 3. “FRIEND TO THE INDIAN” .....	41
CONCLUSION: We are Still Here.....	54
REFERENCES .....	59

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I first have to thank William Wierzbowski, Keeper of the American Section, and Lucy Fowler Williams, Ph.D., Associate Curator and Sabloff Keeper of the American Section, both at the Penn Museum, for listening to my ideas and answering my questions about the individual objects and Speck's collections. They also suggested reading the *Guide to the American Section Collections*, *Savage Kin*, and *The Life and Times of Frank G. Speck* as well as other sources regarding Cherokee and Innu cultures. Thank you to Alessandro Pezzati, the senior archivist at the Penn Museum, for his help in viewing the Speck papers at the museum. I would also like to thank the staff at the library of the American Philosophical Society for their help in viewing Speck's papers. Also, I want to thank Dr. Charles Kupfer, my twentieth century history professor, for his feedback on my exploration of the historiography of the American Indian/anthropologist relationships and museum collections. I need to thank my advisor and public heritage professor, Dr. Anne Verplanck, who provided support and critical feedback on my thesis, making sure I explained anything about museums and anthropology for the general reader as well as assisting me in discovering different avenues for sources on the world of collecting and museums. Lastly, I want to thank my second reader Dr. David Witwer whose suggestions and comments only helped me hone my argument more and bolster my examples for greater effect.

## INTRODUCTION

Walking down the stairs into the bowels of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology there is a set of double doors leading into the sub-basement which provided some of my first experiences performing collections work. Meandering through the dimly lit rows of metal shelving filled with ceramics from the Southwest and Central and South America, I end in front of a yellow cabinet packed with lithics and sherds. I first discovered Frank G. Speck (1881-1950), the University of Pennsylvania anthropologist known for his work and advocacy of Native Americans of the Eastern Woodlands, in the small notecards left with the objects in these drawers. While I inventoried the objects, I wondered who he was and how he started the collections. Did he collect things in his personal life? Was anthropology his calling? Did he stand out in the field or research American Indians similarly to his colleagues? What was his relationship with American Indians? Through my research I discovered that Speck was an anthropologist with whom people should be more familiar. He was a part of the first classes of students under Franz Boas (1858-1942), the chair of the anthropology department at Columbia University. Instead of heading out west or across the ocean like the majority of his colleagues, Speck stayed east of the Mississippi. He studied Native Americans' past and present cultures to expand the public's understanding of them. Speck also assisted them in gaining recognition by recording their remembrances of signed treaties and continual presence related to rights tribal nations have to their land. He accomplished his goal of providing a greater comprehension for researchers and the public through analyzing the material culture of the Cherokee, Six Nations, Nanticoke, and Innu, among others in the Boasian tradition of understanding from the indigenous point of view. Evidence of his work—the indigenous material culture he collected and his papers and notes—is located in

museums and historical and learned societies up and down the Atlantic coast from North Carolina to Labrador, Canada.

This thesis will argue the importance of Speck as a scholar who forged his own path. He was a precursor to the more politically inclined anthropologists today. Speck not only studied American Indians, he advocated for them politically and legally as well as thought their then-present lives were worthy of note, too. Not all Boas trained anthropologists felt this way. Recording the traditional cultures of the tribal nations was more paramount to them. To illustrate this, I analyzed two of Speck's largest collections, the Cherokee collection and Innu (Naskapi/Montagnais) collection, at the Penn Museum along with his papers held at the museum's archives and the library of the American Philosophical Society. I will also review one of his earliest works, *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware* (1915) to learn his method then compare and contrast him to other collectors and anthropologists working at the same time, George Heye and Alfred Kroeber, respectively. Speck had a deep respect for the Native American way of life and developed rapport with many Indigenous people from various tribal nations. This respect is apparent in his detailed notes accompanying objects he donated or sold to museums and certain individuals, such as Samuel Pennypacker, to fund his research. Speck's other colleagues respected the Indigenous; he seemed to have a deeper respect. Through the combination of advocacy, deep respect, and the inclusion of present lives, Frank Speck was an important early twentieth century anthropologist who diverged from the norm and should be better known by people today.

Speck was born in Brooklyn, New York in 1881 to Frank Gouldsmith Speck Sr. and Hattie Staniford. He was raised in Hackensack, New Jersey, where he frequently traipsed

through the woods and bogs there and in New England during family summer vacations.<sup>1</sup> He first enrolled in linguistic studies at Columbia University in 1899 under the direction of John Dyneley, who introduced to him to Franz Boas. While at Columbia Speck conducted fieldwork with the Mohegan people in Connecticut and amazed his professors with his notes of the Mohegan-Pequot language that they thought was dead.<sup>2</sup> Upon graduating with a masters' degree in anthropology in 1905 under Boas, he received the George Harrison Fellowship at the Free Museum of Science and Art (now the Penn Museum).<sup>3</sup> Boas, who remained at Columbia, was Speck's dissertation advisor when Speck became the first person to receive a Ph.D. in anthropology from the University of Pennsylvania in 1908.<sup>4</sup> In 1913 he became a professor of anthropology at the university, becoming chair in 1925 and holding that position until he stepped down for health reasons in 1949. According to University of Pennsylvania professor of anthropology Margaret Bruchac (Abenaki), Speck was "one of the most prolific ethnologists of his generation, with more than three hundred publications including books, scientific monographs, and articles."<sup>5</sup> Over his fifty-year career he worked with countless informants from tribal nations along the Eastern seaboard and Canada.

By the time Frank Speck arrived at the Free Museum of Science and Art on the fellowship in 1907, major ethnographic collecting expeditions were under way. Initially built to research the ancient world of the Mediterranean and Near East, its staff and associates quickly

---

<sup>1</sup> Margaret M. Bruchac, *Savage Kin*. (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2018), 140.

<sup>2</sup>"Background," *Frank G. Speck Papers – Mss.Ms.Coll.126*, American Philosophical Society Library. <https://search.amphilsoc.org/collections/view?docId=ead/Mss.Ms.Coll.126-ead.xml;query=Frank%20Speck;brand=default>.

<sup>3</sup> From the founding of the museum, it was colloquially named the University Museum, which became official in 1913. In the 1980s and 90s the name changed again until The University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, or Penn Museum, became the finalized name. See Pezzati, Alessandro. "A Brief History of the Penn Museum" *Expedition* 54.3 (2012): n. pag. *Expedition*. Penn Museum, 2012 Web. 08 Jul 2020 <<http://www.penn.museum/sites/expedition/?p=14305>>

<sup>4</sup> Margaret M. Bruchac, *Savage Kin*. (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2018), 140.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

decided to investigate Native American history led by renowned anthropologist Daniel Garrison Brinton (1837-1899), who was interested in “systematically documenting Native languages and literature.”<sup>6</sup> Anthropology was not a declared profession in the nineteenth century but a discipline with many in United States regarding Brinton as “spokesperson” for the burgeoning discipline.<sup>7</sup> He argued for the inclusion of “race, language, culture, and archaeology—an Americanist approach to anthropology that would later be labeled ‘four-field anthropology’”.<sup>8</sup> The archaeologists Charles C. Abbot (1843 – 1919), who became curator in 1890, and Henry Mercer (1856 – 1930) started research into the earliest inhabitants of Pennsylvania and New Jersey.<sup>9</sup> In 1911 Speck assisted in establishing a formal anthropology department at the university with archaeologist George Byron Gordon (1870 – 1927), who also served as the museum director from 1910-27.<sup>10</sup> While the field of anthropology has evolved and techniques have changed over time, the mission of the museum has remained much the same, to transform understanding of the human experience.<sup>11</sup> Museum practice regarding artifact display and interpretative methods have evolved over time along with their content and assumptions about the Indigenous and ideas about repatriation. From these men and countless other researchers and anthropologists (both men and women), the American section, today, is the museum’s largest containing 300,000 archaeological and ethnographic specimens housed in eight storage rooms

---

<sup>6</sup> Lucy Fowler Williams, *Guide to the North American Ethnographic Collections* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2003), 3.

<sup>7</sup> Igor Kopytoff, “A Short History of Anthropology at Penn,” *Expedition* 48 No. 1 (2005), 30.  
<https://www.sas.upenn.edu/anthropology/sites/www.sas.upenn.edu/anthropology/files/page/A%20Short%20History%20of%20Anthropology%20at%20Penn.pdf>.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Lucy Fowler Williams, *Guide to the North American Ethnographic Collections* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2003), 3.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> “Mission Statement,” Penn Museum, <https://www.penn.museum/about/our-story>.

and an off-site location.<sup>12</sup> Of the 300,000 objects, around 120,000 archaeological artifacts and 40,000 ethnographic objects are from indigenous North America.

Brinton and Speck illustrate the changing nature of the field of anthropology around the turn of the twentieth century. Very early anthropologists like Brinton thought of culture as an evolutionary model. People began in the “savage” category and moved upwards toward the “civilized” stage.<sup>13</sup> Material culture was used to illustrate human development. Under the influence of Boas, anthropologists in the first quarter of the twentieth century moved away from evolutionary models to a strong interest in historical studies.<sup>14</sup> Studying Native Americans from their point of view was an important part of Boas’s anthropology. Museums were defined by the objects they collected. Speck was a part of a cadre of anthropologists, archaeologists, and scientists spread out across the continent yearning to learn more about the human experience, past and present.

Early anthropologists saw collecting material culture as a vital part of their discipline. Why objects as opposed to other written documents or literature? More broadly, why collect? What does a person gain from studying material culture? There are many important reasons to take another look at artifacts of our everyday lives. Objects embody the pain and hard work of an artist who created it or the love of a family member who spent the time choosing the perfect gift. In museums they have been viewed as representatives of different categories (i.e. ceramics or textiles) or singular creations. The stuff surrounding us has lives, outwardly expressing or concealing the attitudes of society. For example, a wristwatch can simply tell the wearer the

---

<sup>12</sup> “American Section,” Penn Museum, <https://www.penn.museum/about-collections/curatorial-sections/american-section>.

<sup>13</sup> Lucy Fowler Williams, *Guide to the North American Ethnographic Collections* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2003), 3.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

time or display a multitude of functions detailing the technological advances of society and what people deem important—punctuality, health, personal time, or communication. Anthropologists and archaeologists peel information from artifacts, like onions, layer by layer.

Scholars have theorized on the reasons people collect. Rene Brimo (1911-48) was a French antiquarian dealer who studied the history of American collecting from the colonial era to post-World War I in his classic work, *The Evolution of Taste in American Collecting*. Though he mostly centers his discussion on art he explored multiple reasons individuals collect including archaeologists and anthropologists. Some people consider themselves artists curating collections “of consistent quality only by virtue of rigor of choice and a creative discretionary judgment comparable to that involved in the process through which a work of art forms in an artist’s imagination.”<sup>15</sup> In other words, these collectors find their artistic selves through certain media and colors they tend to buy. Similarly, other individuals pride themselves on finding the perfect piece with uncanny ability to pick the beautiful work amongst mediocre works. Others want to create legacies and live on in the minds of visitors viewing their collections in museums.<sup>16</sup>

Much of collecting centers around taste, as Brimo describes in his book, and taste is sometimes “dictated more or less by historical events” as well as public taste being responsive to social and political interests.<sup>17</sup> Indigenous ethnographic objects were collected in a time when society thought Native Americans were “vanishing,” as Penn Museum curator and American section keeper Lucy Fowler Williams notes in her *Guide to the North American Ethnographic Collection* (2003).<sup>18</sup> Williams explains that centuries of confrontations, warfare, and disease

---

<sup>15</sup> Brimo, Rene, *The Evolution of Taste in American Collecting*, trans Kenneth Haltman (University Park: Penn State Press, 2016), Introduction, Kindle.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Lucy Fowler Williams, *Guide to the North American Ethnographic Collections* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2003), 2-3.

took their toll leading tribal leaders to begrudgingly surrender to the US government and reservation lives. The “vanishing” Indian took root within this context which “provoked both popular and scientific interest in salvaging Indian heritage.”<sup>19</sup> Museums displayed objects that were systematically collected “as authentic traits or facts representing particular Indian tribes before contact.”<sup>20</sup> Speck also initially thought Native Americans were disappearing. I contend that after researching and building rapport with them he saw the resilience and adaptability of the tribal nations to continue living. Anthropologists collect objects and archaeologists excavate artifacts and features to discover what human life is like whether it is cultures of the past, present cultures in distant lands, or simply our own communities. It is not unusual for a person to collect objects she or he finds interesting but to think other people might find the same pieces exciting {even exciting enough to pay to see} can be unusual. These exciting, fascinating objects fill the halls of museums with equally enthusiastic professionals studying every facet of them wanting to eagerly share their information with the general public. Not every anthropologist or collector who used material culture to study people had the best intentions.

The relationship between objects and museums and museums and the cultures the objects represent has evolved over time from dominance to complicated to partnership. Objects were needed for study because, unlike European written traditions, Native Americans communicated their teachings through oral and material traditions.<sup>21</sup> The importance of the material record is paramount in helping others understand “the ways in which Native Americans experience their worlds and how they interact with and depend on objects to make their lives meaningful.” Indigenous people still continue to utilize objects as sources of inspiration and knowledge

---

<sup>19</sup> Lucy Fowler Williams, *Guide to the North Ethnographic Collections* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2003), 3.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 2.

today.<sup>22</sup> For example, the Eastern Band of Cherokee still engage in the game of stickball. Scholars Natalie Welch, Jessica Siegele, and Robin Hardin researched modern day stickball. While the game is not played to prevent wars between different groups it is still a very important part of Cherokee identity and culture. They discovered important elements of the game that happen off the field, which assist in perpetuating it, include the “medicine man’s guidance of the team, the ball dance, and the brotherhood that these teams develop.”<sup>23</sup> One element that may or may not continue to be utilized is the scratcher. Scratchers made of wild turkey bone and feather ribs or rattlesnake teeth were ceremoniously used to prepare Cherokee players for stickball.<sup>24</sup> They were utilized to prepare and purify players as well as bring the fierceness of the rattlesnake out of them to play the game.<sup>25</sup> Native students, scholars, and individuals visit and research the collections to learn from and see the traditional material culture. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) ushered in a new phase in the tribal nation/museum relationship in 1990. This legislation laid the foundation for tribal nations and Native Hawaiians to claim human remains, funerary and sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony housed in museum collections. NAGPRA has created new relationships with groups and pushed the museum and staff to “understand ownership from the native point of view.”<sup>26</sup> It also led to contemporary objects complementing the collections and providing context.

As a child I learned about the massacre at Wounded Knee and it felt like it was the end of Native America in the history textbooks at school. I knew it was not the case. More recent

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> Welch, Natalie M., Jessica Siegele, and Robin Hardin, “For the *Sga-Du-Di* (Community): Modern Day Cherokee Stickball,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 41 No. 2 (2017) 94, DOI 10.17953/aicrj.41.2.welch

<sup>24</sup> “Scratchers,” 46-6-32 and 46-6-33 and records, Cherokee Collection, American Section, Penn Museum, accessed February 28, 2020.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Lucy Fowler Williams, *Guide to the North Ethnographic Collections* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2003), 16.

scholarship takes a different tack, David Treuer and Charles King both published works of illuminating scholarship in 2019. Treuer, an Ojibwe writer and anthropology professor, wrote the book, *The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee: Native American from 1890 to the Present* (2019), on the history and story of their “unprecedented resourcefulness and reinvention” because of the intense struggles to preserve their ways of life.<sup>27</sup> Many Americans saw the massacre of more than 150 Lakota at Wounded Knee, South Dakota in 1890 as the end of the Indian. Systematic collecting started around this time, showcasing objects as facts on the tribes before contact, keeping them in the past. Even American Indians themselves, too often, “agreed with the accounts of their own demise,” recounts Treuer. “Much of modern Indian and American life as we know it” emerged from the misery of 1890.<sup>28</sup> He describes how the reservation system, begun in 1851, forced Native Americans on lands provided by the US government freeing or keeping the lands the government wanted. The Dawes Act of 1887 created allotments out of the land set aside for reservations. The act authorized the confiscation of land and redistributed it to Native Americans with stipulations – give up your traditions for land. Boarding schools were soon filled with children taken from their families. Treuer notes,

as with the boarding school system and allotment, the Code of Indian Offenses was designed to destroy Indian culture as a means of making Indians American, but Americans on the bottom rung of the ladder. And in each area of intrusion, coercion was written into the law, with power becoming more and more concentrated in the Office of Indian Affairs. The actions and disposition of the government that appointed itself the

---

<sup>27</sup> David Treuer, *The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee: Native American from 1890 to the Present* (New York: Riverhead Books, 2019), front sleeve.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 11, 15.

guardian of Indian futures seemed designed to bring about the very ‘disappearing Indian’ that American culture so mythologized.<sup>29</sup>

Native Americans made sure this did not happen.

Whereas Treuer writes the indigenous side of history, King examines the anthropologist side of the story. His book *Gods of the Upper Air* also fits in the American Indian/anthropologist relationship category. Most of Boas’s students studied Native American tribal nations at one point in their careers. Ella Deloria (1889 - 1971), an unofficial student of Boas walked the fine line between her personal life as a Dakota activist and as an anthropologist. However, it delves more into how a group of men and women helped change America’s views on race. Boas championed the theory of cultural relativism, the belief in judging a group of people by their own cultural norms, mores, and practices not by the culture of the researcher. King states,

the belief that our ways are the only commonsensical, moral ones has a powerful allure, especially when expressed in the language of science, rationality, religion, or traditions. All societies are predisposed to see their own traits as achievements and others’ as shortcomings. But the core message of the Boas circle was that, in order to live intelligently in the world, we should view the lives of others through an empathetic lens. We ought to suspend our judgment about other ways of seeing social reality until we really understand them, and in turn we should look at our own society with the same dispassion and skepticism with which we study far-flung peoples.<sup>30</sup>

What King is trying to say is that it is only natural for individuals to think their way is the best.

It can be dangerous when groups of people (i.e. Euro-Americans) think this way, subjugating

---

<sup>29</sup> David Treuer, *The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee: Native American from 1890 to the Present* (New York: Riverhead Books, 2019), 158.

<sup>30</sup> Charles King, *Gods of the Upper Air: How a Circle of Renegade Anthropologists Reinvented Race, Sex, and Gender in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Doubleday, 2019): 8 – 9.

certain races such as Native Americans as undesirable and poorer people to constantly work and never move forward. He avers that instead of judging we should begin to understand people of a different culture from their point of view. That approach is in accord with what Boasian anthropologists, including Edward Sapir, Ruth Benedict, and Frank Speck, strove for in the studies of indigenous people around the globe. Scholars at the time such as Margaret Mead and Alfred Kroeber studied cultures far away while Speck decided to study American Indian tribal nations that others deemed too acculturated.

While the early anthropologists were trailblazers, they were not perfect. The process currently being used has evolved since the beginning of the field when Boas started. Three generations so far have grown up with the idea of cultural relativism, or the idea that one group should be viewed from their own cultural point of view instead of the onlooker's cultural point of view. Cultural relativism is both good and bad. Theoretically, if no culture is superior to any other culture then there is no "absolute standard of good or evil, therefore every decision and judgment of what is right and wrong is individually decided in each society. The concept of cultural relativism also means that any opinion on ethics is subject to the perspective of each person within their particular culture."<sup>31</sup> Absolute relativism means "everything that happens within a culture must and should not be questioned by outsiders."<sup>32</sup> An extreme example is the Nazis' point of view justifying for the Holocaust.<sup>33</sup> Critical relativism is the opposite, questioning the cultural practices "in terms of who is accepting them and why,"<sup>34</sup> which brings power dynamics into the discussion. For example, nineteenth- and early twentieth-century

---

<sup>31</sup> "Cultural Relativism," Lumen, <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/culturalanthropology/chapter/cultural-relativism/>.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

Native American children were taken from their families and sent to Indian schools. Why did the United States government start this program? Was it because we were afraid of their differences, wanting to assimilate them, and exploiting the resources from their lands for personal gain? The study of power dynamics provides anthropologists with a framework to view inter-group relationships to better understand the country as a whole.

Rapport is key in anthropology. Building trust is paramount in nurturing relationships between outside researcher and the people he or she wishes to study. Deloria, the Dakota activist and anthropologist, explains “everything had to be approach carefully; you couldn’t just turn up unannounced and demand that people tell you whatever stories they knew. What you were likely to get was equally unrepresentative and ephemeral. It took time and local knowledge to figure out what a great many people in a community actually believed or thought, and what, on the other hand, someone claiming to speak on the community’s behalf made up whole cloth.”<sup>35</sup> Also, outsiders studying other cultures bring fresh perspectives, sometimes finding new things that are taken for granted by the culture being studied. However, outsiders’ perspectives can lead to errors in data collecting, as when thinking a minute aspect is not important when it is. Informants may also give misinformation to the researcher, saying what they think the researcher wants to know.

After the Civil Rights Movement in the 1950s and 1960s, American Indians started pushing back and fighting for proper representation. Orin Starn examines the struggle between Native Americans and anthropologists. He recounts the work of Alfred Kroeber (1876-1960), a former student of Boas, colleague of Speck, founder of the anthropology department at the University of California, Berkeley, and expert in California’s indigenous nations. He spent his

---

<sup>35</sup> Charles King, *Gods of the Upper Air: How a Circle of Renegade Anthropologists Reinvented Race, Sex, and Gender in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Doubleday, 2019): 238.

career studying the indigenous people of California publishing his seminal work, the *Handbook of the Indians of California* in 1925. Several tribes have utilized this work for their contemporary revitalization efforts.<sup>36</sup> While Speck's approach differed from Kroeber's slightly, they still performed the basic "salvage anthropology" that was common in the discipline in the first half of the twentieth century. It mean the attempt to "learn as much as possible about native cultures and customs as they had been before conquest's devastation."<sup>37</sup> Thinking the indigenous people were disappearing, Franz Boas and a majority of his students fanned out across the country to observe and study all they could.<sup>38</sup> Starn and other critics of early anthropology in the United States note that these two white men benefited from the white conquest of indigenous people that made it possible for them to study American Indians in the first place.<sup>39</sup> Ethnographers in the first half of the 1900s did not fully document the lives of Native Americans, focusing on capturing their history rather than their twentieth-century lives. Starn shares the example, "the Yahi had often tipped salmon harpoons with scavenged nails, but in an iconic photograph Kroeber posed Ishi [the last of the Yahi] making one with the more traditional wood prongs, dressed in a faux loincloth for which there is no evidence that the Yahi actually wore."<sup>40</sup> Kroeber and other anthropologists and scientists befriended Ishi but also saw him as a specimen, something to poke and prod to discover the past of the Yahi. Speck did not see the Indigenous as specimens. Speck treated Native Americans with more respect and "met most people as a genial equal."<sup>41</sup> His photographs spread throughout one of his first

---

<sup>36</sup> Orin Starn, "HERE COME THE ANTHROS (AGAIN): The Strange Marriage of Anthropology and Native America," *Cultural Anthropology* 26 No. 2 (2011): 183, DOI 10.1111/j.1548-1360.2011.01094.x.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 181.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 181-182.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 182.

<sup>41</sup> John Witthoft, "Frank Speck: The Formative Years," in *The Life and Times of Frank G. Speck* by Roy Blankenship (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Publications of Anthropology, 1991), 7.

monographs, *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware* (1915) show the Nanticoke men, women, children as individuals present in the beginning of the twentieth century wearing then contemporary clothing.<sup>42</sup> Speck does not dress up his informants or any other people in the community in faux loin cloths.

By the turn of the twentieth century people thought the remaining Native Americans in the eastern half of the United States either melded together with other tribes, were relocated, or exterminated. At this moment of decline Speck studied anthropology and started to learn, study, and collect this history and culture to show everyone that American Indians were still present.

Frank Speck fits well in the current scholarship centering on the relationship between anthropology and Native Americans, but he is omitted from or receives limited attention in many of the books and articles. The latest scholarship that focused on Speck is Siomonn Pulla's 2008 article "'Would You Believe That, Dr. Speck?' Frank Speck and The Redman's Appeal for Justice" and a chapter in Margaret Bruchac's book *Savage Kin* (2018). Chapter One discusses the historiography of museum collections and the relationship between Native Americans and anthropologists including historian Christine DeLucia's research into the Native American collections at the American Antiquarian Society and Yale University's Peabody Museum and archaeologist Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh's *Daedalus* article titled "Reconciling American Archaeology & Native America." Speck's motivations in becoming an anthropologist and why he studied and collected American Indian material culture is addressed in chapters two and three. Chapter Two (The Advocate Scholar) explores the first half of Speck's career delving into one of his first books, *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware* (1915) and his advocacy work with the Six Nations in Ontario, Canada. Chapter Three ("Friend of the Indian") details the second half

---

<sup>42</sup> Frank G. Speck, *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware*, New York: Museum of the American Indian and the Heye Foundation, 1915.

of his career surveying objects from his Cherokee and Innu collections. It also examines Bruchac's claim of describing Speck as "fictive kin." Fictive kin refers to the belief that Speck must have had Native American blood if he could master so many indigenous languages even though he denied it.<sup>43</sup> How Speck is viewed today and who is using the objects he collected is discussed in the conclusion (We Are Still Here).

---

<sup>43</sup> Margaret M. Bruchac, *Savage Kin*. (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2018), 148.

# Chapter 1

## THE RELATIONSHIP

“Ethnographic objects participate in different spheres of knowledge and power. In the process of collecting, the voices and stories of an object’s origins and meaning are sometimes silenced in favor of new ones about progress and civilization.”<sup>44</sup> This statement by curator Fowler Williams epitomizes what can happen to objects taken or donated to museums. False information can occur if scholars disregard the object’s provenience and personal histories, which can be damaging to visitors who might take the information as fact. The false information can lead to perpetuating stereotypes against the tribal nation the objects originate from. This perspective essentially erases the life of the Native Americans who created it and/or believe it carried sacred and ancestral knowledge. Sometimes scholars made the small number of objects they studied historical representatives of entire indigenous groups without noting the specifics such as scope of the technology, indigenous name, or owner. Speck and the Penn Museum American section’s only indigenous scholar at the time, Louis Shotridge (1883 – 1937) (Tlingit), perceived that objects “embodied distinctive histories” which is evident in their copious notes and detailed native accounts.<sup>45</sup> Speck and Shotridge were contemporaries, employed together at the museum until Shotridge was dismissed in 1932 during the height of the museum’s financial crisis during the Great Depression.<sup>46</sup> The two men met in 1912 when Shotridge was visiting Philadelphia and Speck introduced to him to many other anthropologists, including Edward

---

<sup>44</sup> Lucy Fowler Williams, *Guide to the North American Ethnographic Collections at the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology*, (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 17.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> “Background,” Louis Shotridge Papers, Archival Collection Number 0047, Penn Museum Archives, [http://hdl.library.upenn.edu/1017/d/ead/upenn\\_museum\\_PUMu0047](http://hdl.library.upenn.edu/1017/d/ead/upenn_museum_PUMu0047).

Sapir. Shotridge collected objects and provided information and stories from Tlingit culture for Sapir and the Penn Museum, where he was assistant curator in the American Section.

This chapter delves into the secondary literature focusing on the relationship museums have with their collections along with the connections created between anthropologists and American Indians. These relationships are important, showcasing how other museums and anthropologists created and used collections around the same time as Speck. Many early anthropologists focused largely on collecting objects and stories of the American continent's first peoples. The anthropologists' intentions have either been criticized or reevaluated as a result of the shifts in the field from amassing collections to theorizing the meaning of culture and why people act certain ways during the second half of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first century. Margaret Bruchac's book *Savage Kin* is an example of the shift. Christine DeLucia investigates the origins of the collection in New England museums to illuminate the history of museum collections and their corresponding policies.

Museums other than the Penn Museum that collected widely include the American Museum of Natural History, the Peabody-Essex Museum, Yale University's Peabody Museum, the Smithsonian, the British Museum, the Academy of Natural Sciences of Drexel University, and the Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology. These museums sent out researchers and collectors across the globe acquiring objects from various cultures bringing them back to the museums for further research and study to benefit everyone. Many of these museums were founded over a hundred years ago; two museums (the British Museum and Peabody-Essex Museum) are over two hundred years old. With such long histories of collecting, questions arise. How were the collections acquired? Were the objects donated, bought, or excavated? Legally obtained? Is the message being presented by these artifacts historical, contemporary, or both?

The last two questions interest many today. Native peoples want to be seen and heard in the present, not only in the past. For many institutions, combining contemporary objects with historic artifacts allows visitors to see a more wholistic view of American Indians.

Institutional collections and collecting policies at museums have evolved to include more voices in the Indigenous community in the twenty first century. One reason is a change in the philosophy of anthropology. Many anthropologists in early twentieth century were trained by German-born American Franz Boas, considered the founder of American anthropology. Speck was one of the first anthropologists to seriously study American Indians east of the Mississippi River. He is worth remembering and studying because he gave Native Americans a voice and detailed their stories along with the material culture he collected. He also developed true rapport with them. His motivations in becoming an anthropologist and why he studied and collected American Indian material culture will be addressed in chapters two and three.

### **History of the Relationships between American Indians and Anthropologists**

The relationship between American Indians and anthropologists has been a long and rocky one because indigenous nations were studied and presented as vanished peoples rather than as living communities. Presenting indigenous people as vanished created the effect of disconnecting living tribal peoples from their own pasts. Anthropologists hardly commented on contemporary Native American lives and situation, wanting to recreate their flourishing prequest culture. Today many curators contextualize their exhibits with modern items donated by American Indians.

Many indigenous scholars today range from historians, scientists, and teachers to museum professionals, authors, and anthropologists. Some scholars used informants as data

points to generate a scientific report on the specific culture. Edward Sapir, another student of Boas, concluded later in his career that it was important to view people as people first “not as mere data generators.”<sup>47</sup> Scholars tried to make the field of anthropology a science at first then realized it was difficult to create general laws regarding how individuals in the same culture think or feel about their culture. Scholar Charles King notes that “cultures did not live out there, floating above the heads of their practitioners. They were not ‘superorganic,’ as Sapir remarked in another context. You should therefore give up the idea of ever arriving at a once-and-for-all definition of what this or that society is really like.”<sup>48</sup> Current approaches dictate that one should clearly state to outsiders that this is what participants (or experts) of the culture think it is. What one person states is true may not be true for the whole group. These are only two of the reasons why the relationship between indigenous Americans and anthropologists was complicated.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries most anthropologists were people of non-native descent. As anthropologist Orin Starn noted in 2011, the study of Native Americans and their different cultures was a central part of the field in the 1800s continuing well into the 1900s. Scholars in the second half of the twentieth century criticized the early anthropologists for their “arrogant assumption” that they could come in uninvited and “snoop” around in people’s lives without acknowledging what made that possible in the first place.<sup>49</sup> The author uses the term “ethnographic taxidermy” by Fatimah Tobing Rony to describe how American Indians were frozen in time so anthropologists could study how they once were but not the “trauma, poverty, and upheaval” of the modern American Indian after conquest.<sup>50</sup> The reality of their lives did not

---

<sup>47</sup>Charles King, *Gods of the Upper Air: How a Circle of Renegade Anthropologists Reinvented Race, Sex, and Gender in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Doubleday, 2019): 227.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 228.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 182.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

match the thinking of a group of people untouched by colonization. This idea of a “pure Indian” is one of the struggles museums have in exhibiting American Indian material culture and history. Indigenous people were relegated to history and that is what the general public learned until efforts were made in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries to collaborate with native communities.

Anthropology and archaeology are closely linked fields. One cannot discuss treatment of indigenous people in one field and not in the other. Reconciliation between American Indians and the collectors of material culture is the topic described by Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Bruchac. Archaeologist Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh describes the relationship between archaeologists and American Indians in his 2009 *Daedalus* article “Reconciling American Archaeology & Native America.” Over the decades “archaeology has begun a slow metamorphosis, changing from an agent of colonialism to a vehicle of Native American empowerment.”<sup>51</sup> By understanding the history and the social context of the discipline and engaging it, one can more fully understand why American Indians are “insisting their voices be heard and why archaeologists are at last listening to them.”<sup>52</sup> For centuries, bodies of Native Americans have been uncovered and carted away to museums for analysis and treated more like scientific specimens than remains of human beings.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh uses the Army Medical Museum and Samuel G. Morton as examples of colonialism and racism in science. The Army Medical Museum studied the effects of war on the human body. First, they examined the Civil War soldiers then scientists and researchers moved to studying Native American remains that helped to prove prevailing thoughts

---

<sup>51</sup> Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh, “Reconciling American Archaeology & Native America,” *Daedalus* 138 No. 2 (Spring 2009): 95, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40543939>.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

on human biology. Samuel Morton used crania to study human biology that (allegedly) implicitly proved Caucasians were superior to other races as claimed in his 1839 book, *Crania Americana*. This scientific racism fueled a market for “grave goods.” Indigenous archaeology can help push the field forward in regard to combining science and the arts to create a “more just and accurate understanding of the past and nature of our material world.”<sup>53</sup> Indigenous archaeologists will only help to expand the public’s knowledge of the human story.

Margaret Bruchac explores the individual relationships between anthropologists and Native American informants in *Savage Kin: Indigenous Informants and American Anthropologists*. Bruchac, who is of Abenaki descent, is the university’s first indigenous professor of anthropology. She examined five pairs, including Gladys Tantaquidgeon and Frank Speck. Tantaquidgeon (1899 – 2005) was born to Mohegan parents in Connecticut and in 1919 she became the first American Indian to attend classes in anthropology at Penn becoming a research assistant to Speck from 1919 to 1933.<sup>54</sup> The author describes the evidence of their collaborative work, yet Tantaquidgeon was not publicly recognized for her work until much later in life.<sup>55</sup> The finding aids for Frank Speck’s papers in the American Philosophical Society and the Penn Museum Archives do not mention Tantaquidgeon even though she and her family had a close relationship to Speck. One finds her story amongst the papers, objects, and stories told by museum staff. After the publication of her biography by Melissa Jayne Fawcett in 2001, the University of Pennsylvania publicly recognized Tantaquidgeon and her invaluable work, including the founding of the nation’s first indigenous museum – Tantaquidgeon Indian

---

<sup>53</sup> Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh, “Reconciling American Archaeology & Native America,” *Daedalus* 138 No. 2 (Spring 2009): 103, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40543939>.

<sup>54</sup> Margaret Bruchac, *Savage Kin: Indigenous Informants and American Anthropologists*, (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2018): 141.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 175.

Museum, in the School of Arts and Sciences' newsletter article titled "Running Against Time: Medicine Woman Preserves Mohegan Culture."<sup>56</sup>

Bruchac describes the benefits of restorative methodologies and reverse fieldwork. Frequently, an anthropologist's collection of objects and papers are scattered amongst multiple museums and archives resulting in lost connections and missing information at these institutions. Then research is conducted and exhibitions are planned without the full picture, an interpretation that becomes part of the museum's memory. Reverse fieldwork is a method Bruchac advocates because it can reunite the information from disparate sources which can lead to solving mysteries regarding object provenance and meaning.<sup>57</sup> The method, at minimum, consists of diving into archives and other museums to track the objects and all their related stories (good, bad, or strange) through the locales and tribal nations the collections represent.<sup>58</sup> This means cross-referencing all the information from the different institutions, which can be difficult, to map all the interactions the objects had from the moment of acquisition to all the different hands it went through along the way. It is also very helpful to consult with indigenous knowledge keepers who hold "information relevant to the historic objects."<sup>59</sup> Bruchac and some of her students have already used this method with objects housed in the Penn Museum and solved problems. For example, Penn student Pauline Saribas in 2015 chose a quillwork-embellished Cree men's coat (NA3635) to analyze through reverse fieldwork.<sup>60</sup> The registrar's office had little information on the coat leading her to a search for comparable objects located in other museums. While there

---

<sup>56</sup> Anonymous, "Running Against Time: Medicine Woman Preserves Mohegan Culture," Penn Arts & Sciences Newsletter (Summer 2001), <https://www.sas.upenn.edu/sasalum/newsltr/summer2001/running.html>.

<sup>57</sup> Margaret Bruchac, *Savage Kin: Indigenous Informants and American Anthropologists*, (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2018): 183.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

<sup>60</sup> Pauline Saribas, "Quillwork-Embellished 'Cree' Coat: Object Analysis for Anthropology of Museums," Penn Museum Blog, (originally published 4/18/2015). <https://www.penn.museum/blog/museum/quillwork-embellished-cree-coat/>.

were similar coats Saribas could not find an example that closely resembled the one held at Penn. She concluded that the coat's delicate quillwork was most likely accomplished by a woman and the slight evidence of wear could possibly mean the coat is a part of a man's regalia. Ultimately, Saribas explained the Cree coat has a story but its meaning is still shrouded in mystery.<sup>61</sup>

While Bruchac and her students researched additional information found in other institutions or from indigenous experts pertaining to objects Speck collected, independent scholar Siomonn Pulla touches upon his legacy in his 2008 *Ethnohistory* article titled "'Would you believe that, Dr. Speck?' Frank Speck and *The Redman's Appeal for Justice*." Pulla examines Speck's work as a part of a larger "political struggle that included the active participation of aboriginal peoples."<sup>62</sup> Speck was known as an educator who wanted to raise awareness of the continuing presence of indigenous Canadians and their acceptance in mainstream Canadian society. Pulla explores his contributions to the struggle of the Six Nations of the Grand River in receiving recognition from the government. Starting in the spring of 1913 Tuscarora Chief Josiah Hill complained that land granted to Six Nations of Grand River for aiding the British against the Americans was being considered for sale by the Department of Indian Affairs.<sup>63</sup> The Department was being pressured by nonindigenous people from Brantford, a town in Grand River.<sup>64</sup> Speck was aware of the Six Nations' concern about the land from his work assisting them with a different problem. In the multi-year battle the problem evolved from land rights to governmental recognition with the Thompson Commission "claiming that the traditional governing body on the reserve mismanaged public affairs and allowed for the continuation of

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.

<sup>62</sup> Siomonn Pulla, "'Would you believe that, Dr. Speck?' Frank Speck and *The Redman's Appeal for Justice*," *Ethnohistory* 55 No. 2 (Spring 2008): 183. DOI 10.1215/001411801-2007-060.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., 188.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

‘flagrant immoralities’ throughout the territory.”<sup>65</sup> Speck responded by emphasizing the Six Nations’ sovereignty in relationship to the longhouse which was not so different from how Christians worship.<sup>66</sup> The interactions between Speck and the Six Nations show how Speck advocated for present Indigenous people and not just studied and collected their past. Pulla concludes, “an understanding of Speck’s active engagement in [indigenous] issues outside of the paradigm of family hunting territories helps to contextualize his enduring commitment to support the continuing struggles of [indigenous] peoples for respect and recognition of their claims. Speck gained a reputation as a ‘friend of the Indian,’ and his approach to [indigenous] issues during the early twentieth century had a large influence on the role of the anthropologist today, which commonly includes acting as consultant and expert witness on issues connected to [tribal] self-government and traditional land-use practices.”<sup>67</sup>

### **History and Evolution of Museum Collections and Collecting Policies**

When considering collectors, it is important to discuss the institutions that acquire the objects, since it is in the historical society, museum, library, or house that the artifacts take on a new life and does the new life reflect the original one. By examining similar collections from other museums one can start to see how the objects and the tribal nations they came from are treated. This section will explore historian Christine DeLucia’s dive into the history of Native Americans and New England at two museums: the American Antiquarian Society and Yale’s Peabody Museum.

---

<sup>65</sup> Siomonn Pulla, “‘Would you believe that, Dr. Speck?’ Frank Speck and *The Redman’s Appeal for Justice*,” *Ethnohistory* 55 No. 2 (Spring 2008): 190. DOI 10.1215/001411801-2007-060.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 193.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 185.

DeLucia explores the establishment of the American Antiquarian Society (AAS) in Worcester, Massachusetts, specifically the Native American objects once held there. Nineteenth-century historical organizations actively “solicited donations of indigenous artifacts” to assist them in shedding light on America’s prehistory and encounters with indigenous inhabitants and European colonists.<sup>68</sup> When these institutions, which first had a broad sense of their mission and collecting practices, started narrowing their focus, large parts of the collections were deaccessioned to other museums. Inevitably, this can lead to miscommunication and/or missing object information that is actually important but now is lost. Similar to Bruchac, DeLucia explains how “using methodologies [linking] textual, material, visual, ethnographic, and environmental studies” can help reconnect the lost information and objects in a restorative process that can bring back to the conversation the “indigenous descendant communities who have so long been alienated from them”.<sup>69</sup> By uncovering the history of the collection and acknowledging the new perspective of the responsibilities the museum has to their collections, one can collaborate more effectively with indigenous communities and make room for them to conduct research alongside the museum’s staff.

In another article, DeLucia examines the history of Yale University’s Peabody Museum and its American Indian collection.<sup>70</sup> European-Americans and the indigenous communities likely viewed museums differently, especially when many of the oldest university museums were founded in the 1700s and 1800s. The author seeks a different history of museums and Native

---

<sup>68</sup> Christine DeLucia, “Antiquarian Collecting and the Transits of Indigenous Material Culture: Rethinking ‘Indian Relics’ and Tribal Histories,” *Common-place.org* 17 No. 2 (Winter 2017), <http://common-place.org/book/antiquarian-collecting-and-the-transits-of-indigenous-material-culture-rethinking-indian-relics-and-tribal-histories/>.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>70</sup> Christine DeLucia, “Fugitive Collections in New England Indian Country: Indigenous Material Culture and Early American History Making at Ezra Stiles’s Yale Museum,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 75 No. 1 (January 2018): 113-114, DOI: 10.5309/willmaryquar.75.1.0109.

Americans, one that “reckons directly with collecting’s close involvement with a tenuous yet growing form of settler colonialism as well as with persistent indigenous pushback.”<sup>71</sup> As in the case of AAS, Yale’s fugitive collection refers to the “disappearance” of the American Indian collection at the Yale Museum which challenges the “reinterpretation, reconnection, and repatriation in the present.” I place disappearance in quotes because the museum still has the collection, it just was not visible anywhere. The lack of visible clues left behind by “indigenous place-making events such as the 1793 delegation’s visit” make it difficult for historians to reconstruct the “nature and meaning” of American Indian movement through colonial exhibition space.<sup>72</sup>

The events shaping the formation of the Yale Museum and the interactions between the visiting Native American delegations and the prominent European-American leaders can begin to shed light on the movements of the collection. Ezra Stiles (1725 – 95) was a major supporter of the museum as well as a Congregationalist minister, theologian, academic, and president of Yale College from 1778 to 1795. He moved through the Native American communities quite often and most likely knew that European institutions engaged in object-centric practices from collections to education to exhibition.<sup>73</sup> American colonists largely set up their museums after European models. Both places contained American Indian material culture. Native Americans were sometimes captured and forced to work in Europe or delegations of indigenous diplomats traveled to Europe and left objects there either by choice or coercion. Throughout the article DeLucia wants the reader to realize that American Indians and their cultures in the Northeast have survived and have “maintained important continuities with the past while also transforming

---

<sup>71</sup> Ibid.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., 115.

in relation to changing circumstances.”<sup>74</sup> Some institutions have been slowly changing to include indigenous nations as partners in the museum process. Yale’s Peabody Museum is one of them; however, its work is not finished. This is a small sample of the long history of museum collections.

The relationship between anthropologists and the Indigenous has evolved from museums building vast collections to more collaboration between Native Americans and the institutions holding their objects. The stories inhabiting the objects are moving to the foreground with the help of individuals such as Margaret Bruchac and her students who are discovering layers to the objects long forgotten or misinterpreted. The future of the museum world is one of inclusion and continual growth between their staff and the people they represent.

---

<sup>74</sup> Christine DeLucia, “Fugitive Collections in New England Indian Country: Indigenous Material Culture and Early American History Making at Ezra Stiles’s Yale Museum,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 75 No. 1 (January 2018): 149, DOI: 10.5309/willmaryquar.75.1.0109.

## Chapter 2

### THE ADVOCATE SCHOLAR

If a scholar wanted to research American Indian culture in 1870s or 1890s, he or she would travel out west to study the “real” tribal nations not to the East Coast where scholars thought the tribes were too acculturated to study. That changed when Speck graduated from Columbia University and decided to document the American Indian cultures of the Eastern Woodlands. Speck “viewed the study of ethnology as a fluid field that was unlimited and not a fixed study of past cultures.”<sup>75</sup> He wanted to observe and learn about native cultures past and present. By including their voices and contemporary pieces in the exhibits he produced at the Penn Museum, one could see a more wholistic view of American Indian life.

Speck became one of the first anthropologists to seriously research the cultures of the American Indians of the Eastern Woodlands. He is a lesser-known figure in American history and anthropological research but, nonetheless, pivotal. Many anthropologists did not like the idea of studying acculturated tribes. At the time, most of the information regarding these tribal nations was historical. Speck took a different tack by including present experiences by indigenous nations. His view was a precursor, much more in line with the field of anthropology today. The native accounts accompanying the objects Speck collected and the philosophy and methods he used make him a pivotal anthropologist to remember and study, particularly in comparison to some other early anthropologists and collectors. This chapter will chronicle the first half of Speck’s career. To help illustrate my argument I will analyze one of Speck’s first

---

<sup>75</sup> “Background,” *Frank G. Speck Papers – Mss.Ms.Coll.126*, American Philosophical Society Library. <https://search.amphilsoc.org/collections/view?docId=ead/Mss.Ms.Coll.126-ead.xml;query=Frank%20Speck;brand=default>.

publications, *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware* (1915) and his advocacy work among the Six Nations at Grand River, Ontario.

Although the American Indian Movement began in 1968 as a civil rights organization started by native people, the roots of fighting for the rights of Native Americans started in the 1800s. The late nineteenth century saw the founding of organizations such as the Indian Rights Association, the Women's National Indian Association, and the Lake Mohonk Conference that starting to fight against a whole set of social issues ranging from lack of access to education and courts to the reservation system to Indian agents defrauding American Indians.<sup>76</sup> Many of these organizations were created by non-native, wealthy individuals who, many genuinely, wanted to assist Native Americans. The assistance provided did not give the help Native Americans were necessarily seeking. These organizations thought the solutions to indigenous problems was clear: "civilization through citizenship, free enterprise, and private ownership of land."<sup>77</sup> While that seems like a fine solution for European-Americans, Native Americans thought differently about citizenship. Clinton B. Fisk (1828 – 1890), an abolitionist, union officer, and endower of Fisk University, stated how he felt about the relationship among slavery, Indians, and reform: "We could not fit the negro for freedom till we make him free. We shall never fit the Indian for citizenship till we make him a citizen."<sup>78</sup> He also thought every man was born with certain inalienable rights – life, liberty, and property. The Native Americans might have had different thoughts on these issues. During this period of mass diaspora, indigenous people, observed Ojibwe scholar David Treuer, brought "their culture and their understandings of themselves and community in its most general terms – their tribes with them."<sup>79</sup> The sacrifice of uprooting their

---

<sup>76</sup> David Treuer, *The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee: Native America from 1890 to the Present*, 131.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., 174.

lives and making new homes somewhere else meant relinquishing some governing authority. They persevered and continued to survive whatever was thrown their way.

American Indians advocates had a victory in 1924 when Congress passed the Citizen Act. Treuer explains legislation was as a “tool meant to curb abuses by non-Indians.”<sup>80</sup> The act stated “all non-citizen Indians born within the territorial limits of the United States be, and they are hereby, declared to be citizens of the United States: Provided that the granting of such citizenship shall not in any manner impair or otherwise affect the right of any Indian to tribal or other property.”<sup>81</sup> Previous laws mandated that they had to renounce the tribal citizenship in order to buy land. This new legislation allowed American Indians to become citizens of the US and remain citizens of their tribal nations. States still denied Native Americans the right to vote, though. Some argued Native Americans should not vote because they did not pay taxes on real estate and lived on lands held in federal trusteeship. Others argued it was not right for indigenous people to vote in both tribal and US elections.<sup>82</sup> The southwestern US kept American Indians from voting prior to World War II because of a fear of undue influence in local and state elections, according to Treuer. Since there was such a large number of Americans Indians, “their participation would likely skew elections away from desired Angle outcomes.”<sup>83</sup> Seven states denied suffrage to the Indigenous as of 1938 and it took federal pressure against New Mexico and Arizona to allow Native Americans to vote in 1948 (after thousands of Navajo, Hopi, Apache, and Pueblo fought in World War II).<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> David Treuer, *The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee: Native America from 1890 to the Present*, 200.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 201.

Recognition for the Nanticoke took a long time to achieve from when the first Europeans saw them. Captain John Smith and his men first saw the Nanticoke in 1608 and he wrote about them in his journal and letters.<sup>85</sup> The state of Delaware recognized the Nanticoke as a legal entity in 1881. In 1921 the Nanticoke people formed the Nanticoke Indian Association, garnering nonprofit status.<sup>86</sup> Their tribal lands include the Nanticoke Indian Center, the Nanticoke Indian Museum, and sixteen acres of land. They erected these buildings and acquired land after many years of hard work petitioning the governments of Maryland and Delaware for recognition and assistance.

The American Indians endured a tremendous amount of hatred and the belief they were inferior to the dominant white, mainstream American society. Social Darwinism prevailed in many institutions and white supremacy was prevalent, especially in the southern states. Some scholars, scientists, politicians, and others took Darwin's theory of evolution and subjected different cultures, people and groups to it creating a hierarchy. These ideas permeated society. Speck and his colleagues fought back against these horrible perspectives and assisted society in moving forward regarding new ways to view race. Boas is best known for his theories of cultural relativism, the belief of judging a group of people by their own cultural norms, mores, and practices not by the culture of the researcher. Charles King states,

the belief that our ways are the only commonsensical, moral ones has a powerful allure, especially when expressed in the language of science, rationality, religion, or traditions. All societies are predisposed to see their own traits as achievements and others' as shortcomings. But the core message of the Boas circle was that, in order to live intelligently in the world, we should view the lives of others through an empathetic lens.

---

<sup>85</sup> Frank G. Speck, "History," 6.

<sup>86</sup> "History," The Nanticoke Indian Tribe, copyright 2011, <https://www.nanticokeindians.org/page/history>.

We ought to suspend our judgment about other ways of seeing social reality until we really understand the, and in turn we should look at our own with the same dispassion and skepticism with which we study far-flung peoples.<sup>87</sup>

It is only natural for individuals to think their way is the best. However, when it comes to the larger whole it can be dangerous, subjugating certain races.

Speck took cultural relativism to heart and that is evident in his scholarship. One of his earliest works was *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware*, published in 1915. The name Nanticoke means “people of the tidewaters” in their language of Nantaquak. Nantaquak is a part of the larger Algonquian group of languages that is a common language of indigenous Americans in the Northeast.<sup>88</sup> The other prevalent language group is Iroquoian, a family of six languages, spoken by the Haudenosaunee.

*The Nanticoke* is a brief study, only forty-three pages, but a thorough one. He provides an introduction explaining how he started working on this ethnography in 1911. Other sections include history, physical characteristics of the region, agriculture, fishing, hunting, and other forms of industry as well as local customs, folklore, archaeology, and tales. At the very end he explores the variations of English words in the local dialect. Speck conducted field work in the winters and springs of 1911 and 1915 and was assisted by his student Anthony F. C. Wallace and a Nanticoke informant, Mr. W. R. Clark. Dr. W. D. Wallis of Penn also assisted Speck in investigating the community. The Museum of the American Indian in New York City (the prior home of the collection of Smithsonian’s National Museum of the American Indian in Washington, D.C.) and the Heye Foundation published the book in 1915. Along with

---

<sup>87</sup> Charles King, *Gods of the Upper Air: How a Circle of Renegade Anthropologists Reinvented Race, Sex, and Gender in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Doubleday, 2019), 8 – 9.

<sup>88</sup> “History,” The Nanticoke Indian Tribe, copyright 2011, <https://www.nanticokeindians.org/page/history>.

ethnographic field work, Speck also collected approximately 100 objects of material culture relating to the different industries listed above. The objects were sent to the Museum of the American Indian for further study and investigation.<sup>89</sup>

As mentioned earlier, scholars thought Eastern Woodland tribal nations were too acculturated or had changed too much from their pre-contact cultures. *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware* details a group that researchers before Speck would not have chosen for study. Speck introduces the public to the idea that some of the people are tri-racial. The Nanticoke consisted of two bands, one living in Indian River Hundred in Sussex County and the other band living in Cheswold in Kent County, Delaware. He describes, “Some of the individuals have straight hair, fair skin, and blue eyes; some have brown skin and kinky or curly hair; others have broad faces and straight, black hair, the color and general appearance of Indians.”<sup>90</sup> One tradition explaining how this intermingling happened is sailors from a Moorish pirate ship shipwrecked near the Indian River Inlet and married some of the local people.<sup>91</sup> Some disagree with the story, but there is a general consensus about a shipwreck among the people interviewed. Speck was “inclined to credit the general claim that Moorish sailors might have been shipwrecked on the treacherous shoals off the southern Delaware coast and come ashore to the shelter of the Indian natives.”<sup>92</sup> The story of the Moors intermarrying with the Nanticoke people was largely written as matter of fact.<sup>93</sup> I mention this origin story because of, I

---

<sup>89</sup> The Heye Foundation and the Museum of the American Indian were essentially the same. They are different names for the same institution Heye established.

<sup>90</sup> Frank G. Speck, “Introduction,” *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware*, New York: Museum of the American Indian and the Heye Foundation, 1915, 2.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>93</sup> Historians still debate the reasons why Indian River Hundred band called themselves Moors. The latest researcher was Chris Slavens who compiled the different news articles and previous research on the topic in his blog “Revisiting the Delaware Moors, Part 1: The Legends,” PeninsulaRoots.com, last modified August 26, 2016, <https://peninsularoots.com/2016/08/26/revisiting-the-delaware-moors-part-i-the-legend/>. The conclusion is historians still do not know why but there is enough compelling evidence to warrant further investigation. Slavens

imagine, how unusual it must have been for readers and academics in the early twentieth century to learn about this small band related to the larger Nanticoke Lenni - Lenape people of New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland. This tale assists in illustrating Speck's non-judgmental view on who Native Americans were and continue to be.

Speck explores the history of the two bands, how they ended up in their current location of Millsboro, Delaware, and examines their foodways/tools and industries. For example, he examines their production of corn. The predominant crop Speck describes as showing "more surviving native characteristics" is corn.<sup>94</sup> The tools used in cultivation and planting of the corn are described including the corn-husking peg. The peg is used to husk the ears of corn which are then thrown in a pile for women and children to gather into large baskets. Fishing is one of the most important activities for the Nanticoke. Oak and pine eel pots caught eels and other fish in a fashion that is characteristic of Atlantic Coast tribes south of the St. Lawrence river.<sup>95</sup> Basketry is another industry important not to only the Nanticoke but most, if not all, American Indians. Only a few styles have survived over the years, mainly utilitarian uses. Speck describes the various plants and berries used to produce dyes to color baskets such as myrtle berries for varying shades of purple, red, and dark brown as well as pokeberries for a pink color.<sup>96</sup> These are only some of the tools and industries surveyed by Speck in his study.

The Turkey Shoot, also referred to as a shooting match, is one of the local customs that Speck believed/found has parallels to the historical activity.<sup>97</sup> It is also referred to as a shooting match. Generally convening in Autumn, the Nanticoke gathered at different houses where

---

thinks the legends of shipwrecks or pirates is unlikely. He thinks it could be the band was named after the town they use to live in Moortown according to an 1896 news article from the Smyrna Press.

<sup>94</sup> Frank G. Speck, "Agriculture and Food," 10.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.

<sup>96</sup> Frank G. Speck, "Other Industries," 25.

<sup>97</sup> Frank G. Speck, "Local Customs," 27.

women gossiped and cooked food and men retired to a corner of the property with their shotguns. Speck recorded slips of paper were purchased from the owner and attached to the sticks poking out of the ground. The turkey or chicken that was for winning was shown and the men shot at the slips that have their initials written on them. Historically, the Nanticoke men would compete against each other to see who could shoot the head off the bird.<sup>98</sup> The Turkey Shoot has evolved over the years from the ancient sport described by the Swedish Lutheran priest John Campanius (1601-1683), “The sachem causes a turkey to be hung up in the air, of which the bowels being taken out and the belly filled with money, he who shoots the bird down gets the money that is within it.”<sup>99</sup> As one can see the custom does not harm the animal at first: it is merely the prize.

Speck was also interested in folklore of the Nanticoke. He recorded and explored their traditional beliefs, customs, and stories spread by word of mouth and passed down through the generations. This section of his work consists of the instructions and herbal remedies curing various ailments from horsemint for colds and eel skin wound around parts affected by rheumatism.<sup>100</sup> Other remedies include tobacco smoke blown into a cup of water then drunk to cure stomach pain and cobwebs and/or soot used to heal cuts.<sup>101</sup> Weather was predicted by animal behavior and nature. Speck shares an interesting way to tell if it will rain the next day: “If you kill a snake and throw it into a tree, it is a sign that it will rain the next day if the carcass hangs in the branches, but if it falls through the branches the next day will be clear.”<sup>102</sup> The

---

<sup>98</sup> Ibid.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid.

<sup>100</sup> Gladys Tantaquidgeon, a Mohegan medicine woman and anthropologist (studied under Speck), conducted original research into the medical practices, in the 1920s to the 1940s, of the Nanticoke in her book *Folk Medicine of the Delaware and Related Algonkian Indians* (Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 2001, fourth edition). She incorporated previously published and unpublished material on the subject, including Speck’s 1915 work.

<sup>101</sup> Frank G. Speck, “Folklore,” 29.

<sup>102</sup> Frank G. Speck, “Weather Signs,” 33.

Nanticoke possessed, and still do, an immense amount of knowledge of the land and how to read it. He added the folklore section because he felt that folk communities across the United States were garnering more importance to ethnology.<sup>103</sup>

Speck ended his book with tales of the Nanticoke and a short list of vocabulary words pertaining to the local variation of English. The stories act as cautionary tales. They are not necessarily original to the indigenous community because some of the stories were widespread among European-Americans and African Americans.<sup>104</sup> For example, the “Rabbit and Fox Raise a Crop” story explores the themes of asking for all the information before making decisions. Speck recorded a handful of “phonetic peculiarities” of the local English dialect spoken by the Nanticoke. It renders their speech difficult to understand at first by other people from the Mid-Atlantic states.<sup>105</sup> Most likely speakers of the indigenous language adapted it over the years and mixed some of their words or sounds with the dominant language (English) of their area to produce a particular dialect unique to the area. It is not surprising that Speck included language in the study because of his educational background. Speck entered the field of anthropology through linguistic studies at Columbia University.

Speck provides observations on a tribal group who continued to live on some of the land of their ancestors and adapted to their surroundings. His observations also show how much of a generalist he was. All facets of American Indian life interested Speck. *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware* is a useful primary source of anthropology. It also provides a steppingstone for interested students and readers to explore further scholarship. A reader sees cultural relativism in action because Speck’s writing is not judgmental. As mentioned earlier the

---

<sup>103</sup> Ibid.

<sup>104</sup> Frank G. Speck, “Tales,” 38.

<sup>105</sup> Frank G. Speck, “The Local Dialect of English,” 40.

appearance of the Nanticoke reflected their tri-racial background. Speck noted the Nanticoke were considered “colored people” before the Civil War but none were slaves themselves.<sup>106</sup> They fought for recognition as indigenous people and won, securing it from the state of Delaware in the early twentieth century.<sup>107</sup> Many scholars at the time may have skipped over this band of Nanticoke because the larger tribal nation broke up sometime before 1748 joining other nations and the descendants of the small group that remained behind in Delaware were a mix of European, African, and Native American ancestry.<sup>108</sup> That did not deter Speck from conducting research among the small band for five years. Readers receive a clear understanding of who the Nanticoke are, their history, and some of their present lives in 1915.

Frank Speck was interested in fishing, hunting, and trapping practices, which the information found compromised the largest section of the study. Anthony F. C. Wallace, one of Speck’s former students at the University of Pennsylvania who visited the Nanticoke with Speck, commented there was “a simmering internal dispute with a long history raged quietly over the extent to which the Indians should preserve their claim to Indianness or simply merge with the local black population.”<sup>109</sup> The uniqueness of this community of Nanticoke led to resentment by some in the surrounding non-indigenous communities. Wallace noted in his essay, “A Field Trip to Indian River with Frank G. Speck,” that Speck’s fieldwork itself indirectly aided in the Nanticoke efforts in recreating their indigenous ethnic identity.<sup>110</sup> Today, most people of Nanticoke descent are either a part of the different Lenape groups or live among the general

---

<sup>106</sup> Frank G. Speck, “Introduction,” 4.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., 8.

<sup>109</sup> Anthony F. C. Wallace, “A Field Trip to Indian River with Frank G. Speck,” in *The Life and Times of Frank G. Speck* by Roy Blankenship (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Publications of Anthropology, 1991), 86.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid.

American population.<sup>111</sup> People living in the Mid-Atlantic who want to learn more about local indigenous tribal nations and communities can read *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware* and see a people proud of their identity as Nanticoke.

Another way to discover the Nanticoke is through the objects Speck collected and the Native American Voices exhibit at the Penn Museum. The museum houses a very small number of objects from the Nanticoke people. At times Speck sold objects he collected to fund his field work including three objects from the Nanticoke. Samuel Pennypacker was one of the university's auditors and was wealthy. He unofficially attended Speck's courses and accompanied him to the field.<sup>112</sup> He bought many artifacts from his teacher at the time which were later donated to the Museum.<sup>113</sup> They included a corn husking peg (70-9-265), unfinished pipe (70-9-266), and a charm (70-9-275) from the Nanticoke.<sup>114</sup> The corn husking peg shows the use of more "modern" material – rubber – to make the thong attached to the small peg. The unfinished pipe is one piece created from holly root. The charm is for a teething baby. A tiny pink pouch carries mole feet and is worn around the baby's neck.<sup>115</sup>

Speck collected far and wide. The boundary between the United States and Canada did not stop him from studying the First Nations living in Canada. He assisted the Six Nations at Grand River in Ontario, previously mentioned in the last chapter, first dealing with stolen wampum belts. After collecting material, including two wampum belts, for the Victoria

---

<sup>111</sup> "Native Languages of the Americas: Nanticoke (Southern Delaware)," last modified 2015, <http://www.native-languages.org/nanticoke.htm>.

<sup>112</sup> "Biography," Samuel W. Pennypacker II Papers, Archival number 1093, Penn Museum Archives, last updated March 9, 2017, [http://dla.library.upenn.edu/dla/ead/ead.pdf?id=EAD\\_upenn\\_museum\\_PUMu1093](http://dla.library.upenn.edu/dla/ead/ead.pdf?id=EAD_upenn_museum_PUMu1093).

<sup>113</sup> Pennypacker's widow donated her husband's collection to the museum in 1968 and it was accessioned into the collection in 1970.

<sup>114</sup> "70-9-265 – Corn Husking Peg, 70-9-266 – Unfinished Pipe, 70-9-275 - Charm," Object records, Online collections, American Section, Penn Museum, accessed 3/1/2020.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid.

Memorial Museum in Ottawa he became directly involved with the Six Nations.<sup>116</sup> Speck purchased the belts from a Frenchman who married an Iroquois woman from the Oka Indian Reserve.<sup>117</sup> After selling the wampum belts to the museum, he asked the Six Nations chief Josiah Hill to provide Sapir, Victoria Museum's anthropology division head, with assistance in identifying the museum's wampum belts. It is in this context of assisting the Victoria Museum with provenance of the belts purchased from Speck that Hill told Speck that other wampum belts were stolen from the reserve and provided Speck with a photograph of the stolen belts. Through Speck's research and collecting he recognized the stolen belts in the photograph as the ones on display in the Penn Museum that George Heye loaned from his private collection.<sup>118</sup> The anthropological community knew that Heye was not always careful in noting where he acquired his objects. Heye denied any wrongdoing when the Department of Indian Affairs requested he provide information about the belts. Heye eventually conceded the wampum belts were stolen but he bought them in good faith and still refused to give them back. Decades later, in 1988, the belts were returned to the Six Nations.<sup>119</sup> Speck's involvement in assisting the First Nation shows the knowledge he gained from collecting. His focus on the ethical treatment of ethnographic indigenous material can have farther implications beyond academic scholarship. Speck's commitment to showing the general public that Native Americans were not frozen in time but continued to live assisted tribal nations in the efforts to fight against racist governmental policies.

---

<sup>116</sup> Siomonn Pulla, "'Would You Believe that, Dr. Speck?': Frank Speck and The Redman's Appeal for Justice," *Ethnohistory* 55 No. 2 (Spring 2008), 186, DOI 10.1215/00141801-2007-060.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., 186-187.

Frank Speck was an advocate and anthropologist interested in the present as well as the past early in his career. His book *The Nanticoke Community* showed the public and other scholars a group of American Indians different from their historical example and explores more than just their past. The Indian River Nanticoke were tri-racial individuals living in an area once filled by the larger Leni-Lenape and Delaware nations. The wampum belt incident shows the influence anthropologists could have on governmental agencies and Speck's role as an advocate.

## Chapter 3

### “FRIEND TO THE INDIAN”

The title of this chapter describes the reputation Speck gained for his approach to helping American Indians with issues they had. Speck felt more at home among American Indians than in the larger nonindigenous society and wanted to aid them where he could. His approach influenced the role of anthropologists today, as Siomonn Pulla noted, “which commonly includes acting as consultant and expert witness on issues connected to [indigenous] self-government and traditional land-use practices.<sup>120</sup> The rapport Speck created with individuals and groups led to greater cooperation in sharing their knowledge, an aspect of fieldwork of which an anthropologist should be mindful. Is the person I am speaking with telling me the truth about their culture or simply telling what I want to hear? Pulla mentioned that Speck noted “Indeed they are somewhat flattered to know that their cures, handed down through the ages, are now worth the interest of their white brethren and not considered just hocus pocus.”<sup>121</sup> If someone takes a genuine interest in what another person does or knows, the person who was asked will most likely be more willing to share knowledge and stories than to someone just asking questions for an assignment and not genuinely interested. The quote references the December 27, 1943 *Philadelphia Bulletin*, which featured an article detailing how Speck contributed to the war effort. Speck wanted to develop a stockpile of Native American herbal medicine to help wean the US off of its dependence on Asia for medical supplies. He established a specific

---

<sup>120</sup> Siomonn Pulla, “‘Would You Believe that, Dr. Speck?’ Frank Speck and The Redman’s Appeal for Justice,” *Ethnohistory* 55 No. 2 (Spring 2008), 185, DOI 10.1215/00141801-2007-060

<sup>121</sup> Ibid.

research unit to study the “medical-botanical lore of the [indigenous] peoples in Virginia, the Carolinas, and Louisiana.”<sup>122</sup> That noble goal has not yet been realized.

This chapter will show how Frank Speck saw American Indians as living people with stories to tell, not merely historical figures from early American history. Anthropologists were not the only ones who collected material culture during the early twentieth century, other people, such as George Heye, did as well. These two men were colleagues as well as patron and collector, but they had distinct collecting methodologies. One collected for a purpose of solving a particular problem (missing representation on a certain tribal nation in the museum) while the other collected anything and everything.

Similar to Speck, the Indian Rights Association, mentioned in the last chapter, thought of themselves as friends of the Indian. Unlike Boasian anthropologists who tried to see American Indians from their point of the view, the association “did not consider what Indians thought and what Indians themselves wanted.”<sup>123</sup> They may have wanted to help but their reforms contributed to taking the native out of the Native American. On November 17, 1940 Mark R. Harrington, a friend and colleague at the Southwest Museum, wrote a letter to Speck praising his treatment of the Penobscot in his book, *Penobscot Man* (1940). He noted, “I like your treatment of Indians as people, living people. Some students seem to regard them as bugs stuck on pins, as objects of study, nothing more; but you can’t look at them that way; and I can’t. If that is being unsophisticated and outmoded, let’em make the most of it.”<sup>124</sup> Harrington and Speck both

---

<sup>122</sup> Siomonn Pulla, “‘Would You Believe that, Dr. Speck?’ Frank Speck and The Redman’s Appeal for Justice,” *Ethnohistory* 55 No. 2 (Spring 2008), 197-198, DOI 10.1215/00141801-2007-060

<sup>123</sup> David Treuer, *The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee: Native American from 1890 to the Present*. (New York: Riverhead Books, 2019), 131.

<sup>124</sup> “November 17, 1940 Letter from M.R. Harrington to Frank Speck,” *Frank G. Speck Papers – Mss.Ms.Coll.126*, American Philosophical Society Library. <https://search.amphilsoc.org/collections/view?docId=ead/Mss.Ms.Coll.126-ead.xml;query=Frank%20Speck;brand=default>.

treated American Indians as people, not mere data points to be tabulated and evaluated against each other or the larger mainstream American society. Natural history museums (along with some early history museums such as the American Antiquarian Society) displayed American Indian material culture before museums dedicated to anthropology existed. As the field of anthropology formalized as an academic discipline, it first started in museums then later in universities.<sup>125</sup> The collections in natural history museums moved to the new anthropology museums to be studied and displayed according to culture.

Quite a few institutions other than the Penn Museum hold objects that Speck collected. Those institutions include the Reading Public Museum, Peabody Essex Museum, Denver Art Museum, the American Museum of Natural History, Victoria Museum (now called the Canadian Museum of History), and the Museum of the American Indian (now called the National Museum of the American Indian, a member of the Smithsonian Institution), among others.<sup>126</sup> George Gustav Heye (1874-1957) passionately and widely collected indigenous American material culture. He also used multiple means to acquire his objects - purchasing from dealers and anthropologists as well as supporting anthropologists and their museums. Clara Sue Kidwell, remarked about Heye's passion:

It produced one of the world's greatest collections of material from Native American culture, approximately one million objects, from exquisite Eskimo carved ivory to textiles from the Yamana (Yahgan) people of Tierra del Fuego at the tip of South America, but an anthropologist who knew Heye well observed, "He didn't give a hang about Indians individually, and he never seemed to have heard about their problems in

---

<sup>125</sup> William C. Sturtevant, "Forward," in *Collecting Native America 1870-1960*, ed. Shephard Krech III and Barbara A. Hail (Washington, D. C.: the Smithsonian Institute, 1999), v.

<sup>126</sup> Margaret M. Bruchac, *Savage Kin: Indigenous Informants and American Anthropologists* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2018), 140.

present-day society...George didn't buy Indian stuff in order to study the life of a people, because it never crossed his mind that that's what they were. He bought all those objects solely in order to own them—for what purposes, he never said.<sup>127</sup>

Heye stated he was bit by the “collecting bug” in his earlier career as an engineer on a railroad building project.<sup>128</sup> Native America fascinated him and he wanted to own some of baskets, clothes, and ceramics, among other objects and let someone else do the studying.

Herein lies a difference between some collectors and professional anthropologists who collect as part of their job. Anthropologist see objects as knowledge gatekeepers, by fully understanding the object one can understand what part of the culture the object comes from. For instance, Speck studied the Eastern band of the Cherokee at Big Cove in North Carolina. Ceremonialism, religion, and medicine fascinated Speck so much he studied these aspects in almost every indigenous group he encountered. One ritual the Cherokee still perform today is the ball game (or stickball). The aforementioned scratchers are used in the game along with drums and ball sticks. The Ball Game is a similar cousin to lacrosse; however, instead of using one stick to throw the ball to another teammate, a Cherokee person uses two sticks to scoop and “shove” the ball along the ground.<sup>129</sup> Speck acquired a set of wooden ball sticks with spiral bands decorating the grip (46-6-25A-B) with spoon-shaped ends which are considered to be the only ones of their type known.<sup>130</sup> The spoon-shaped sticks predated the netted sticks. According to Victoria Lindsay Levine, “ball play traditionally served to maintain cosmic balance and peace

---

<sup>127</sup> Clara Sue Kidwell, “Every Last Dishcloth: The Prodigious Collecting of George Gustav Heye,” in *Collecting Native America 1870-1960*, ed. Shephard Krech III and Barbara A. Hail (Washington, D. C.: the Smithsonian Institution, 1999), 232-233. See also Kevin Wallace, “Slim-Shin’s Monument,” *New Yorker*, November 19, 1960, 118.

<sup>128</sup> Clara Sue Kidwell, “Every Last Dishcloth: The Prodigious Collecting of George Gustav Heye,” in *Collecting Native America 1870-1960*, ed. Shephard Krech III and Barbara A. Hail (Washington, D. C.: the Smithsonian Institution, 1999), 232.

<sup>129</sup> “46-6-25A-B” object record, Cherokee Collection, Penn Museum, accessed January 28, 2020

<sup>130</sup> Ibid.

through the symbolic enactment of conflict and resolution. The ritual complex that frames ball play may include scratching, a special daytime dance, medicine rites performed by a shaman, betting, orations, feasts, and night dances. Originally, the Ball Game constituted part of a larger ceremonial cycle that lasted several days.”<sup>131</sup> Speck details the purpose of a drum (46-6-80) he collected that is the same type and half the size of those traditionally used in the game ball dance.<sup>132</sup> John Witthoft (1921 – 1993), one of his last students, accompanied him on his trips to the Big Cove Band of Cherokee from 1932-1940.

The Innu material culture comprises another large collection of Speck’s. He spent thirty years on and off investigating the Montagnais of Lake St. John and the Barren Ground band of Innu (Naskapi) of Labrador. Between 1929 to 1931 Speck acquired significant collections from this region ranging from winter coats, moccasins, and pouches, just to name a few. Speck’s goal, Fowler-Williams explains, “was to understand the underlying belief system connecting objects and ways of life to the supernatural world. He identified the concept of reciprocity as central to the dynamic relationship between humans and nature.”<sup>133</sup> Killing animals, for the Innu, is a sacred occupation that requires certain “knowledge of traditional rules and conduct” which need to be carried out by every hunter.<sup>134</sup> If that does not happen a hunter can perish from starvation. The collection reflects this relationship between animal and human. In 1930 Speck purchased small wooden animal figurines including a wolverine (30-3-93), bear (30-3-95), beaver (30-3-96), and porcupine (30-3-97). The Innu tanned caribou hide to create coats themselves. 31-7-7 is a child’s coat painted with red, blue, and yellow curvilinear decorations.<sup>135</sup> A man’s coat (31-

---

<sup>131</sup> Victoria Lindsay Levine, “Feathers in Southeast American Indian Ceremonialism,” *Expedition Magazine* 33 No. 2 (1991), Penn Museum, <<http://www.penn.museum/sites/expedition/?p=3952>>

<sup>132</sup> “46-6-80” object record, Cherokee Collection, Penn Museum, accessed January 28, 2020.

<sup>133</sup> Lucy Fowler Williams, *Guide to the North American Ethnographic Collections at the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology*, (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 14.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>135</sup> “31-7-7” object record, Innu Collection, American Section, Penn Museum, accessed February 11, 2020.

7-1) is also painted with red, blue, and yellow decoration around the bottom and front with beaded fringe across the shoulders.<sup>136</sup> Speck collected tools as well, including a stamper. The maker of the stamper (30-3-150) carved two deep indents into the bone for three ridges used to stamp the paint as a body or facial decorations.<sup>137</sup>

Many of the records for objects Speck collected share a characteristic hallmark of his – indigenous names. Ernest Stanley Dodge (1913 – 1980), a colleague, friend, and former director of the Peabody Museum, remarked that Speck meticulously obtained “every scrap of information about each piece he could obtain—its maker, its owner, its use, its history, its symbolism, the source of its designs.”<sup>138</sup> This included learning the indigenous language and recording the individual names of the objects he collected. For example, the name for the previously mentioned Cherokee drum is *ahuhi*.<sup>139</sup> The record for a gourd container (46-6-88) contains the native name, *gugu*, and the maker and user, Nancy Conseen, from the Snowbird Band of Eastern Cherokee.<sup>140</sup> All the information found on the record Speck jotted down on any piece of paper he could obtain - postcards, scraps, notepads. For example, he collected a bear patella (70-9-514) from the St. Augustine Band of Innu used for divination. On both sides of a piece of cardboard barely larger than the patella, Speck wrote, “Naskapi St. Augustine Band, Bear patella used in divination. Put on hot stone or stove. If it moves answer is yes, if not it is no. See F. G. Speck, *Naskapi*, p. 162 From Synbes Mak, chief.”<sup>141</sup> Keepers (those responsible for the collection) later typed the catalogue card with Speck’s information and a reference to the page number in the 1977 edition of his book. All the information Speck recorded is a part of what

---

<sup>136</sup> “31-7-1” and object record, Innu Collection, American Section, Penn Museum, accessed February 11, 2020.

<sup>137</sup> “30-7-150” and object record, Innu Collection, American Section, Penn Museum, accessed February 11, 2020.

<sup>138</sup> Ernest S. Dodge, “Speck on the North Shore,” in *The Life and Times of Frank G. Speck* ed. Roy Blankenship (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Publications in Anthropology, 1991), 47.

<sup>139</sup> “46-6-80” object record, Cherokee Collection, American Section, Penn Museum, accessed January 28, 2020.

<sup>140</sup> “46-6-88” object record, Cherokee Collection, American Section, Penn Museum, accessed January 28, 2020.

<sup>141</sup> “70-9-514,” Innu collection, American Section, Penn Museum, accessed February 11, 2020.

anthropology museum professionals regard as provenance and provenience. Provenance is the detailed history of where the object has been since its creation. Provenience centers around the context of the object including place of origin, culture, history, and proximity to other artifacts – in essence the meaning of the object.

Just like Heye, Speck was a passionate collector. However, he “collected objects for a purpose and with a specific problem in mind,” writes William Fenton, a friend and former student, “and then he used them for research, in teaching, and in publication.”<sup>142</sup> Speck also collected things in his personal life, too. Dodge explains he was a pack rat, collecting trash out of people’s bins, old stones, animal bones, string, paper clips as well as antiques, beadwork, moccasins, and more from antique stores and auctions.<sup>143</sup> He was also a naturalist with a fondness for reptiles such as turtles and snakes. People might wonder why an anthropologist would keep all sorts of reptiles and lichens and plants if he or she studied Native American material culture? It actually makes perfect sense to also consider natural history for collecting because the Cherokee, Oneida, Seneca, Innu, and Penobscot used flora and fauna as integral to their very way of life. “All common living things,” Dodge describes, “animal life, ferns, mosses, lichens, herbs, flowering plants, shellfish—were grist for his mill in communication with Indians. They too were interested in all-natural things and the topic served as an entree to get conversation going and break the ice. Frank’s studies of nature also served for a continuing series of small papers on ethnobotany, ethnozoology, and the medicinal, spiritual, artistic, or

---

<sup>142</sup> William Fenton, “Frank G. Speck’s Anthropology (1881 – 1950),” *Man in the Northeast* No. 40 (1990): 99. ILLIAD TN: 2429487

<sup>143</sup> Ernest S. Dodge, “Speck on the North Shore,” in *The Life and Times of Frank G. Speck* ed. Roy Blankenship (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Publications in Anthropology, 1991), 47.

other uses of plants and animals.”<sup>144</sup> Finding common interests helps to build rapport with people who may be distrustful of outsiders, especially ones who ask many questions.

Speck’s collecting strategy was methodical attempting to provide a more holistic sense of the tribal nation. In contrast, Heye collected everything and constantly wanted “new” objects from tribal nations’ past, not their present. Harrington also collected for Heye and frustratingly realized Heye strictly wanted the past, which is illustrated in a story Kidwell uses in her chapter.

The story goes,

He was more interested in Indian cultures of the distant past than in the living cultures of his time. He supported M. R. Harrington’s excavations in ancient cave sites, but when an elderly Osage man offered to teach Harrington his rituals and language and give the museum his bundles and other possessions, Heye would not support the effort. A Potawatomie medicine man came from Kansas to Shawnee, Oklahoma, to meet Harrington and promised to teach him “all he knew about herbs and their use in doctoring, and to show me the actual herbs growing so that I could have them identified with their ‘white man names.’” He would then give the museum his “prescription sticks,” with their carved symbols of herbs used in doctoring disease. Heye dismissed the projects, saying “We can’t spare the time.”<sup>145</sup>

Harrington, much like Speck, thought of himself as an anthropologist where listening to elders share their knowledge is his job. They were not mere collectors. On July 17, 1946, Heye sent Speck a demanding letter stating, “Have really been disappointed that you found nothing for me

---

<sup>144</sup> Ibid., 50.

<sup>145</sup> Clara Sue Kidwell, “Every Last Dishcloth: The Prodigious Collecting of George Gustav Heye,” in *Collecting Native America 1870-1960*, ed. Shephard Krech III and Barbara A. Hail (Washington, D. C.: the Smithsonian Institution, 1999), 251. See also M. R. Harrington, “Memories of My Work with George G. Heye,” National Museum of the American Indian Archives, New York City, New York.

in such a long while. Get busy and find me something on this trip and all will be forgiven.”<sup>146</sup>

The methodical Speck and the “take everything” Heye seem at odds. Steven Lubar writes:

Over the past few decades, many museum curators have begun to think of new stories, beyond Art History 101. More and more, they are interested in objects that tell a range of stories. Indeed, they’re not just collecting objects; they’re collecting stories, collecting meaning. Sometimes, the story is in the object itself: its creation, its use. Sometimes it’s the way it relates to other objects, the role it played in society. Collecting objects for the stories they tell allows museums to make an argument for the value of collections, and to focus collecting. It lets them make a case for an object being significant: a part of history, useful for teaching and research.<sup>147</sup>

Speck collected stories; Heye did not believe they were important enough to collect.

As noted above Speck kept the names of the makers and/or users of the objects he collected, if he knew the information. He also photographed the people he met and the activities they performed to help illustrate his work. *The Nanticoke Community* contains pictures of men and women in the community showing non-indigenous individuals who the Nanticoke are. Many of Speck’s photographs are located at the APS library, the Penn Museum, and the National Museum of the American Indian. A Cherokee basket he collected has a fascinating story. From a photograph, Lottie Stamper of Cherokee, North Carolina, in the 1940s reproduced a Cherokee telescope basket housed in the British Museum that was taken to England in 1744.<sup>148</sup> The basket is a double weave, pineapple design created from natural cane with natural color and dyed

---

<sup>146</sup> George G. Heye, “Letter to Speck,” *Frank G. Speck Papers – Mss.Ms.Coll.126*, American Philosophical Society Library. Accessed January 22, 2020.

<sup>147</sup> Steven Lubar, *Inside the Lost Museum: Curating, Past and Present* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017), 34.

<sup>148</sup> “46-6-49A-B” object record, Cherokee Collection, American Section, Penn Museum, accessed on January 28, 2020.

butternut.<sup>149</sup> It was actually obtained by John Witthoft. The tiny basket shows a “new technique introduced among the Eastern Cherokee about 1915. The use of runners for basketry shows no greater antiquity among these Cherokee but is traditional among the Oklahoma Cherokee (use of buckthorn roots for basketry).”<sup>150</sup> This basket shows Speck also collected objects that were evidence of new techniques.

George Heye concerned himself greatly with the accuracy of provenance of the objects collected for his museum.<sup>151</sup> He pushed Boas and other anthropologists to “clarify the names” of the indigenous nations who owned the object.<sup>152</sup> If no provenance was given Heye felt compelled to create one. Although Heye’s approach to collecting and research was very different than Speck’s, Speck “remained friendly with him throughout their lives, although [Speck] could see little value in Heye’s attitudes and goals,” according historian Clara Sue Kidwell (White Earth Chippewa and Choctaw).<sup>153</sup>

By modern standards, Speck had a number of faults as an anthropologist. As a university professor he spent his summers and any other time off in the field. This led to short trips and a continual correspondence from his office with his indigenous informants.<sup>154</sup> Fenton illustrates the limitations of this method , which Speck used for several of his monographs, including not being able to verify in person verbal accounts of tribal ceremonies like he did before in his earlier work.<sup>155</sup> Speck also did not always check the ethnohistorical sources in the library and

---

<sup>149</sup> Ibid.

<sup>150</sup> “46-6-59” object record, Cherokee Collection, American Section, Penn Museum, accessed on January 28, 2020.

<sup>151</sup> Clara Sue Kidwell, “Every Last Dishcloth: The Prodigious Collecting of George Gustav Heye,” in *Collecting Native America 1870-1960*, ed. Shephard Krech III and Barbara A. Hail (Washington, D. C.: the Smithsonian Institution, 1999), 252.

<sup>152</sup> Ibid.

<sup>153</sup> John Witthoft, “Frank Speck: The Formative Years,” in *The Life and Times of Frank G. Speck* ed. Roy Blankenship (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Publications in Anthropology, 1991), 7.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid., 14.

was usually inclined to let others synthesize that information.<sup>156</sup> This method was part of his way of training his graduate students.

Another limitation that Margaret Bruchac explores is Native American heritage. Most, if not all, biographies of Frank Speck describe how he met Fidelia Fielding (Mohegan/Pequot) at a young age and grew up hearing and speaking Mohegan because of it. Bruchac attempts to verify this in her book *Savage Kin: Indigenous Informants and American Anthropologists*. In her section “Fictive Kin” she notes that in Speck’s early publications he explicitly mentions meeting Fielding as a college student but later his colleagues and biographers “embraced (and appears to have originated the myth) that young Frank, as a sickly child, was sent away to live with Mohegan Indians.”<sup>157</sup> Whether he did or not can be verified. Bruchac implies that Speck pretended to be a Native American and used that to collect their material culture,

At heart, it seems that Frank Speck was an opportunist and a sort of ethnographic shapeshifter, willing to participate in whatever fictive kinship would offer him the best access to desired material or data. Native people welcomed him because he was generous, kind, and nonjudgmental. He allowed his white colleagues to imagine that he had Native ancestry or Native kin, perhaps as a means to explain his desire to cross social color lines or avoid compliance with white social norms.<sup>158</sup>

In other words, Speck used what other people thought of him to his advantage. It is important with historical discussions to consider the perceptions of Native and non-Native Americans at the time Speck was working in the early twentieth century versus those in 2020. Bruchac speaks to non-indigenous white scholars, students, and members of the general public to enlighten them

---

<sup>156</sup> Ibid.

<sup>157</sup> Margaret M. Bruchac, *Savage Kin: Indigenous Informants and American Anthropologists* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2018), 149.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid., 164.

on the full relationships between anthropologists and their informants. Indigenous informants were more than just passive liaisons between their mostly white researchers and members of tribal nations, they were active gatekeepers of their knowledge. Many of Speck's skills regarding indigenous culture he gained from the people he collaborated with instead of a fictional native upbringing perpetuated by his students, which obscures the contributions of the many people who worked alongside Speck.<sup>159</sup>

Bruchac spends most of the fictive kin section describing the possible ways of how the myth originated, most likely from his students, John Witthoft and Loren Eisley.<sup>160</sup> Speck may have longed to be Native American but he had never explicitly said he was. His children remember their father imagining he was indigenous, but Speck found genetic evidence that he was not. Speck did not seem to correct his colleagues and friends when they assumed he must be part Native American that is why he so easily learned their languages and admired their philosophy.<sup>161</sup> Bruchac extrapolates from the lack of discouragement his students and colleagues filled in the gaps with guesses that became the standard background story of Frank Speck's early life. The problem of ancestry lies more with his students and associates, not Speck, who seemed unable to imagine their professor as just an anthropologist keenly interested in American Indians, he had to have native blood to be so interested. From a modern perspective, it is not unusual for a person to dream about being a part of a different group than his or her own or having a different life. That is not the problem, but it can become a problem when that said person explicitly pretends to be a part of that different group. It is unclear if Speck outwardly pretended to be an American Indian, especially to gain friendship with potential informants, which is

---

<sup>159</sup> Ibid., 152.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid., 151.

<sup>161</sup> Margaret M. Bruchac, *Savage Kin: Indigenous Informants and American Anthropologists* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2018), 151.

doubtful. It is clear, from reading his papers and history of late nineteenth to early twentieth century American Indians, that Speck felt a deep, deep appreciation of and connection with the indigenous people on the east coast.

In the 1940s the Seneca adopted Speck into the Turtle Clan and gave him the “free name Gahehdago:wa (Great Porcupine)” after more than ten years of fieldwork and collaboration.<sup>162</sup> If Speck pretended to be Native American, he would not have been adopted into a special clan for outside friends. In January 1950 Speck traveled to the see the Midwinter Rites performed by the Seneca. It was after the ceremony that he fell ill and came back to Pennsylvania. He later died on February 6, 1950, at the University of Pennsylvania Hospital.

---

<sup>162</sup> William Fenton, “Frank G. Speck Anthropology (1881-1950), in *The Life and Times of Frank G. Speck* ed. Roy Blankenship (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Publications in Anthropology, 1991), 29.

## CONCLUSION

### We Are Still Here

Individuals collect items for different reasons: social prestige, the thrill of the chase, economic hoarding, curiosity, and nostalgia, among others. Anthropologists collect objects to understand a culture: the learned and shared knowledge used by the society to generate behavior and interpret experience. The field evolved over time to focus more on theory and less on large-scale collecting. Written in 2017, Steven Lubar describes,

Anthropology museums have always collected broadly, both objects and documentation, but their focus has changed over time. They originally tried to collect “pure” culture of an imagined primitive past, based on theories of social evolution. Ethnographic collecting went out of favor at the end of the twentieth century, and archaeological collecting became more difficult, restricted both by new ethical guidelines and by political realities. Some anthropological museums have begun to focus their collecting on the complexities and cross-connecting cultures of the contemporary world.<sup>163</sup>

Museums still collect, usually on a smaller scale, relying on gifts, bequests, and purchases. Most artifacts excavated by archaeologists now are recorded and placed in museums in the site’s country or state of origin. American Indians and anthropology museums collaborate more than ever before with the passage of NAGPRA. Consultants and researchers from various tribal nations assist curators in correcting information and finding ways to supplement the collection with contemporary pieces.

---

<sup>163</sup> Steven Lubar, *Inside the Lost Museum: Curating, Past and Present* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017), 22.

The accuracy of the cultural information given to past and present anthropologists by their informants depends on multiple factors. These factors include the memory of the informant. Is he or she describing the ideal ritual versus how the ritual was actually performed? Is the person telling the anthropologist what he or she wants to hear? Besides knowledge gatekeepers not saying everything, curators also put their own interpretations on the information and stories collected with the objects. Scholars from different institutions may not consider how other museums interpret similar objects and information. To begin to ameliorate this, Margaret Bruchac is teaching her students in museum anthropology how to uncover hidden information from objects. Specifically, in 2015, she used objects from the Pennypacker collection to conduct “restorative” research to bring more of the indigenous information scattered around the country in multiple archives and museums back to the objects at the Penn Museum.<sup>164</sup> It was unknown if Pennypacker ever sold any of the objects Speck collected for him to other people or museums. Students found that Speck collected all the objects Pennypacker owned. Bruchac found no record of Pennypacker ever selling the objects he bought from Speck and he displayed the objects in his mansion outside Philadelphia.<sup>165</sup> In conclusion, she explains this type of “focused approach to investigating museum objects, and the stories people tell about objects, can help students develop more nuanced awareness of Indigenous collections, and gain more sensitive understandings of why, and to whom, these collections and these histories matter.”<sup>166</sup> By understanding the whole history of the collection from the anthropologist who collected it to the

---

<sup>164</sup> Margaret Bruchac, “The Speck Connection: Recovering History of Indigenous Objects,” Penn Museum, last modified May 20, 2015, <https://www.penn.museum/blog/museum/the-speck-connection-recovering-histories-of-indigenous-objects/>.

<sup>165</sup> Ibid.

<sup>166</sup> Ibid.

people they belong to, we can better engage with the appropriate collaborating communities and assist the general public in knowing why the material culture is important to American Indians.

Indigenous individuals who research and visit the American section to view Speck's collections today comprise most of the researchers visiting the museum. Teachers bring their students to view material from their tribal ancestors stored there. This spring a visiting group of Innu (Naskapi) students accompanied by their assistant principal and director of the Naskapi liaison office came to view the Innu collection mentioned in chapter three. In late 2018 Jill Goldberg, the director of the Naskapi Liaison for the Central Quebec School Board saw a blog post concerning a child's hunting coat and cap written by Bruchac and recent Penn graduate Ben Kelser.<sup>167</sup> Goldberg, along with Principal Joseph Whelan and Assistant Principal Shannon Uniam, brought the four students of the senior class to visit the United States culminating in a two-day visit to the Penn Museum to view the Innu/Naskapi collection collected by Speck. Goldberg explained, "this is about giving these students a chance to reconnect with their story."<sup>168</sup> Upon seeing the objects the students and assistant principal had an immediate personal reaction to the objects their tribal ancestors created. Uniam shared "the first thing I thought about as I walked in was my grandfather, and the first thing I saw were the leggings. I was kind of shocked. I felt like my grandfather was there with me."<sup>169</sup> Speck started a relationship with the Naskapi almost a hundred years ago and now his collection again is sparking a relationship with the community. These connections between the objects and the descendent communities

---

<sup>167</sup> Louisa Shepard, "Naskapi Connections: Restorative Research in the Penn Museum Collection," *Penn Today* April 8, 2020. <https://penntoday.upenn.edu/news/canada-naskapi-nation-visit-penn-museum-native-american-collection>.

<sup>168</sup> Ibid.

<sup>169</sup> Ibid.

are what Bruchac hopes for to be a bridge between generations as well as museums and communities.<sup>170</sup>

Anthropology has changed since Franz Boas started teaching it to a bright, eager class of students in the early twentieth century, one which included Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, Alfred Kroeber, Edward Sapir, and Frank G. Speck. While they were not all in the same class, they were contemporaries and colleagues. Kroeber was Boas's first student and received the first doctorate in anthropology from Columbia in 1901. Sapir and Speck graduated the same year (1905) with their master's degrees. They also held the same fellowship at the Penn Museum one year after each other as well as collaborated occasionally throughout their careers. Around a decade later Ruth Benedict studied under Boas; she graduated in 1923 and became a professor at Columbia. Margaret Mead learned from both Benedict and Boas graduating with her master's degree in 1924. Besides Speck, all these anthropologists formulated theories concerning languages, nature v. nurture, and culture and personality. They also worked across and outside the United States.

Instead of researching overseas like Mead, Speck ventured into his own backyard, becoming one of the first to seriously study American Indians of the Eastern Woodlands. He set a path for the understanding of all indigenous people and advocating for their recognition. Speck became part of a pivotal cadre of scholars revolutionizing the study of race and the American consciousness. He accomplished this through collecting Native American objects that provide a glimpse into the historical lives of the first Americans on the east coast. By understanding the motivations and reasoning behind the collection, museums can more easily collaborate with indigenous communities to correct wrongs, return sacred objects, and assist the public in better

---

<sup>170</sup> Ibid.

understanding the lives of the first Americans. His landmark work also provides a glimpse for the American Indians who are still here.

## REFERENCES

Anonymous, "Running Against Time: Medicine Woman Preserves Mohegan Culture." Penn Arts & Sciences Newsletter, Summer 2001.

<https://www.sas.upenn/sasalum/newsltr/summer2001/running/html>.

Brimo, Rene. *The Evolution of Taste in American Collecting*. Translated by Kenneth Haltman. University Park: Penn State Press, 2016)

Bruchac, Margaret M. *Savage Kin: Indigenous Informants and American Anthropologist*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2018.

Cherokee Collection. "46-6-25A-B – Shinny Sticks, 46-6-32 - Scratcher, 46-6-33 – Scratcher, 46-6-49A-B – Basket, 46-6-59 – Basket, 46-6-80 – Drum, 46-6-88 – Gourd Container

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip. "Reconciling American Archaeology & Native America." *Daedalus* 138 No. 2 (Spring 2009): 94-104. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40543939>

"Cultural Relativism." Lumen.

<https://courses.lumenlearning.com/culturalanthropology/chapter/cultural-relativism/>.

DeLucia, Christine. "Antiquarian Collecting and the Transits of Indigenous Material Culture: Rethinking "Indian Relics" and Tribal Histories." *Common-place.org* 17, no. 2 (Winter 2017). <http://common-place.org/book/antiquarian-collecting-and-the-transits-of-indigenous-material-culture-rethinking-indian-relics-and-tribal-histories/>

DeLucia, Christine. "Fugitive Collections in New England Indian Country: Indigenous Material Culture and Early American History Making at Ezra Stiles's Yale Museum." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 75 No. 1 (January 2018). DOI: 10.5309/willmaryquar.75.1.0109.

Dodge, Ernest. "Speck on the North Shore." In *The Life and Times of Frank G. Speck 1881-1950*, edited by Roy Blankenship, 38 - 51. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Publications in Anthropology, 1991.

Fenton, William N. "Frank G. Speck's Anthropology (1881-1950)." In *The Life and Times of Frank G. Speck 1881-1950*, edited by Roy Blankenship, 9 - 37. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Publications in Anthropology, 1991.

Fenton, William N. "Frank G. Speck's Anthropology (1881-1950)." *Man in the Northeast* No. 40 (1990): 95 – 101. ILLIAD TN: 2429487

Frank G. Speck Papers – Collection # Mss.Ms.Coll.126, American Philosophical Society Library. <https://search.amphilsoc.org/collections/view?docId=ead/Mss.Ms.Coll.126-ead.xml;query=Frank%20Speck;brand=default>.

“History,” The Nanticoke Indian Tribe, copyright 2011.  
<https://www.nanticokeindians.org/page/history>.

Innu Collection. “31-7-7 – Child’s Coat, 31-7-1 – Man’s Coat, 30-7-150 – Stamper, 70-9-514 – Bear Patella.” Objects records. Storage and Online Collections. American Section. University of Pennsylvania Museum. Accessed February 11, 2020.

Kidwell, Clara Sue. “Every Last Dishcloth: The Prodigious Collecting of George Gustav Heye,” in *Collecting Native America, 1870-1960*, edited by Shepard Krech III and Barbara A. Hail, 232 - 259. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institute, 1999.

King, Charles. *Gods of the Upper Air: How a Circle of Renegade Anthropologists Reinvented Race, Sex, and Gender in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Doubleday, 2019.

Kopytoff, Igor. “A Short History of Anthropology at Penn.” *Expedition* 48 No. 1 (2005).  
<https://www.sas.upenn.edu/anthropology/sites/www.sas.upenn.edu/anthropology/files/page/A%20Short%20History%20of%20Anthropology%20at%20Penn.pdf>.

Levine, Victoria Lindsay. “Feathers in Southeast American Indian Ceremonialism.” *Expedition Magazine* 33 No. 2 (1991). University of Pennsylvania Museum.  
<<http://www.penn.museum/sites/expedition/?p=3952>>.

Louis Shotridge Papers. Archival Collection Number 0047. University of Pennsylvania Museum Archives. [http://hdl.library.upenn.edu/1017/d/ead/upenn\\_museum\\_PUMu0047](http://hdl.library.upenn.edu/1017/d/ead/upenn_museum_PUMu0047).

Lubar, Steven. *Inside the Lost Museum*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017.

Nanticoke Collection. “70-9-265 – Corn Husking Peg, 70-9-266 – Unfinished Pipe, 70-9-275 – Charm.” Objects records. Online Collections. American Section. University of Pennsylvania Museum. Accessed March 1, 2020.

“Native Languages of the Americas: Nanticoke (southern Delaware).” Last modified 2015.  
<http://www.nativelanguages.org/Nanticoke.html>.

Pezzati, Alessandro. "A Brief History of the Penn Museum" *Expedition* 54.3 (2012) *Expedition*. Penn Museum, 2012 Web. 08 Jul 2020 <<http://www.penn.museum/sites/expedition/?p=14305>>

Pulla, Siomonn. “‘Would You Believe It, Dr. Speck?’ Frank Speck and *The Redman’s Appeal for Justice*.” *Ethnohistory* 55 No. 2 (Spring 2008). DOI: 10.1215/00141801-2007-060.

Samuel W. Pennypacker II Papers. Archival Collection Number 1093. University of Pennsylvania Museum Archives. Last updated March 9, 2017.  
[http://dla.library.upenn.edu/dla/ead/pdf?id=EAD\\_upenn\\_museum\\_PUMu1093](http://dla.library.upenn.edu/dla/ead/pdf?id=EAD_upenn_museum_PUMu1093).

Saribas, Pauline. “Quillwork-Embellished ‘Cree’ Coat: Object Analysis for Anthropology of Museums.” Penn Museum Blog, April 18, 2015. <https://www.penn.museum/blog/museum/quillwork-embellished-cree-coat/>.

Shepard, Louisa. “Naskapi Connections: Restorative Research in the Penn Museum Collection,” *Penn Today* April 8, 2020. <https://penntoday.upenn.edu/news/canada-naskapi-nation-visit-penn-museum-native-american-collection>.

Slavens, Chris. “Revisiting the Delaware Moors, Part 1: The Legends,” *PennisulaRoots.com*, last modified August 26, 2016. <https://pennisularoots.com/2016/08/26/revisiting-the-delaware-moors-part-i-the-legend/>.

Speck, Frank G. *The Nanticoke Community of Delaware*. New York: Museum of the American Indian and the Heye Foundation, 1915.

Starn, Orin. “Here Come the Anthros (Again): The Strange Marriage of Anthropology and Native America.” *Cultural Anthropology* 26 No. 2 (2011): 179 – 204. DOI 10.1111/j.1548-1360.2011.01094.x

Sturtevant, William C. “Forward.” In *Collecting Native America 1870-1960*, edited by Shepherd Krech III and Barbara A. Hail. v. Washington, D. C.: the Smithsonian Institute, 1999.

Treuer, David. *The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee: Native America from 1890 to the Present*. New York: Riverhead Books, 2019.

Wallace, Anthony F. C. “A Field Trip to Indian River with Frank G. Speck.” In *The Life and Times of Frank G. Speck 1881-1950*, edited by Roy Blankenship, 85 – 101. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Publications in Anthropology, 1991.

Welch, Natalie M., Jessica Siegele, and Robin Hardin, “For the *Sga-Du-Di* (Community): Modern Day Cherokee Stickball,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 41 No. 2 (2017) 94, DOI 10.17953/aicrj.41.2.welch

Williams, Lucy Fowler. *Guide to the North American Ethnographic Collections*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2003.

Witthoft, John. “Frank Speck: The Formative Years.” In *The Life and Times of Frank G. Speck 1881-1950*, edited by Roy Blankenship, 1 – 8. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Publications in Anthropology, 1991.