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ABSTRACT

During the 1960s and 1970s, the waterways of the Pacific Northwest played host to fish-ins held by Indigenous communities as they sought to protect their way of life and ensure the continued recognition of their treaty rights to fish on and off their reservations. The Treaty of Medicine Creek of 1854 and Treaty of Point Elliot of 1855 guaranteed the fishing and hunting rights of Indigenous groups of the Pacific Northwest in “all usual and accustomed grounds and stations.” Due to impacts from hydroelectric dams, a growing lumber industry, sportsmen fishing, and other stresses on the waterways, salmon populations declined drastically. The conservation policies set forth by states restricted Indigenous fishing methods and sites, thus infringing on their rights. In response, Indigenous fishers actively defied the regulations and began to organize in the early 1960s, leading to what were called “fish-ins.” Although some scholars have described the overall Fish Wars as “women-led” demonstrations, historians have given the role of Indigenous women little scholarly attention.

To expand the scholarship on the experience of Indigenous women of the Fish Wars in the 1960s and 1970s, this project seeks to combine public history and decolonial methodology into three main components: an exhibit, which includes content and design; a grant application for a mobile humanities unit; and an article on student-led decolonial public history projects.

The goals of this project are: 1) Recover the stories of the Fish Wars, a series of Indigenous-led demonstrations to protect fishing and treaty rights, and the roles and experiences of Indigenous women, creating a more complete story of the Pacific Northwest’s past; 2) Democratize the modes of knowledge production by increasing their accessibility to ordinary people and communities through a mobile humanities unit; 3) Design a project grounded in decolonial public history methodology, adhering to principles of collaboration, relationality, and shared authority.
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Project Narrative

A. Nature of Proposal

This proposal, submitted to the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Division of Public Programs for a Discovery Grant, constitutes a request for $18,358 to fund the Fish Wars: Stories of Cultural Survival and the Activism of Native Women project’s inaugural phase. The Discovery stage of this project involves the planning of a mobile humanities unit that will engage with and present marginalized histories of the Pacific Northwest. Fish Wars: Stories of Cultural Survival and the Activism of Native Women aims to recover the stories of Indigenous women activists and their role in the Fish Wars of Washington State. In the 1960s and 1970s, Indigenous peoples gathered along the riverbanks of the Pacific Northwest to protect their right to fish in all “usual and accustomed grounds.”¹ As state conservation regulations threatened their fishing rights, three small tribes of the southern Puget Sound area—the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot—gained national attention for their efforts to protect their treaty rights.² NEH funding will support the exploratory stages of a mobile humanities unit that will bring tribal representatives, community stakeholders, and humanities scholars together to design an experience that not only highlights Pacific Northwest Indigenous history, but also promotes the long-term goal to democratize knowledge production.

The mobile humanities unit is an experimental mobile platform that can be transformed into an exhibit gallery, maker and workshop space, recording studio, movie theater, and performance venue. The project seeks to design a space where communities can gather, learn, and create, emphasizing the important role ordinary people play in knowledge production. Due to its mobility and flexibility, the mobile humanities unit increases the accessibility of the history-making process. By bringing the mobile humanities unit to communities and encouraging their participation, the project seeks to identify, digitize, and promulgate histories that have been overlooked and purposefully excluded from the standard historical narrative, upholding the public history principles of collaboration, inclusivity, and shared authority. These principles also support the work of decolonial public history, a methodology grounded in collaborating with Indigenous scholars and community members. Collaboration with Native partners will launch a larger project of ensuring Pacific Northwest Indigenous history is brought to mainstream avenues and larger audiences. The mobile humanities unit intends to tour the Pacific Northwest, bringing


² Federal policies of the 1950s—such as House Concurrent Resolution 108 (1953) that effectively terminated federal aid, services, and protection to selected groups of tribes—commonly targeted smaller tribes because they lacked the financial means and internal organization to fight the policies in court. Similarly, the policing efforts of Pacific Northwest waterways targeted the smaller tribes of the Puget Sound area because state authorities assumed they would not have the means to resist state regulations.
stories of Indigenous women within the fishing rights dispute as well as other important moments of Pacific Northwest Indigenous history that have been excluded from the region’s historical narrative.

The goals of this project are: 1) Recover the stories of the Fish Wars and the roles and experiences of Indigenous women, creating a more complete story of the Pacific Northwest’s past; 2) Design a project grounded in decolonial public history methodology, adhering to principles of collaboration, relationality, and shared authority; 3) Democratize the modes of knowledge production by increasing their accessibility to ordinary people and communities; 4) Hold a series of planning meetings and workshops with tribal representatives, tribal community members, and technical experts to discuss the content and design of the mobile humanities unit.

B. Humanities Content

*Recovering the stories of marginalized communities and creating a more complete historical narrative.*

“The right of taking fish, at all usual and accustomed grounds and stations, is further secured to said Indians in common with all citizens of the Territory…”

— Treaty of Medicine Creek, Article III

On December 26, 1854, the first governor of Washington Territory, Isaac Stevens, met with chiefs and delegates from the Nisqually, Puyallup, Steilacoom, Squawskin (Squaxin Island), S’Homamish, Stechass, T’Peeksin, Squa-aitl, and Sa-heh-wamish nations to sign the Treaty of Medicine Creek, in which the United States received 2.24 million acres of Indigenous land in exchange for the establishment of three reservations, payment of annuities, and recognition of Indigenous right to fish and hunt “all usual and accustomed grounds and stations.” In the Treaty of Point Elliott (1855), the Muckleshoot tribes signed similar treaty agreements, and the terms regarding their fishing and hunting rights were nearly identical. In the 1960s, descendants of the treaty signers lined the banks of Pacific Northwest waterways to protect those fishing rights promised to their people one hundred years prior.

For decades after the treaties, Washington State imposed hardly any regulations on Indigenous fisheries, but by the late-nineteenth and early twentieth century, the state slowly increased its regulations and conservation efforts. In 1883, railroad workers drove the last spike of the Northern Pacific transcontinental line with Tacoma as the railroad’s terminus, effectively connecting Puget Sound with the rest of the country. With the newly established connection, large scale lumber and agriculture operations increased in Western Washington, attracting new waves of settlers. Between 1880 and 1890, the population of the Puget Sound area increased from nearly 25,000 to over 180,000. In the early twentieth century, population growth, the construction of dams, increased logging operations, and other industrial pollutants caused a sharp

---

3 Ibid.
decline in the anadromous fish population, especially salmon and steelhead. With more people living in the Pacific Northwest, commercial and sport fishing industries also developed, increasing competition for an already declining fish population.

To manage the depleted resources, Washington State established the Department of Fisheries, to regulate food fish and the Department of Game to regulate game fish in 1932. Both departments declared that those fishing off reservation would be subject to state regulations and had to abide by sport and commercial fishing regulations. State regulations outlawed certain types of fishing equipment, many of which targeted Native fishers and their traditional gear. For example, in 1935, the departments outlawed fish wheels, and in 1939, the state legislature passed a Fisheries Code as a conservation measure, prohibiting the use of “set gear”—a generic term that included the types of nets favored by Native fishers. In 1942, the verdict of Tulee v. Washington provided a vague interpretation of Native fishing rights, ultimately deciding that the state possessed the power to impose regulations on Native fishers if it was deemed necessary for the conservation of fish. Ambiguous court decisions and harsher enforcement by state authorities pushed more Native fishers to fish solely on their reservations, where the state had no jurisdiction. However, the best fishing grounds were often beyond the boundaries of their reservations. When Native fishers argued that these regulations were in direct violation of the Treaty of Medicine Creek, Washington State and the media portrayed these Native fishers as non-compliant to the progressive conservation policies that were meant for the public good.

5 The Pacific Northwest salmon crisis has been documented and analyzed by numerous humanities scholars, particularly environmental historians. In the late 1980s and 1990s, environmental histories grappled with the relationship between the human and nonhuman, natural world. Scholars applied these themes of environmental history to Pacific salmon fisheries, moving history beyond the shorelines to include coastal waterways and riparian areas. Pacific Northwest Indigenous groups and their fisheries were, and still are, central to discussions on the salmon crisis, but the early works of Arthur McEvoy, Joseph Taylor, and James Lichatowich often only considered Indigenous fisheries as part of “precontact” societies. Largely sparked by Shepard Krech’s The Ecological Indian: Myth and History (1999), new historiographical trends shifted towards an Indigenous perspective on the salmon crisis and contemporary issues of resource management, leading to works by Roberta Ulrich, Lissa Wadewitz, and Joshua Reid. For additional reading see, Richard White’s The Organic Machine (1995); Joseph E. Taylor’s Making Salmon: An Environmental History of the Northwest Fisheries Crisis (1999); James Lichatowich’s Salmon Without Rivers: A History of the Pacific Salmon Crisis (1999); Roberta Ulrich’s Empty Nets: Indians, Dams, and the Columbia (1999); Lissa Wadewitz’s The Nature of Borders: Salmon, Boundaries, and Bandits on the Salish Sea (2012); Joshua Reid’s The Sea is My Country (2015).

6 For example, in 1945, only 46 gillnetters fished for sockeye along the Nisqually River, which jumped to 322 in 1953 and 637 in 1957. Charles Wilkinson, Messages from Frank’s Landing (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2000), 30.

7 William Sherman, “Case #9225339: Su’Zan Satiacum,” 1966, NIYC Papers, University of New Mexico Center for Southwest Research, Box 19, Folder 5, 23.

8 In Klickitat County, Sampson Tulee, a member of the Yakima tribe, was convicted of fishing with a net without having a fishing license. He appealed on the grounds that paying for a fishing license went against his fishing and treaty rights. Although the case upheld the rights of Native fishers to fish in their “usual and accustomed places,” it gave state fisheries managers the right to decide which measures were conservation measures. Tulee v. Washington, quoted in American Friends Service Committee, Uncommon Controversy: Fishing Rights of the Muckleshoot, Puyallup, and Nisqually Indians (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1970), 90.

9 Native fishers did not often have the financial means to purchase expensive boats or fishing equipment that would enable them to fish offshore in Puget Sound. They were thus confined to the rivers where state authorities could monitor them easily. Fay G. Cohen, Treaties on Trial: The Continuing Controversy over Northwest Indian Fishing Rights (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1986), 70.
In the 1950s, tribal authorities and councils attempted to resolve the fishing rights dispute through negotiation and compromise. With an agenda of assimilation, federal termination policies ceased federal aid and protection to tribes. In 1953, Public Law 280 allowed states to exercise criminal and civil jurisdiction over reservations. Washington State later passed a series of laws in 1957 and 1963 that adopted Public Law 280, extending the power of state authorities to reservation lands. Although these laws excepted fishing rights at the time, tribal authorities had little support from the federal government. With the increased media attention and regulations, many tribes felt that they could affect little change in state policies, so tribal authorities often sought conciliation in response to rising tensions. This approach caused only a small number of tribal members to fish illegally off-reservation in the 1950s.

However, by January 1964, a group of Native fishers frustrated and angered by state regulations and the hesitant action taken by tribal authorities and councils established the Survival of American Indians Association (SAIA), an organization dedicated to resolving the fishing rights dispute through direct action and civil disobedience. Members of SAIA organized a campaign in which they conducted fish-in demonstrations, nonviolent protests where they would fish at “all usual and accustomed grounds and stations” in active defiance of state regulations. In the southern Puget Sound area, fish-ins occurred on the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Green Rivers. As word spread of their effectiveness, Native fishers implemented this model of protest across the Pacific Northwest. Conflicts between Native fishers and state authorities amplified in the early 1960s, and three small tribes in the southern Puget Sound area of Washington State entered the public spotlight—the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot—as they led fierce fishing rights campaigns.

Throughout the 1960s, the SAIA and other Native fishers staged fish-ins, treaty treks, and marches to protect their fishing rights and protest the unfair fishing regulations sanctioned by Washington State. Unlike the approach of tribal governments in the 1950s which shied away from media attention, the organizers of fish-ins often notified the press to announce when and where their demonstration would take place in order to gain the most publicity. In February 1964, the movement attracted the support of the National Indian Youth Council (NIYC), a Native student organization founded in 1961 in New Mexico and dedicated to progressing Native

---

10 Under the 1957 state act, Washington State asserted full jurisdiction over 11 tribes, and under the 1963 state act, Washington State asserted limited jurisdiction over all other tribes in the state. American Friends Service Committee, 57 and 84.

11 From the mid-1940s to mid-1960s, a series of federal laws and policies were designed with the intention to assimilate Native Americans into mainstream American society. The policy ceased the federal government’s relationship with tribes, ending recognition of tribal sovereignty, trusteeship over reservations, and Native Americans being excluded from state laws. American Friends Service Committee, 123. For a Native perspective on termination policy, see Vine Deloria Jr.’s Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto (1969). Deloria argues that termination policy was a guise used by the federal government to obtain more Native land.

12 The most prominent location for fish-ins during the Fish Wars was a site along the Nisqually River, known as Frank’s Landing. In 1916, the city of Tacoma removed 40,000 acres from the Nisqually Reservation as part of 60,000 acres given to the United States Army to build Fort Lewis. The acreage taken from the Nisqually Reservation included several miles of the Nisqually River—traditional fishing areas. To protect his communities’ “usual and accustomed grounds and stations,” Willy Frank Sr. bought a six-acre plot along the Nisqually River from Winthrop Humphrey Bennett.
The NIYC’s involvement brought new energy and structure to the fish-in movement as well as national attention. Publicity also increased when several celebrities joined the cause. Actor Marlon Brando was arrested on March 2, 1964, for catching two steelhead trout in the Puyallup River, and comedian Dick Gregory was arrested for participating in a fish-in demonstration in the Nisqually River on February 16, 1966. As the coalition of Native fishers and non-Native supporters grew, so too did the state’s policing efforts.

At fish-ins, state authorities and game wardens prowled the riverbanks, waiting for Native fishers to cast their nets to arrest them. As more Native men were imprisoned, Native women fished in their stead. Women, such as Janet McCloud (Tulalip), Ramona Bennett (Puyallup), Su’Zan Satiacum (Kaw), Maiselle Bridges (Nisqually), and Alison Bridges (Puyallup), became prominent leaders in the Fish Wars, confronting state authorities in increasingly violent fish-in demonstrations. On October 13, 1965, Janet McCloud led a group of fishers at a fish-in along the Nisqually River that turned violent when state officials attacked the fishers. In response to severe policing in the late 1960s, Native fishers answered with more militant tactics. On August 13, 1970, Charlie Cantrell announced that tribal organizations would police their fish-ins and fishing encampments to ensure the protection of their people. Ramona Bennett, leader of a fishing encampment along the Puyallup River, supported the possession of firearms by Native fishers. On September 9, 1970, state authorities raided the fishing encampment along the Puyallup River, leading to the most violent confrontation of the Fish Wars.

Individually, these demonstrations had varying levels of impact, but together, they formed a unified front of Native fishers demanding that their treaty rights be honored. By 1971, it appeared that Native fishers had gained public and state favor—fishers at Frank’s Landing made it through the entire fishing season without any arrests. The change in sentiment and increased public support seemingly concluded the Fish Wars with the passing of the Boldt decision in 1974. On February 12, 1974, Judge George Boldt handed down his verdict on United States v. State of Washington, after nearly four years of discovery, pretrial motions, and the trial. His decision affirmed the rights of several Western Washington tribes to fish off-reservation in accordance with treaties signed in the 1850s; promised Native fishers half of the fish harvest each year; and protected their rights to regulate their own fisheries. With state regulations protecting their treaty rights, activities and demonstrations of the Fish Wars ceased. Conversations on how Native agencies and state agencies would co-manage the Northwest’s riparian environment defined the following decades.

The Fish Wars were part of a larger Native rights movement that swept the United States in the 1960s and 1970s. The activism of the Native fishers involved in the fish-in movement echoed the

---

13 For further reading on the NIYC’s participation in the Fish Wars, see Bradley G. Shreve’s Red Power Rising: The National Indian Youth Council and the Origins of Native Activism.
15 State authorities arrested 60 men, women, and children and bulldozed the encampment site “Indians will Police Fish-Ins,” Seattle Post-Intelligencer, (Seattle, WA), August 14, 1970, B.
16 Although the Boldt decision provided clear language for the protection of Native fishing rights and Native fisheries, the Pacific Northwest salmon crisis continues to be an area of contention. State and tribal agencies are still determining the best ways to collaborate with each other in salmon and watershed management.
17 The U.S. Supreme Court declined to hear the case, thus establishing the Boldt decision as the precedent.
calls for self-determination, tribal sovereignty, and protected treaty rights heard throughout the country. The content of this project contributes to a growing corpus of scholarship focused on expanding our understanding of the Native rights movement and Indigenous women activism.

Previous scholarship on the Native rights movement focuses on the media-garnering events, such as the 1969 Occupation of Alcatraz Island, the 1972 “Trail of Broken Treaties” march and takeover of the Bureau of Indian Affairs building in Washington, D.C., the 1973 Wounded Knee Occupation, and the 1978 “Longest Walk” from San Francisco to Washington, D.C.\(^\text{18}\) By centering on these events, scholarship likens the Native rights movement to the activities of the male-led American Indian Movement (AIM). By doing so, historians lionized male leadership and the confrontational tactics that were typical of AIM, leaving women’s participation in these demonstrations overlooked and their efforts severely under analyzed.

Recent trends in the historiography of Native American activism reconsider the chronological, geographical, and ideological boundaries of the Native rights movement. Vera Parham’s work establishes the importance of Native activism within the Pacific Northwest by examining protests that occurred on Washington State reservations in the 1950s and the fish-in movement of the 1960s and 1970s. Daniel Cobb redefines Native political activism as one with reformative goals, characterized by informal political action, rather than transformative goals, much like AIM’s occupations, in his assessment of the Northwest fish-ins and the National Indian Youth Council.\(^\text{19}\) However, even with these scholarly expansions, a discussion on Indigenous women’s efforts, both their roles and ideological motivations, is often marginalized or excluded. If a scholarly work provided an historical account on Indigenous women in the Native rights movement, it was typically within a chapter, article, or brief aside, never taking the foreground of the historical analysis.

Scholars such as Annette Jaimes Guerrero (Juaneño/Yaqui), Nancy Shoemaker, Devon Abbott Mihesuah (Oklahoma Choctaw), and Andrea Smith explore the role of Indigenous women within the Native rights movement and examine their involvement using the small but growing corpus of Indigenous feminist theories.\(^\text{20}\) Indigenous feminism is not to be confused with or thought of as a reiteration of mainstream feminism, which elicits various responses amongst Indigenous women and scholars. Even during the Native rights movement of the 1960s and 1970s,

\(^{18}\) For additional reading on these media-garnering events, see Alvin M. Josephy Jr., Joane Nagel, and Troy Johnson’s edited volume *Red Power: The American Indians’ Fight for Freedom*; Troy Johnson, Joane Nagel, and Duane Champagne’s edited volume *American Indian Activism: Alcatraz to the Longest*; Troy Johnson’s *The Occupation of Alcatraz Island: Indian Self-Determination and the Rise of Indian*; and Paul Chaat Smith and Robert Allen Warrior’s *Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee*.

\(^{19}\) For additional scholarship that considers Native activism beyond AIM, see Charles Wilkinson’s *Blood Struggle: The Rise of Modern Indian Nations*; Daniel Cobb’s *Native Activism in Cold War America: The Struggle for Sovereignty*; Bradley G. Shreve’s *Red Power Rising: The National Indian Youth Council and the Origins of Native Activism*; and Vera Parham’s *Pan-Tribal Activism in the Pacific Northwest: The Power of Indigenous Protest and the Birth of Daybreak Star Cultural Center*.

\(^{20}\) For additional reading on Indigenous women’s activism within the Native rights movement and Indigenous feminism, see: Nancy Shoemaker’s *Negotiators of Change: Historical Perspectives on Native American Women* (1995); Devon Abbott Mihesuah’s *Indigenous American Women: Decolonization, Empowerment, and Activism* (2003); Andrea Smith’s “Native American Feminism, Sovereignty and Social Change” (2005); Andrea Smith and J. Kēhaulani’s “Native Feminisms Engage American Studies” (2008); Cheryl Suzack, Shari M. Huhndorf, Jeanne Perreault, and Jean Barman’s edited volume *Indigenous Women and Feminism: Politics, Activism, Culture* (2010).
Indigenous women struggled to accept the Western idea of feminism, worrying that it would create more division rather than unification for their efforts. As a political movement and academic discipline, feminism historically addressed issues of equality pertaining to white, middle-class women. Minority women were often excluded from these discussions, or their colonial history was not taken into consideration. Women from marginalized communities dealt, and continue to deal with, the effects of colonialism and how it imposed ideas of Western gender roles and patriarchal structures. To these women, the imposition of gender roles and patriarchy fused feminism to colonialism.

One of the most prominent scholarly works on Native American women and feminism, Annette Jaimes Guerrero’s article, “American Indian Women: At the Center of Indigenous Resistance in North America,” argues that most Native women activists do not consider themselves feminists, believing feminism to be an imperial project and interlinking feminism with struggles for sovereignty. If Indigenous women wanted to partake in feminist inquiry, they were seemingly forced to choose between feminism or their struggle for Indigenous sovereignty. However, scholars such as Andrea Smith and J. Kēhaulani Kauanui (Kanaka Maoli) claimed such a choice oversimplified Native women’s theories about feminism. Thus, Indigenous feminism pushes against such dichotomies that pit feminists against non-feminists; recognizes that a single, monolithic definition of Indigenous feminism is not appropriate because of the wide, varied experience that Indigenous women have with efforts of colonialism along with their own unique cultural traditions and practices; and addresses sexism while promoting Indigenous sovereignty.

As Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars reconcile Indigenous women with more nuanced definitions of feminism, our collective understanding of Native women activism expands. Works by Verna St. Denis (Metis and Okemasis) and Kim Anderson (Cree and Metis) consider themes of motherhood in Native women activism. Elizabeth Archuleta (Yaqui/Chicana) suggests that

21 Although many Indigenous women disregarded the label of “feminist,” they were more willing to accept the label of “activist,” as Devon Abbott Mihesuah stated in her 2003 study, Indigenous American Women: Decolonization, Empowerment, and Activism.


25 Contemporary Indigenous feminist scholar Verna St. Denis (Metis and Okemasis) described that Indigenous women hold a “distinct valorization of maternalism and motherhood in Aboriginal cultures.” However, Western ideas of motherhood and its relation to Western feminism often misperceived Indigenous women’s embracement of maternity as essentialist. Kim Anderson (Cree and Metis) countered the essentialist critique by explaining that maternity is “the source of Indigenous female authority in the family and in the governance of our pre-colonial nations.” During the Red Power movement, motherhood grounded Indigenous women activism. Indigenous women activists rooted themselves in and drew authority from the ideas set forth by their ancestors’ matrilineal societies, understanding that if future generations gained their Indigenous heritage through their mothers, then it was their responsibility to ensure that continuity. Verna St. Denis, “Feminism Is for Everybody: Aboriginal Women, Feminism, and Diversity,” in Making Space for Indigenous Feminism, ed. Joyce Green (Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing, 2007), 38. Kim Anderson, “Affirmations of an Indigenous Feminist,” in Indigenous Women and
an “Indigenous feminist ethos of responsibility” compels Indigenous women to ensure cultural survival, empower their communities, and heal from collective trauma. By emphasizing “responsibility” within our analysis of the Fish Wars, Indigenous women’s activism and efforts situate themselves within a legacy of Indigenous women resistance. Their responsibility stemmed from the acts of their ancestors and the needs of their communities. This project aligns with these recent efforts, largely led by both Indigenous and non-Indigenous women scholars, to enrich the Native rights movement by addressing the Indigenous-women-sized gap in the historical narrative and expand the scholarly understanding of Indigenous women activism.

Historical records highlight the role Indigenous women held in the fishing rights dispute and some even depict the Fish Wars as women led. However, researchers are often left questioning: Who were these women? Why did women take charge in planning and organizing the fish-in demonstrations? What informed and motivated their activism? Did they consider their actions activism? The answers to these questions and others not only recover the histories of marginalized communities, but also increase our understanding of the activism of Native women.

In response to the fishing rights dispute, a 1966 report from the American Friends Service Committee suggested: “There is need for an aggressive program of public education regarding the treaties (their content and status), Indian fishing practices, the legal status of Indian fishing rights, and continuing significance of fishing to the Indians.” Such a program still does not exist, and the general public lacks an understanding of Pacific Northwest treaties and Indigenous histories. The goal of the mobile humanities unit and Fish Wars: Stories of Cultural Survival and the Activism of Native Women seeks to fill that educational void. Indigenous women leaders of the Fish Wars are essential to telling the full story of Pacific Northwest tribes. Their roles as cultural protectors must be included in any educational programming to showcase how Indigenous women offer unique perspectives and need to be included in current and future conversations on ecosystem management.

**Developing a public history project grounded in decolonial public history.**

Research endeavors with Indigenous histories have long been associated with a colonized conception of what knowledge is and how it is obtained, leaving Indigenous histories distorted...
and underrepresented. Historically, historians and researchers have taken an ethnographic approach to their studies, making deductions and inductions on Indigenous cultures without receiving input from members of the studied culture. Not only does this perpetuate the idea that Indigenous individuals and groups are entities to be examined and observed, like science experiments, but it also suggests that Native epistemologies and research methodologies are inferior to Western claims of knowledge. Recent trends in public history favor projects and programs embedded with themes of collaboration, inclusivity, meaningful community engagement, and reflective practices. The collaborative nature of public history offers a unique space for Indigenous and non-Indigenous partners to work together in the history-making process, making public history projects valuable opportunities to decolonize historical research and the discipline of history as a whole.

Only recently have public historians applied decolonial research methodology to their projects and programs. Decoloniality in research abandons the authority of the dominant culture, often a colonial presence, and instead favors Indigenous ways of seeking and defining knowledge. Decolonial practices recognize the validity of Indigenous epistemologies and methodologies and seek to actively incorporate them within research and projects. Indigenous research methodologies use techniques and methods drawn from cultural practices and traditional practices, including storytelling, sharing circles, personal reflection, and formal and informal ceremonies. Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars use the principles of shared authority, contact zones, storywork, relationality, and survivance to apply Indigenous methodologies to both academic research and public history projects.

Shared authority evokes the collaborative nature of public history by emphasizing the relationship between scholars and stakeholders. The principle requires researchers and project teams to consider the perspectives of all involved stakeholders, not just those of credentialed scholars, and demands that an asymmetrical relation of authority is not reinforced. Originally suggested by Michael Frisch in 1990, public historians have implemented shared authority in the field of public history for decades, and more recently, shared authority has been employed as a means for decolonial methodology. In this project, Indigenous participants, credentialed or not,

29 Ethnographic narratives are numerous, and early twentieth century scholarship on Native communities is embedded with a rhetoric of victimization and that idea that the Native culture and existence illustrated a vanishing America. For examples of early twentieth century scholarship, see Paul Radin’s *The Story of the American Indian* (1927) and Angie Debo’s *And Still the Waters Run: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes* (1940).

30 The field of public history has benefitted from scholarship that pushes the boundaries of how historical institutions and organizations produce and disseminate knowledge. For example, Nina Simone’s *The Participatory Museum* (2010) provides practical guidance to developing visitor participation experiences that transform cultural institutions and organizations into dynamic, relevant community gathering spaces. Other scholarship, such as The Inclusive Historian’s Handbook, a digital reference source, provides concrete examples of how public historians can make history more engaging and meaningful, [https://inclusivehistorian.com](https://inclusivehistorian.com). Works such as these center on the ways in which public history can be made more equitable, inclusive, and diverse.


32 Margaret Kovach’s *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts* rejects a pan-Indigenous approach to research, arguing that Indigenous research methods are tied to culturally specific systems of knowledge. Although similar themes emerge from Indigenous methodologies, it must be recognized that each Indigenous community’s approach is unique.

will take an active role in the narration of their history in order to break the cycle of historical research methods that seek to study Indigenous individuals and objects rather than engage with and learn from them.

A term coined by Cuban sociologist Fernando Ortiz in the 1940s and later studied by Mary Louise Pratt in the 1990s, “contact zones” has become shorthand for the negotiated spaces where cultures meet and grapple with one another while practicing shared authority. Contact zones require a reexamination of the Western claim to historical objectivity, significance, and accuracy. Western historical methodology favors objectivity, written documents, an avoidance of presentism, and an unemotional assessment of the past, but Indigenous historical narratives reject that, upholding the complexities and subjectivity found in the past. Western ideals of explicitness resulted in weak or misinterpreted translations of Indigenous stories, which are often steeped in implicit meanings. As the mobile humanities unit serves as a space where community members who are part of marginalized and underrepresented communities can tell their histories, in their own voices and on their own grounds, it acts as a contact zone and honors the subjectivity found in the past through storywork and relationality.

“Storywork,” a term contrived by Jo-Ann Archibald (Stó:lō), asks scholars to become storytellers, reaching beyond standard academic discourse and creating an environment for dynamic dialogue between scholar, stakeholders, and community members within a project. Archibald, having researched the process of storytelling with Indigenous Coast Salish/Stó:lō Elders, asserts that storytelling is a form of cultural work. Storywork involves a deeper understanding of Indigenous traditional life and experiences, which can only evolve from meaningful partnerships with Indigenous partners. Partnerships with Indigenous stakeholders and community members require the practical application of respect, responsibility, reverence, and reciprocity. From these principles emerges relationality. The Discovery stage of the project supports storywork and relationality by actively seeking opportunities to develop personal connections with tribal representatives through collaborative meetings and community workshops.

Originally set forth by Gerald Vizenor, “survivance” is common sense gained from the adverse experiences of colonization and cultural domination. He likens survivance to a “tragic wisdom,” arguing that it is the Indigenous voice within stories that denies victimization and seeks to reassert Indigenous agency and liberation in mainstream narratives. Too often Native communities have to remind the public that “we are still here!”; although settler colonialism

36 Shawn Wilson’s *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods* demonstrates how Indigenous methodology, while upholding an Indigenous epistemic foundation, becomes a ceremony of storytelling.
threatened their communities and cultures, they did not vanish.\textsuperscript{39} The mobile humanities unit seeks to craft historical narratives that highlight the resiliency of communities and support them in the telling of their stories. By reshaping a historical narrative of victimization into one of resilience, as illustrated in \textit{Fish Wars: Stories of Cultural Survival and the Activism of Native Women}, Indigenous communities reclaim their histories through Indigenous methodologies, and by doing so, create a sustainable and culturally revitalizing public history project.

Archibald states “Indigenous storywork is not an easy process but is essential to educating the heart, mind, body, and spirit.”\textsuperscript{40} The project team recognizes that decolonial public history requires patience, dedication, and a willingness to relearn and reconsider our preexisting historical notions and practices. The only possible way of achieving decolonial practices is by collaborating with Indigenous representatives and experts identified by Indigenous communities. We begin this project by acknowledging the oppression inflicted upon these communities and recognizing the positionality our project team brings to our research in hopes that this project will serve as a space for Indigenous methodologies to be upheld and Native voices to be heard.

\textit{Democratizing the process of knowledge production.}

To capture the expansiveness of the human experience, the stories of ordinary people must be collected and interpreted. A mobile humanities unit offers a means by which to bridge the gap between communities and historical institutions. Most significantly, it is designed to meet community members on their own grounds, bringing the history-making process to them. This project presents not only opportunities to acquire new insights and knowledge, but also to learn from one another.

Emerging from the model of mobile libraries, mobile museums developed as educational outreach programs in the early twentieth century. The Columbian Exposition of 1893 prompted the Chicago Principals’ Association to establish a traveling museum to supplement the curriculum of Chicago’s public schools in May 1901. It was their belief that a series of small museum collections that would be circulated amongst schools would be useful pedagogical tools. Other large cities, including New York, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and St. Louis, soon imitated the traveling school museum model. The execution of these first traveling museums is similar to what would now be considered “traveling trunks”; however, the objectives of community outreach are the same. During the mid-twentieth century, the next generation of the mobile museums came in the form of traveling exhibits in truck trailers that sought to make the museum experience more accessible.\textsuperscript{41} Only recently have cultural and historical institutions considered

\textsuperscript{39} In the case of the United States, settler colonialism involved Euro-American settlers moving into an area already inhabited by Indigenous residents and subsequently replacing and eliminating an Indigenous presence with a settler society. The Revisionist Era (1990s-2010s) of the historiography of Native American studies emphasized the agency and cultural resiliency of Native groups in the United States. The works of James Axtell, Gary Nash, Francis Jennings, and Neal Salisbury dismiss 1492 as seminal dates in United States history. However, recent work by post-revisionist scholars, such as Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz’s \textit{An Indigenous Peoples’ History of the United States}, criticizes revisionist scholars for devaluing the land stealing and violence inflicted upon Native communities. Land dispossession and racial violence are central to Dunbar-Ortiz’s critiques of settler colonialism.

\textsuperscript{40} Archibald, \textit{Indigenous Storywork: Educating the Heart, Mind, Body, and Spirit}, 143.

\textsuperscript{41} Jamie Rees, “A Brief History of the Mobile Museum: What it is, what is was, and what it can be,” University of Kansas, May 10, 2016. https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/21027/Rees_2016.pdf?sequenc.
expanding the mobile museum model beyond promulgating histories. This project follows these newest trends to move beyond stagnant historical interpretation and design a collaborative humanities initiative.

Only a few other projects boast similar visions—American University’s Humanities Truck in Washington, D.C., and the Chesapeake Heartland’s African American Humanities Truck in Kent County, Maryland, are the most notable.42 Both projects are experimental mobile platforms designed to engage communities in consuming and producing history. American University’s Humanities Truck has worked with the general public of Washington, D.C. since 2018, showcasing the diverse cultures and histories represented in the metropolitan region. Serving Kent County and the Eastern Shore of Maryland since 2020, the Chesapeake Heartland’s African American Humanities Truck highlights the rich African American heritage dating back nearly four centuries of the Chesapeake region. Both mobile humanities units demonstrate successful project execution in content and design. Their success hinges on their ability to create an experience where their respective communities can collectively reflect and interpret histories. The collaborative approach of the mobile humanities unit brings people together with diverse perspectives and experiences to create a network of co-learners and co-creators. The proposed mobile humanities unit envisions a platform to engage the communities of the Pacific Northwest through historical and cultural collaboration, producing a public education program that emphasizes the multifaceted history of the Indigenous experience in the region.

C. Project Format

The proposed mobile humanities unit is a fully customized step van that encourages historical, cultural, and educational exploration. The project team chose the terminology “mobile humanities unit” intentionally, hoping to emphasize their mission to create an experimental mobile platform that democratizes knowledge production. Originally calling the project a “mobile museum” or “mobile history unit,” the project team decided that that terminology did not capture the interdisciplinary nature of the space. The proposed mobile humanities unit can be transformed into an exhibit gallery, maker and workshop space, recording studio for oral histories, mobile movie theater, and performance venue. Each of these spaces promotes bringing communities together in the promulgation and production of knowledge. The vision of the project is to have a high-tech humanities unit that can drive to parks, parking lots, and street

Mobile museums are traditionally designed as museum educational outreach programs, using grant or donor support to bring museum exhibits to underserved populations. They are typically outfitted Recreational Vehicles (RVs) or trucks/trailers. Some examples include the following: In 1992, The Susquehanna Art Museum of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, developed the VanGo! Museum on Wheels to reach populations with limited access to museum-quality art experiences. Since its inception, the VanGo! program has utilized three vehicles: a city transportation bus, a school bus, and now a 34-foot, custom-built Winnebago. The Texas Alliance for Minorities in Engineering established their original traveling exhibit in 1980, but in 2013, they upgraded to two 40-foot trailers named Trailblazer I and Trailblazer II. Both contain interactive STEM exhibit spaces and visit thousands of students across Texas every year. Previously called “The Van of Enchantment,” The New Mexico Department of Cultural Affairs’ (DCA) “Wonder on Wheels” brings museum exhibits from one of DCA’s eight state-run museums to public schools and libraries throughout the state in a retrofitted 38-foot RV.

42 Discover more about American University’s Humanities Truck, along with their digital platform and archive: https://humanitiestruck.com; Learn more about Chesapeake Heartland’s African American Humanities Truck mission and next steps: https://chesapeakeheartland.org/african-american-humanities-truck.
corners throughout Western Washington, collecting diverse experiences and perspectives of people from the Pacific Northwest.

The mobile humanities unit’s interior is modular and can be converted to fit the project’s programming needs. The interior walls can be used as an exhibit gallery and one wall of magnetic dry-erase whiteboard panels to transform the space into a creative maker space. The interior also contains a cabinet unit and dinette with storage benches for storing digitization and recording equipment. The dinette will also be used as a seating area for oral history interviews and other community workshops. Other features include air conditioning and insulation, 30” flat screen television, ceiling speakers, and ceiling lighting. The exterior of the mobile humanities unit is composed of magnetic siding, an all-weather flat screen television, brackets to attach a roll-down movie screen for films, and awning.

The project team plans on having *Fish Wars: Stories of Cultural Survival and Activism of Native Women* be the inaugural exhibit in the proposed mobile humanities unit. The exhibit explores how Native women’s traditional roles as cultural protectors and transmitters informed and motivated their activism in the Fish Wars. Other humanities activities will be associated with the theme of fishing rights and treaty rights and will include hosting workshops, performing oral history recordings, and showcasing documentaries. For example, the proposed exhibit includes the showing of *As Long as the River Runs*, a 1971 documentary produced by Carol Burns and Hank Adams that examines the fishing rights dispute and emphasizes the civil disobedience of Native fishers at Frank’s Landing. In addition to featuring the film within the interior, the project team could partner with a local theater to have a screening of the documentary and park the mobile humanities unit outside the theater for attendees to visit before or after the screening. The project team has already performed extensive research and developed prototypes of interpretive panels. Part of the Discovery stage will identify additional resources, materials, and stories during the Community Workshops to support the exhibit. Moving forward, the project plans to solicit proposals from humanities scholars, graduate students, tribal representatives, and community members for second-year projects. The module nature of the mobile humanities unit not only allows the space to be reconfigured for programming needs, but also supports a variety of projects to be displayed, hopefully encouraging a myriad of proposals to be submitted for future projects.

Mirroring the decolonial methodology that *Fish Wars: Stories of Cultural Survival and Activism of Native Women* seeks to uphold, the mobile humanities unit encourages creative approaches to collaborations between credentialed and non-credentialed scholars, Indigenous and non-Indigenous partners. The Discovery stage plans to be an iterative and dialogic process. The project team will conduct a series of in-person and virtual meetings to discuss how to best collaborate with tribal representatives and community members. The intention of these meetings is to develop a project that respects tribal needs and reflects the project team’s vision. These meetings present opportunities to develop collaborative partnerships rooted in the principles of relationality and shared authority—components that will help ensure the project’s longevity and sustainability.

Through these series of meetings, the project team aims to work collaboratively to create a final design document that informs the project’s next steps and guides future goals. The meetings will
also identify how to best develop and curate the mobile humanities unit. As the project brings together historians, Indigenous scholars, tribal representatives, archivists, and community members, we hope to create a unified network of interdisciplinary history makers with the shared goal to increase the accessibility of knowledge production, craft a more complete story of the Pacific Northwest, and engage the public in reflection and dialogue about an unacknowledged history that is crucial to the historic fabric of the Pacific Northwest.

The **first Tribal Collaborations** are tentatively scheduled for July 2023. The use of “collaboration” rather than “consultation” when referring to meetings with tribal representatives is intentional. Because this project is grounded in decolonial methodologies, the project team seeks to support a network of Indigenous co-creators. We do not plan on simply consulting the tribal representatives but collaborating with them at every stage to create a project that meets their communities’ needs as well as our vision. The core project team will meet with representatives from the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot Tribes in Washington State. The initial meetings will be held individually with each tribe. The goal of these meetings will be to discuss the project and its objectives, as seen by the project team, and lay the groundwork for subsequent meetings. The first Tribal Collaborations will be followed by project team meetings to discuss the input received by the initial Tribal Collaborations.

The **second Tribal Collaborations** are tentatively scheduled for early August 2023. The project team will again travel to Washington State to meet with tribal representatives from the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot Tribes individually. This series of meetings will be follow-up meetings to the first meetings during which the project team and tribal representatives will discuss project objectives and methodologies. These meetings will also be an opportunity to begin developing ideas for the inaugural exhibit; discussing potential digital repository and platform for digitized records gathered during various stages of the project (i.e. Omeka); and composing a list of features contained and included in the mobile humanities unit. The project team will also visit the Tribal Historic Preservation Offices and archives of each tribe to identify documents to be digitized.

The **first Expert Consultations** are tentatively scheduled for late August 2023 and will be held in-person and virtually. The project team will meet with humanities and project advisers to discuss and evaluate project objectives and methodologies as determined by initial tribal collaborations. Technical advisers will consider the possibilities of different digital platforms and the practicalities of converting a step van to fit the needs of a mobile humanities unit. These meetings will also begin to identify the costs and resources required to purchase a customized step van, digitization and recording panels, interpretive panels, and website development.

The **third Tribal Collaboration** is tentatively scheduled for early September 2023 and will be a joint meeting with representatives from the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot Tribes. The meeting will be held in Tacoma, Washington, a central meeting location for all the tribes. The project team will distill the results from the Expert Consultations to share with the tribal representatives. The goal of the meeting is to collaboratively evaluate the results and develop an initial outline for the content and design of the mobile humanities unit. During the meeting,

---

43 Unlike “Tribal Collaborations,” “consultation” rather than “collaboration” will be used when referring to meetings with technical advisers to distinguish the two types of partnerships.
participants will also begin planning Community Workshops and identifying community spaces where they may occur.

**Three Community Workshops** are tentatively scheduled for November and December 2023. The Community Workshops will be held at venues designated by the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot Tribes. The project team will present the project objectives and outline produced by the first Tribal Collaborations and Expert Consultations. The goal of these workshops is to receive feedback from community members on both the form and content of the project, reviewing the ways in which community members are involved, potential sources and stories to be included, and other methodologies that need to be addressed. The critique and evaluation of community members in the early stages of the project is essential to upholding the project’s mission to democratize public history and knowledge production. These workshops will also involve a catered meal to promote building sustainable, trusting relationships between the project team and community members.

A **Final Tribal Collaboration** will be combined with a **Final Expert Consultation** and is tentatively scheduled for early January 2024. This meeting with the project team will evaluate the results of the community workshops and discuss how to incorporate them into the final project design. The goal of this final meeting will produce a final outline for the content and design of the mobile humanities unit as well as finalize the costs and resources required to purchase a customized step van, digitization and recording panels, interpretive panels, and website development.

A **Final Community Workshop** is tentatively scheduled for April 2024 and will be held in Tacoma, Washington. The project director will contact and invite participants from the previous community workshops to join the meeting. The project team will share the design document draft with community members and partners. The project director will lead attendees in critiquing and evaluating the design document. For those unable to attend the workshop, copies of the design document draft will be sent to them via email, and the team will work with them to receive their reviews and feedback virtually. Similar to the previous workshops, this workshop will also offer a catered meal.

**D. User-Generated Content**

The Discovery stage of the project will be an iterative process with the user-generated content produced in the form of evaluations and self-reflective practices. The project team will ask for verbal feedback during Tribal Collaborations and Expert Consultations, and evaluation forms will be given to Community Workshop participants to complete.

Part of the Discovery stage will include discussions on how the final iteration of the mobile humanities unit can best encourage user contribution and creation. The project is propelled forward by the mission to increase the process of knowledge production to all people, in all communities. The project team envisions the mobile humanities unit to be a participatory experience. The project will be used as a space for workshops, oral history recordings, digital collection days, so user-generated content can be expected in the form of interviews, visual recordings, and digital replications of historical artifacts and documents, to name a few.
possibilities. During the Discovery stage, the project team will develop other ideas for user-contribution and user-creation.

E. Audience and Distribution

The targeted audience for *Fish Wars: Stories of Cultural Survival and the Activism of Native Women* extends beyond scholars of Indigenous history. Scholars in a variety of disciplines will find the exhibit and associated resources beneficial. The project team will reach out to historical and cultural institutions and organizations, tribal cultural departments, educators, and humanities scholars to share the project through. Initial introduction of the project will be conducted through email correspondence. Promotional material will be developed and sent to historical institutions and organizations as well as community gathering spaces (i.e., local libraries, schools, community centers, coffee shops) to be shared in newsletters, bulletin boards, and community calendars. Other opportunities to share the project include conferences and speaking engagements. Because the content explores marginalized histories, the exhibit expands the historical narrative in the hopes that the unit will attract members of underrepresented communities. The Discovery stage will examine the efficacy of different modes of interpretive analysis and identify the best forms of interpretation.

Development of the mobile humanities unit will be based around a general audience, with the goal of making the unit an interesting and engaging experience to the broadest population possible. Response to similar mobile humanities units suggest wide, diverse, and large audiences. In its first four years of use, American University’s Humanities Truck, the mobile humanities unit which inspired this project, engaged with more than 20,000 participants at more than 185 events, and their digital platform reports high usage. The project will be used by non-history experts, tourists, students, and local community members. Due to its mobility, the humanities unit can be found in any areas where communities gather. The project team envisions that the mobile humanities unit will attend music and cultural festivals, weekly farmer markets, and other community events as well as be parked at libraries, schools, cultural centers, and other educational institutions. Another appeal of the mobile humanities unit model is that its reach is not limited to a single community. The project team intends on having a presence in a variety of communities—urban, rural, large, and small.

Part of the Discovery stage will identify how the project will store and make accessible any digitization efforts conducted at workshops held by the mobile humanities unit. The project team plans on housing the digital records created at such workshops on a digital platform, where users can engage with the material and explore how the mobile humanities unit captures stories of ordinary people and expands the historical narrative by doing so. The Discovery stage will identify the platform by which digitization efforts will be made accessible and determine a process to develop the digital platform during subsequent project phases.

F. Rights, Permissions, and Licensing

In preparation of the final design document, the Discovery stage of the project will determine both ethical and legal issues of licensing and usage associated with mobile humanities units. The determination of ethical practices is particularly pertinent when collaborating with Indigenous
partners. Decolonial public history projects present unique challenges by confronting preexisting colonial public history practices. Historically, Indigenous communities were excluded from the process of knowledge production and their epistemologies and research methodologies were viewed as inferior to Western claims of knowledge. Some Indigenous partners maintain complex relationships with their colonizers, and the project team must confront the ongoing realities of colonization, racism, and oppression. Many Indigenous scholars have set forth ethical principles: obtain permission to enter and conduct research in a cultural territory; respect and honor cultural protocols; consistently follow verification guidelines; and move beyond intellectual property rights to a practice of reciprocity or loaning stories. Collaboration with tribal agencies through Collaboration Meetings and Community Workshops will identify and craft clear ethical standards that the project team will adhere to throughout the course of the project.

During the Discovery stage, the project team plans to conduct a Community Workshop, where the project team will digitize community members’ artifacts and photographs and perform oral history interviews to support the Fish Wars: Stories of Cultural Survival and the Activism of Native Women exhibit. Prior to the Community Workshop, the project team will determine how and where the digital replications will be stored. Digital files will be held by the project team at the designated digital repository and copies will be sent to participants. Community members will also be required to sign consent and permission forms.

The bulk of materials that have already been identified for the proposed exhibit come from university and historical society archives—University of New Mexico’s Center for Southwest Research, Washington State Historical Society, University of Washington Libraries Digital Collections, and Puyallup Tribal Historic Preservation Office. The project team will work collaboratively with the institutions to ensure that they obtain the proper permission to include the respective materials in the exhibit. The final design document created at the end of the Discovery stage will outline all technology-related rights, permissions, and licensing issues.

G. Humanities Advisers

The project draws on the experience of an interdisciplinary team of scholars with expertise on public history, decolonial methodology, and Pacific Northwest Indigenous histories. To be grounded in decolonial methodology, this project values the expertise of non-credentialed scholars and believes that expanding humanities advisers beyond the realm of university academia is an essential step for successful decolonial public history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities Advisers</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Klade</td>
<td>Rachel Klade’s research and focus include Pacific Northwest Indigenous history, Indigenous feminism, and public history. She has produced a historiography on the Native rights movement of the 1960s and 1970s in which she noticed a significant gap in the literature regarding Indigenous women activists. Klade sought to address this Indigenous-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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| Rachel Klade is the Project Director and will coordinate the Discovery Stage. | women-sized absence through her master’s project which combined her academic research and decolonial methodology. |
| Katrine Barber | Dr. Barber’s research and focus include Pacific Northwest, Native American, and public history. She is a member of the Native American Studies faculty and was the director of the defunct Center for Columbia River History. Her scholarship is interdisciplinary and grounded in community-based research methods and the collaborative inclusion of undergraduate and graduate students in public history projects. |
| Associate Professor of History at Portland State University | Dr. Katrine Barber contributes expertise in Pacific Northwest history, Native American history, and decolonial public history projects. |
| Annette “Nettsie” Bullchild | Annette Bullchild serves as the Director of the Nisqually Tribe Archives and Historic Preservation Office. She works to protect, collect, and preserve the cultural heritage and history of the Nisqually Tribe. As Director of the Archives and THPO, Bullchild leads the effort to pass along the culture and history for future generations through education and outreach programs. |
| Director of Nisqually Tribal Archives and Tribal Historic Preservation Office | Nettsie Bullchild contributes expertise on the Nisqually Tribe’s history and culture as well as access to tribal archives and collections. |
| Donna Hogerhuis | As the Collection Specialists of the Muckleshoot Tribe, Hogerhuis works to protect, collect, preserve, and exhibit artifacts, photographs, archival and library materials important to the Muckleshoot Tribe. She is also charged with the care of the program’s collections and research library, which are particularly strong in showcasing regional topics and Muckleshoot specific histories. |
| Collections Specialists of the Muckleshoot Tribal Historic Preservation Office | Donna Hogerhuis contributes expertise on the Muckleshoot Tribe’s history and culture as well as access to tribal archives and collections. |
| Warren Kinggeorge | As the Oral Historian of the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, Kinggeorge’s primary responsibilities include collecting and preserving oral history from tribal and community members. He works with various government agencies, museums, colleges, and private institutions to ensure treaty rights are upheld and to create management plans to maintain and enhance the Muckleshoot Tribe’s valuable cultural resources. |
| Oral Historian of the Muckleshoot Tribal Historic Preservation Office | Warren Kinggeorge contributes expertise on the Muckleshoot Tribe’s history and culture as well as already established partnerships with tribal storytellers. |
| Corey Larson | Dr. Corey Larson’s research and focus include environmental history, North American West, and Pacific Worlds. He teaches in the Native Pathways Program at Evergreen State College, a program dedicated to promoting Indigenous scholarship by placing value on cultural and traditional ways of |
| Faculty in the Native Pathways Program at Evergreen State College | Dr. Corey Larson contributes expertise on Pacific Northwest history, Indigenous history, and Indigenous...
| **Joshua Reid**  
Associate Professor of History,  
Director of the Center for the Study of the Pacific Northwest at the University of Washington | Dr. Joshua Reid’s research and focus include identity formation, cultural meanings of space and place, the American and Canadian Wests, the environment, and the Indigenous Pacific. His first published book, *The Sea is My Country: The Maritime World of the Makahs* (2015) received several awards and acknowledgements from the Organization for American Historians, the Western History Association, and others. For his book, he implemented decolonial research methodology by upholding Indigenous ways of knowledge production. |
| **Bob Reinhardt**  
Associate Professor of History,  
Internship Coordinator for the Department of History, and the founder and director of the Working History Center at Boise State University | Dr. Bob Reinhardt’s research and focus include environmental history, public history, history of the American West, and history of public health. Reinhardt’s research interests have culminated in the Atlas of Drowned Towns, a digital humanities project that seeks to capture the stories of towns inundated by river development projects. Reinhardt’s experience with digital humanities projects will provide expertise on collaborative research methodology and community outreach. He previously served as Executive Director of the Willamette Heritage Center. |
| **Brandon Reynon**  
Director of the Puyallup Tribal Historic Preservation Office | Brandon Reynon serves as the Director of the Puyallup Tribe Historic Preservation Office. He works to protect, collect, and preserve the cultural heritage and history of the Puyallup Tribe. As Director of THPO, Reynon leads the effort to pass along the culture and history for future generations through education and outreach programs. He is currently involved in the efforts and lawsuit to keep the National Archive collection in Seattle, ensuring that the extensive collection of tribal documents and materials would not be sent to an out-of-state repository. |
| **Amber Taylor**  
Collections Management Lead of the Puyallup Tribal Historic Preservation Office | Amber Taylor previously served as an Administrative Assistant for the Puyallup Tribe Historic Preservation Office and now serves as the Collections Management Lead. Taylor offers unique knowledge not only on the Puyallup Tribe’s collections and archives, but also on her active involvement in |
Amber Taylor contributes expertise on the Puyallup Tribe’s history and culture, access to tribal archives and collections, and personal experience with tribal fishing rights disputes. Present-day fishing rights disputes and tribal environmental efforts. In 2018, Taylor was part of a Native-led campaign to save orcas in the Puget Sound, whose population decline were a result of salmon population decline. Taylor’s father, Eric Bennett, served as a member of the Puyallup Tribe’s Fish Commission and her grandmother, Ramona Bennett, was a prominent leader of the Fish Wars.

H. Project Advisers

The project draws on the expertise of graphic designers, exhibit developers, and scholars who have previous experience with mobile humanities units. These experts will contribute to the technical aspects of the project development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Advisers</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barbara Perry Bauer</strong>&lt;br&gt;President and Owner of TAG Historical Research &amp; Consulting&lt;br&gt;<em>Barbara Perry Bauer contributes her expertise of public history programming and interpretive exhibit development.</em>&lt;br&gt;Barbara Perry Bauer boasts over twenty-five years of experience conducting cultural resource investigations, litigation support, and developing interpretive exhibits and programs. She has written and contributed to dozens of reports generated by TAG Historical Research &amp; Consulting. Barbara has completed historic context statements, as well as HABS/HAER documentation reports, National Register nominations, interpretive plans, and other technical studies. She will support the project with her experience in exhibit programs and interpretive plans.</td>
<td>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Fred Fritchman</strong>&lt;br&gt;Exhibit and Graphic Designer&lt;br&gt;<em>Fred Fritchman will provide the graphic design of interpretive panels and promotional material.</em>&lt;br&gt;Fred Fritchman has designed many exhibits within the Treasure Valley of Idaho. He has been employed by the Bown House, State Capitol rotunda, Eagle Museum of History and Preservation, Meridian Library District, TAG Historical Research and Consulting and Boise City Hall. Fritchman will contribute his expertise to the visual experience of the mobile humanities unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. State of the Project

Thus far, the project director has received positive feedback on the project concept from humanities and public history scholars. The project director conducted extensive research on the Fish Wars of Washington State and the involvement of Native women in the fishing rights dispute, particularly those of the Nisqually and Puyallup tribes. This research has been synthesized into a proposed traveling exhibit, complete with prototype exhibit script, interpretive panel designs, and exhibit layout. In preparation for the project, the project director also delved into scholarship on Indigenous feminism as it relates to Native women activism and explored decolonial research methodology as it applies to public history, which culminated in an article that considers the practicalities of student-led decolonial public history projects.

The project director has begun to identify the stories and archival materials that will appear in the inaugural traveling exhibit, tentatively titled *Fish Wars: Stories of Cultural Survival and the Activism of Native Women*. The proposed traveling exhibit contains eleven interpretive panels, a video presentation, and an opportunity for visitor participation, all of which are included in “Attachment 7” of the grant application. The project director crafted an interpretive narrative that tells the story of the Fish Wars of Washington State while highlighting the roles of Indigenous women activists. This interpretive narrative and selected images were then applied to exhibit panels that the project director designed with the consultation of Fred Fritchman, an exhibit and graphic designer based in Boise, Idaho. In addition to the interpretive panels, visitors will be able to watch *As Long as the River Runs*, which provides colorized footage of fish-in demonstrations and interviews with various leaders of the Fish Wars. The video presentation will be featured on a continuous loop on the monitor within the mobile humanities unit. To facilitate visitor interaction, visitors will be encouraged to write themselves, friends, or families a postcard, describing what they learned from the traveling exhibit. The project team will then send the postcards one week later to remind or share with the recipient what was learned in the mobile humanities unit.
The project director has also created a 3D model of the interior and exterior of the proposed mobile humanities unit. The 3D model illustrates the proposed exhibit layout and demonstrates how visitors will navigate the space. As part of the design, the project director includes a detailed summary of the various features the mobile humanities unit will contain (i.e. television monitors, lighting, air conditioning) as well as the other equipment that will be housed in the unit (i.e. document scanner, camera, audio and visual recording equipment).

J. Work Plan

June 2023:
- Project Director will coordinate with project advisers, Corey Larson and Joshua Reid, to schedule meetings with Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot tribal governments and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices.
- Project Director will contact Annette Bullchild (Director of Nisqually Tribal Archives Tribal Historic Preservation Office), Brandon Reynon (Director of the Puyallup Tribal Historic Preservation Office), Amber Taylor (Collections Management Lead of the Puyallup Tribal Historic Preservation Office), Warren KingGeorge (Oral Historian of the Muckleshoot Tribal Historic Preservation Office), Donna Hogerhuis (Collections Specialists of the Muckleshoot Tribal Historic Preservation Office).
- The core project team will meet prior to these meetings with tribal representatives to organize travel plans and create agendas for the meetings, which will be held in Washington State.

July 2023:
- **First Tribal Collaborations:** The core project team will travel to Washington State to meet with representatives from each tribe individually to present the project, its objectives, and long-term visions; the project team will also lay the groundwork for subsequent meetings.
- Following the initial collaboration with tribal representatives, the core project team will meet to review the feedback received in the initial meetings.
- Project Director will schedule secondary meetings with tribal representatives.
- Project Director will draft letters seeking permission from tribal councils to allow the identified tribal representatives to participate in the project.

August 2023:
- **Second Tribal Collaborations:** The project team will travel again to Washington State to meet with representatives from each tribe individually to discuss and evaluate project objectives and methodologies. During these meetings, participants will begin developing ideas for the inaugural exhibit; discuss potential digital repository and platform to be used for digitized records gathered during various stages of the project (i.e. Omeka); and compose a list of features contained and included in the mobile humanities unit.
- While visiting Washington State, the project team will visit Tribal Historic Preservation Offices and Archives of each tribe to identify documents to be digitized and discuss the proper licensing and permission needed to include the material in the project.
- **First Expert Consultations:** The project team will meet with humanities and project advisers to discuss and evaluate project objectives and methodologies as determined by
initial tribal collaborations. Technical advisers will consider the possibilities of different
digital platforms and the practicalities of converting a step van to fit the needs of a mobile
humanities unit.

- The project team will begin to identify potential web development firms and
customizable van/truck companies.
- The project team will create a Strategic Plan or Theory of Change for the project.  

September 2023:

- **Third Tribal Collaboration:** The project team will hold a meeting in Tacoma,
  Washington, with all representatives from the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot
  Tribes. The project team will distill the results from the Expert Consultations to share
  with the tribal representatives. The goal of the meeting is to collaboratively evaluate the
  results and develop an initial outline for the content and design of the mobile humanities
  unit. During the meeting, participants will also begin planning Community Workshops
  and identifying community spaces where they may occur. The project team will also
  present the drafted Strategic Plan/Theory of Change and solicit feedback from tribal
  representatives.
- Using the initial outline produced during the third tribal collaboration, the project team
  will create a list of features and equipment and begin identifying manufactures and
  associated costs.
- The project director will reach out to web development firms and customizable van/truck
  companies with the initial outline of the mobile humanities unit to receive respective
  quotes.

October 2023:

- The project team will finalize the Strategic Plan after incorporating the feedback from the
  tribal representatives.
- The project team will begin scheduling and planning for the three Community
  Workshops.
- The project director will reach out to tribal representatives to decide on venues and
  caterers near or on the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot reservations, preferably
  tribal-owned or Native-owned venues and caterers in order to support the local
  community and economy.

---

45 Historical institutions, such as museums, and public history projects typically develop strategic institutional plans
(often referred to as strategic plans or long-range plans) as means to evaluate the success of exhibits, projects, and/or
other programming. The multi-year document contains measurable goals and methods; establishes action steps and
timelines; assesses existing resources and identifies needed resources; and assigns responsibilities to institutional or
project partners. A comprehensive strategic plan ensures that all involved parties agree on the objectives, goals, and
vision of the project and understand the necessary steps to implement the project. Similarly, a Theory of Change is a
conceptual model that helps institutions and project teams articulate their objectives, define decision-making roles,
and establish useful measuring tools. The process of creating a Theory of Change encourages institutions and project
teams to not only clarify their objectives but also consider potential weaknesses, identifying areas of opportunities
for the project team to evaluate. At this point in the project’s work plan, the project team will discuss the benefits of
both types of strategic models and decide which type we would like to implement.

*Developing a Strategic Institutional Plan*, American Alliance of Museums, 2018, [https://www.aam-us.org/wp-
content/uploads/2017/12/Developing-a-Strategic-Institutional-Plan-2018.pdf];
• The project team will create promotional material for the Community Workshops, which will then be given to tribal representatives to distribute amongst their communities.
• The project director will also contact and invite participation from academic historians working at local universities, directors of local historical societies and museums, members of local humanities councils, and local librarians.

November and December 2023:
• The project director will meet with Fred Fritchman to begin discussing interpretive design plans and layout.
• **Three Community Workshops:** The Community Workshops will be held at venues designated by the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot Tribes. The project team will present the project objectives and outline produced by the first Tribal Collaborations and Expert Consultations as well as the Strategic Plan. The goal of these workshops is to receive feedback from community members on both the form and content of the project, reviewing the ways in which community members are involved, potential sources and stories to be included, and other methodologies that need to be addressed. A catered meal will also be served at the workshops to encourage building sustainable, trusting relationships between the project team and community members.
• The project team will meet for a follow-up meeting to discuss and debrief the results of the workshops.

January 2024:
• **Final Tribal Collaboration and Expert Consultation:** This meeting with the project team will evaluate the results of the community workshops and discuss how to incorporate them into the final project design. The goal of this final meeting will produce a final outline for the content and design of the mobile humanities unit as well as finalize the costs and resources required to purchase a customized step van, digitization and recording panels, interpretive panels, and website development.
• The project team will compose design document drafts.

February and March 2024:
• The design documents drafts will be sent to participating tribal representatives, humanities advisers, and project advisers for review and feedback.
• The project team will compile the feedback sent by participating tribal representatives, humanities advisers, and project advisers into a formal report.
• Project director will plan the final community workshop, reserving a venue and catering services in Tacoma, Washington.

April 2024:
• **Final Community Workshop:** Project team will host a final Community Workshop to share the design document draft with community members and partners. Attendees will provide feedback and review. For those unable to attend the workshop, copies of the design document draft will be sent to them via email, and the team will work with them to receive their reviews and feedback virtually.
• The project team will compile the feedback from the Community Workshop into a formal report and meet to discuss the reviews given by community members and scholars.
May 2024:

- The project team will finalize the final design document, adjusting the design document according to the reviews and feedback they received.
- The project team submits the final design document to NEH and sends copies to tribal representatives and community members.
- The project director prepares applications for future funding to NEH Public Programs for Prototyping Grant as well as additional funding opportunities from Washington Humanities.

K. Organization Profile

Boise State University is a public, metropolitan research university providing leadership in academics, research, and civic engagement. The university offers an array of undergraduate degrees and experiences that foster student success, lifelong learning, community service, and creativity – an integrative approach to education, scholarship, and service that is at the heart of this humanities project. As this project seeks innovative ways to expand the historical narrative and increase the history-making process’s accessibility, Boise State’s research, creative activity, and graduate programs, including an MA in Public History, advance new knowledge and benefit the community, the state, and the nation. The university is an integral part of its metropolitan environment and is engaged in its economic vitality, policy issues, professional and continuing education programming, and cultural enrichment; these university priorities align with and will support this project. With both a broad range of humanities programs combined with the fastest growing research programs in Idaho, Boise State stands uniquely positioned to respond to a variety of humanities projects and exhibits as the university nurtures traditional strengths in teaching and community engagement, while rapidly expanding research and scholarly activity. With Boise as the third largest metropolitan region in the Pacific Northwest after Seattle and Portland, Boise State serves as an urban university dedicated to research and student experiences that contribute to a vibrant, healthy community and region.

L. Fundraising Plan

The nature of the project is well-suited for the staged design of the National Endowment for the Humanities Division of Public Programs grants. Following the execution of the Discovery stage, the project director will apply for a Prototype grant focused on developing a prototype of the mobile humanities unit along with a prototype of Fish Wars: Stories of Cultural Survival and the Activism of Native Women exhibit, which will serve as the inaugural traveling exhibit. After the completion of the prototypes, the project director will apply for an Implementation grant to purchase and outfit a mobile humanities unit with the necessary equipment to conduct community outreach as outlined in the project format as well as the interpretive panels of the traveling exhibit.

The project is also suitable for other funding opportunities. Washington Humanities offers Washington Stories Fund Grants and Opportunity Grants, both of which can provide supplemental funding for the Discovery and Prototype stages of the project. The Washington
Stories Fund Grants award projects that highlight and share stories of marginalized individuals or groups that have contributed to the cultural richness of Washington State. The Opportunity Grants support public humanities presentations and events led by or serving underrepresented groups, which could supplement costs for community workshops.

Once the project reaches Implementation stage, the project director will seek funding from the Humanities Without Walls Consortium’s Grand Research Challenge, which provides grants of up to $150,000 over a three-year period for teams pursuing research and projects grounded in methodologies of reciprocity and redistribution. Being grounded in decolonial methodology and collaborative approaches, along with the mobile humanities unit’s various means of community engagement, the nature of this project aligns with the Consortium’s mission to support scholars practicing academic and public history grounded in inclusivity.

The project team will explore additional funding opportunities through state historical societies in Washington, state-level humanities councils, tribal governments and cultural departments, state and tribal historic preservation offices, and other historical organizations and institutions.

**M. Project Evaluation**

The Discovery phase of the project will be an iterative process. The project team will solicit feedback from partners at Tribal Collaborations, Expert Consultations, and the Community Workshop. The Community Workshop will ask for more formal feedback by passing out Visitor Feedback Forms to community members. Qualitative evaluation hinges on the input of tribal representatives and community members as well as the project’s technical experts to determine the extent and direction of the project being contemplated. Evaluations will take place regularly with the core project team, and self-reflective practices amongst members of the core project team will also serve as another form of qualitative metric, such as journaling and group check-ins. The primary goal of this project is to create a public history project designed and implemented with decolonial practices, and this can only be achieved with consistent evaluation from Indigenous participants and self-reflective practices from all project members.

At this stage of the project, final evaluation will be based on the development of collaborative partnerships with tribal governments and tribal communities and the crafting of a final design document.
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Attachment 2: Budget Justification

A. SENIOR PERSONNEL

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Rachel Klade is the Principal Investigator (PI) and will be responsible for coordinating all aspects of work for the Discovery Stage. As an independent contractor, she will not receive a salary.

SENIOR PERSONS

There are eight additional Senior Persons who will contribute their expertise to the content and format of the project. All eight will participate in team meetings and Expert Consultations as Humanities Advisers. Total salary request for Senior Persons is $6,400.

The following five Humanities Advisers will serve as the project’s tribal collaborators: Annette Bullchild (Director of Nisqually Tribal Archives Tribal Historic Preservation Office), Brandon Reynon (Director of the Puyallup Tribal Historic Preservation Office), Amber Taylor (Collections Management Lead of the Puyallup Tribal Historic Preservation Office), Warren Kinggeorge (Oral Historian of the Muckleshoot Tribal Historic Preservation Office), Donna Hogerhuis (Collections Specialists of the Muckleshoot Tribal Historic Preservation Office). These collaborators will be heavily involved in Tribal Collaborations and Community Workshops, in addition to participating in Expert Consultations. The Principal Investigator acknowledges that the project requires more involvement from the Humanities Advisers who are also tribal collaborators than it does other Humanities Advisers who are not tribal collaborators. Therefore, tribal collaborators will receive a larger salary than other Humanities Advisers. For their work as tribal representatives and community liaisons, the salary request for these five Humanities Advisers is $800 each.

Dr. Corey Larson and Dr. Joshua Reid will coordinate with the Principal Investigator to schedule meetings with Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot tribal governments and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices. They will participate in the First Tribal Collaborations and later in Community Workshops. For their involvement in Expert Consultations, First Tribal Collaborations, and Community Workshops, the salary request for Dr. Corey Larson and Dr. Joshua Reid is $700 each.

Dr. Katrine Barber and Dr. Bob Reinhardt will participate in Expert Consultations as Humanities Advisers, providing insight on content and public history project development. The salary request for Dr. Katrine Barber and Dr. Bob Reinhardt is $500 each.

FRINGE BENEFITS: None.

B. OTHER PERSONNEL

None.
C. EQUIPMENT DESCRIPTION

None.

D. TRAVEL

Funding is requested for travel to Tribal Collaborations and Community Workshops that will occur in the southern Puget Sound area. The PI is based in Boise, Idaho, so for the Discovery Stage of this project, the PI will take six trips to Tacoma, Washington, over the designated first year of the project. Total travel request is $5,558.

First Tribal Collaboration: The PI will travel to Washington State to meet with representatives from each tribe individually to present the project, its objectives, and long-term visions as well as lay the groundwork for subsequent meetings. Three meetings with Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot representatives will occur over three days. The travel expenses for a three-day, two-night trip are as follows:

- Airfare: $168 (roundtrip from Boise to Seattle)
- Lodging: $300 (average price for Tacoma hotel is $150/night)
- Car rental: $300 (three days)
- Per Diem: $50 (three meals/day)–$150 total
- Total Travel Expenses: $918

Second Tribal Collaboration: The PI will travel to Washington State to meet with representatives from each tribe individually to discuss and evaluate project objectives and methodologies. During these meetings, participants will begin developing ideas for the inaugural exhibit; discuss potential digital repository and platform to be used for digitized records gathered during various stages of the project (i.e. Omeka); and compose a list of features contained and included in the mobile humanities unit. The PI will also visit Tribal Historic Preservation Offices and Archives of each tribe to identify documents to be digitized and discuss the proper licensing and permission needed to include the material in the project. Three meetings with Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot representatives, along with archival visits, will occur over four days. The travel expenses for a four-day, three-night trip are as follows:

- Airfare: $168 (roundtrip from Boise to Seattle)
- Lodging: $450 (average price for Tacoma hotel is $150/night)
- Car rental: $400 (four days)
- Per Diem: $50 (three meals/day)–$200 total
- Total Travel Expenses: $1,218

Third Tribal Collaboration: The PI will hold a meeting in Tacoma, Washington, with all representatives from the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot Tribes to distill the results from the Expert Consultations to share with the tribal representatives. The goal of the meeting is to collaboratively evaluate the results and develop an initial outline for the content and design of the mobile humanities unit. During the meeting, participants will also begin planning
Community Workshops and identifying community spaces where they may occur. The meeting will occur over one day. The travel expenses for a two-day, one-night trip are as follows:

- Airfare: $168 (roundtrip from Boise to Seattle)
- Lodging: $150 (average price for Tacoma hotel is $150/night)
- Car rental: $200 (two days)
- Per Diem: $50 (three meals/day)–$100 total
- Total Travel Expenses: $618

Three Community Workshops: The PI will travel to Washington State to host Community Workshops that will be held at venues designated by the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot Tribes. The PI will present the project objectives and outline produced by the first Tribal Collaborations and Expert Consultations as well as the Strategic Plan. The goal of these workshops is to receive feedback from community members on both the form and content of the project, reviewing the ways in which community members are involved, potential sources and stories to be included, and other methodologies that need to be addressed. The workshops will take place during a five-day-long visit to the Tacoma area. The travel expenses for a five-day, four-night trip are as follows:

- Airfare: $168 (roundtrip from Boise to Seattle)
- Lodging: $600 (average price for Tacoma hotel is $150/night)
- Car rental: $500 (five days)
- Per Diem: $50 (three meals/day)–$250 total
- Total Travel Expenses: $1,568

Final Tribal Collaboration and Expert Consultation: The PI will hold a meeting in Tacoma, Washington, with all representatives from the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot Tribes to evaluate the results of the community workshops and discuss how to incorporate them into the final project design. The goal of this final meeting will produce a final outline for the content and design of the mobile humanities unit as well as finalize the costs and resources required to purchase a customized step van, digitization and recording panels, interpretive panels, and website development. The meeting will occur over one day. The travel expenses for a two-day, one-night trip are as follows:

- Airfare: $168 (roundtrip from Boise to Seattle)
- Lodging: $150 (average price for Tacoma hotel is $150/night)
- Car rental: $200 (two days)
- Per Diem: $50 (three meals/day)–$100 total
- Total Travel Expenses: $618

Final Community Workshop: The PI will travel to Washington State to host the Final Community Workshops to share the design document draft with community members and partners. Attendees will provide feedback and review. The workshop will occur over one day. The travel expenses for a two-day, one-night trip are as follows:

- Airfare: $168 (roundtrip from Boise to Seattle)
- Lodging: $150 (average price for Tacoma hotel is $150/night)
- Car rental: $200 (two days)
- Per Diem: $50 (three meals/day)--$100 total
- Total Travel Expenses: $618

E. PARTICIPANT/TRAINEE SUPPORT COSTS

None.

F. OTHER DIRECT COST SUPPLIES

OTHER: CONSULTANT SERVICES

Funding is requested for Consultants. Barbara Perry Bauer, Fred Fritchman, and Dr. Dan Kerr will contribute their expertise as Project Advisers during the two one-day Expert Consultations. Bauer and Fritchman offer experience in exhibit development, graphic design, and interpretive writing. Kerr offers experience with mobile humanities unit. Each will receive $400 for their participation. The project’s Tribal Collaborators (Humanities Advisers) will identify groups of community leaders to participate in the Community Workshops as storytellers and educators. Representatives from the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot Tribes who contribute their expertise in local history during the Community Workshop will receive a $200 stipend. Total request is $2,400 ($1,200 for Project Advisers and $1,200 for six potential tribal representatives).

OTHER: WORKSHOP CATERING

Funding is requested for catering at all four community workshops. The PI plans to offer light beverages and heavy appetizers as part of the community workshop program to encourage building sustainable, trusting relationships between the project team and community members. Total catering request is $4,000 ($1,000 per workshop).

G. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS

Total direct cost request is $18,358.

H. INDIRECT COSTS

None.

I. TOTAL DIRECT AND INDIRECT COSTS

Total budget request for the project is $18,258.

J. FEE

None.
Attachment 3: Additional Materials

Additional Materials include items associated with the mobile humanities unit design, interpretive narrative, and link for the video presentation that will be included in the proposed traveling exhibit.
Mobile Humanities Unit Design

The following additional materials include a sample floor plan of the mobile humanities unit, interpretive zone sample, sample logo, and various views of the interior and exterior of the mobile humanities unit. These designs showcase the vision of the mobile humanities unit as a platform suitable for a wide range of activities—exhibit gallery, recording studio, workshop and maker space, movie theater, and performance venue.

Mobile Humanities Unit Overview:

The Converted Interior:

The design model for mobile humanities unit is based on a Ford F-59 Morgan Olson Step Van or Freightliner MT45 P1000 Step Van. The project team proposes the use of a step van because they are easily configured to meet our needs for an exhibit gallery, recording studio, and maker space. The proposed unit’s dimensions are 16’(L)x7’(W)x7’(H). Insulation, air conditioning, sky lights, and ceiling lights will ensure the mobile humanities unit’s interior is comfortable in all weather conditions. The project team has chosen the following interior materials: vinyl wood flooring for its durability and functionality and painted lauan plywood for the walls. Walls will be used as an exhibit gallery, and one wall will feature magnetic dry-erase whiteboard panels to easily convert the space into a creative maker space. The interior will also contain a 30” flat screen television and ceiling speakers to show films and other visuals that accompany the traveling exhibits. An L-shaped dinette offers visitors an opportunity to sit and watch the documentary, or it can be converted into a space for oral history interviews. Along the wall that lines the van’s cab, a floor-to-ceiling cabinet and shelving unit, along with the dinette with storage benches, will ensure enough areas to store equipment, such as document scanners and recording devices. The space is modular and flexible, excluding the permanent cabinet unit and dinette, to ensure that the mobile humanities unit can be suitable for numerous needs.

The Converted Exterior:

The exterior features magnetic siding so that the exterior can also serve as an exhibit gallery; an all-weather flat screen television and brackets to attach a roll-down movie screen for film showings; and an awning to protect staff, volunteers, and visitors from various weather conditions.
View from Rear Door

The desk will provide a view of the interior and basket will be on the back.

An example of a "Poncho" sign:

Interior dimension: 30" x 15"

Folding Desk/Chair

LED Lights:

- Height: 10" x 10"
- Dimensions: 10" x 10"
- Qty: 2

Use to provide natural light.

- Height: 29" x 21"
- Dimensions: 29" x 21"
- Qty: 3

The use of baskets and desks decrease electricity usage and decrease electricity cost.

Humanities Truck: View from Rear Door
Space to conduct oral histories. Table can be used to photograph and display artifacts.

Cushions can be removed to reveal extra storage space. Visitors can sit and watch.

Dimensions (Short Section): 33.5" x 40.85" x 20.85"
Dimensions (Long Section): 60" x 40.85" x 20.85"

GTV: 1

OTT: 1

Leadership Touch: 16" x 17.9"

Flatscreen Television Monitor: 192" (16)
Heirloom 5 x 14" (40)

Dimensions: 27.9" x 31.1" x 20.85"

Shelves: 14.4" x 14.4" x 4.4" (8)

Dimensions: 19.7" x 8.4" x 8.4"

Magnetic 12 x 12 Erase Wall

Using Omni RM-100 Magnetic Wall

Adhesive Dry Erase Wall Covering: Lemos Hung

Dry Erase Wall

Right and Front Side in View

Humanities Truck: Right and Front Side in View

Dimensions: 192" (16)

Interior Height: 84" (7)

(pens, papers, etc.) will be stored in this unit

Other amenities: pens, pencils, highlighters, memory equipment (cameras, scanners, laptops, memory)

Storage: Two cabinets and three drawers: Digitization

QTV: 1

(least, etc.) will be stored in this unit

Other amenities: pens, pencils, highlighters, memory equipment (cameras, scanners, laptops, memory)

Storage: Two cabinets and three drawers: Digitization
Exterior truck features:

Into an exhibit space
of the mobile humanities unit to be transformed
Metal magnetic slide in order for the exhibit
Metal Slide

Exterior Features:

To attach a roll-down movie screen
screen television, outdoor speakers, and projectors
unit will feature an awning, all-weather
The mobile version of the mobile humanities
Exterior Features:
Mobile Humanities Unit Sample Logo
Interpretive Panels Narrative

The following interpretive narrative and the associated panels were developed by the Project Director in consultation with Fred Fritchman, a Boise-based exhibit developer and graphic designer. Fritchman provided numerous resources on interpretive writing, exhibit development, and graphic design as well as shared foundational knowledge on interpretation with the Project Director through a series of meetings.46

Scholarship on interpretive writing and exhibit development emphasizes the importance of writing to one’s audience. If the project team envisions the mobile humanities unit being parked at community festivals or visiting schools and libraries, then the mobile humanities unit needs to cater to the general public. To be accessible to a larger audience, the narrative needs to engage individuals with varying levels of interest, reading ability, and time. The Project Director carefully considered these requirements when developing the exhibit’s interpretive plan.47

Alan Leftridge’s *Interpretive Writing* (2006) provides a useful guide on writing exhibit text, focusing on the importance of language and word choice.48 To reach the largest, most diverse audience possible, the general rule in exhibit development is to write at a 5-8 reading level. The following narrative attempts to follow that rule, creating a story that can be understood by multigenerational visitors. Leftridge exemplifies how rich language engages readers’ imaginations; how concise and precise wording avoids mental fatigue; and how word choice and selecting the right words gives writing clarity and vitality. Applying Leftridge’s rules, the Project Director crafted a narrative that caters to individuals who are looking to have an enjoyable experience where they learn something but are not overwhelmed with new knowledge.

Beverly Serell’s *Exhibit Labels: An Interpretive Approach* (1996) largely informs the graphic hierarchy of the *Fish Wars: Stories of Cultural Survival and the Power of Native Women* exhibit.49 The graphic hierarchy refers to how exhibit panels are organized and structured, moving from the most general ideas to the most specific. The hierarchical design acts as a navigational function and reinforces the big ideas of the exhibit. Because *Fish Wars: Stories of Cultural Survival and the Power of Native Women* is housed in a smaller space, each panel contains more information than a traditional museum panel. However, the use of headlines,

---

46 Scholarship that provided the Project Director with direction in developing the interpretive narrative include: Alan Leftridge’s *Interpretive Writing* (2006); Beverly Serell’s *Exhibit Labels: An Interpretive Approach* (1996); Lisa Brochu’s *The 5-M Model for Successful Planning Projects* (2013); Paul Caputo, Shea Lewis, and Lisa Brochu’s *Interpretation by Design: Graphic Design Basics for Heritage Interpreters* (2008); Timothy Ambrose and Crisipin Paine’s *Museum Basics* (2006); Louise J. Ravelli’s *Museum Texts: Communication Frameworks* (2006). Other resources can be found through the National Association of Interpretation; the American Association of Museums; and the National Park Service’s Harpers Ferry Center, which has been providing the NPS with interpretive planning strategies for over 30 years.

47 Although designed for informal environmental educational programs, Lisa Brochu’s *The 5-M Model for Successful Planning Projects* (2013) develops a five-stage model that serves as a checklist that can be applied to other educational contexts. When developing an interpretive plan, the 5-M Model, which includes management, message, market, mechanics, and media, reminds content developers and interpreters of the areas they must consider in order to create a successful interpretive program. Lisa Brochu, *The 5-M Model for Successful Planning Projects, 2nd ed.* (Fort Collins, CO: InterpPress, 2013).


subheadings, and subsections maintains the graphic hierarchy, ensuring that each panel is visually pleasing and effective.50

50 Although the panels are organized in a linear fashion, visitors do not typically move in a linear manner. With that, some of the panels are redundant, ensuring that visitors receive all the information even if they skip a panel or two. Other helpful resources on graphic design basics includes Paul Caputo, Shea Lewis, and Lisa Brochu’s Interpretation by Design: Graphic Design Basics for Heritage Interpreters (2008), which provides guidance for interpreters with little to no training in graphic design. Focusing on the basic principles of graphic design, they demonstrate how to decide what type, color, and composition will make the most effective narrative; Paul Caputo, Shea Lewis, and Lisa Brochu, Interpretation by Design: Graphic Design Basics for Heritage Interpreters (Fort Collins, CO: InterpPress, 2008).
Panel 1 Title: “What Were the Fish Wars?”

Primary Text:
In 1854, the first governor of Washington Territory, Isaac Stevens, met with representatives of nine Native nations along the banks of the Nisqually River in the southern Puget Sound area of Washington State. There, they signed the Treaty of Medicine Creek, which moved the Native nations of the area onto three reservations but protected their right to fish in “all usual and accustomed grounds and stations.” This clause meant that Native fishers could fish on and off the newly established reservations.

To the signers of the treaty, it seemed like the anadromous fish population was inexhaustible. The rivers of the Puget Sound region flowed with at least four different species of salmon each year, and Native fishers would set their nets out at the mouth of rivers, especially the Nisqually and Puyallup Rivers, to catch their annual bounty.\(^5\)

Pull Quote/Definition:
Anadromous: A type of fish that migrates from freshwater rivers to the ocean and then back to freshwater rivers to spawn.

Primary Text:
However, by the 1930s, sportsmen and commercial fishing, the construction of dams, increased logging operations, and other industrial pollutants caused a sharp decline in the anadromous fish population, especially salmon and steelhead. To manage the depleted resources, Washington State established the Department of Fisheries to regulate food fish and the Department of Game to regulate game fish in 1932. Both departments declared that Native fishers wishing to fish off reservation would be subject to state regulations and had to abide by sport and commercial fishing regulations.

Pull Quote:
“The right of taking fish, at all usual and accustomed grounds and stations, is further secured to said Indians in common with all citizens of the Territory…” –Treaty of Medicine Creek, Article III\(^5\)

Secondary Text:
Native fishers resisted these regulations, arguing that the Treaty of Medicine Creek protected their right to fish on and off reservation. State authorities argued that “in common with all

\(^{51}\) William Sherman, “Case #9225339: Su’Zan Satiacum,” 1966, NIYC Papers, University of New Mexico Center for Southwest Research, Box 19, Folder 5, 23.

\(^{52}\) Article III of the Treaty of Medicine Creek, quoted in American Friends Service Committee, *Uncommon Controversy: Fishing Rights of the Muckleshoot, Puyallup, and Nisqually Indians* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1970), 25. Isaac Stevens met with chiefs and delegates from the Nisqually, Puyallup, Steilacoom, Squawskin (Squaxin Island), S’Homamish, Stehchass, T’Peeksin, Squi-aitl, and Sa-heh-wamish nations to sign a treaty in which the United States received 2.24 million acres of Indigenous land in exchange for the establishment of three reservations, payment of annuities, and recognition of Indigenous right to fish and hunt “all usual and accustomed grounds and stations.” In the Treaty of Point Elliott (1855), the Muckleshoot tribes signed similar treaty agreements, and the terms regarding their fishing and hunting rights were near identical.
citizens” meant that Native fishers fell within the definition of a citizen when it came to fishing practices.

Although Native fishers resisted these regulations from the beginning, conflicts between Native fishers and state authorities amplified in the early 1960s. They staged fish-ins (fishing in active defiance), marches, and other demonstrations. As Indigenous peoples gathered along the riverbanks of the Pacific Northwest to protect their fishing rights, three tribes in the southern Puget Sound area entered the public spotlight—the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot—as they led fierce fishing rights campaigns.

Panel 2 Title: “How the Salmon People Lived”

Primary Text:
Living alongside abundant salmon runs, many Indigenous tribes of the Pacific Northwest identify themselves as “Salmon People” and “Salmon Nations.” To this day, salmon contributes to the economic, social, and cultural foundations of many Northwest Indigenous groups.

By understanding the many ways in which salmon is central to Northwest Indigenous groups, we can better understand how state regulations threatened not only their traditional way of life but also their Indigenous identity. Indigenous women responded to this threat by assuming their traditional roles as cultural protectors and cultural transmitters.

Subheading: Gathering at the Water’s Edge
Coastal Indigenous groups formed communities based on their fishing waters. Indigenous peoples of the area typically lived in small groups that gathered at the mouth of rivers during the more sedentary, winter months. For that reason, the areas of river drainage were deemed areas of social unity.

In this off season, coastal tribes traded and sold their salmon with inland tribes and white settlers.

The process of salmon fishing also established distinctive gender roles in Northwest Indigenous communities. Men fished while women cleaned and processed the salmon.

Subheading: Celebrating the First Salmon
Many Northwest tribes host a “First Salmon Ceremony” to mark the first salmon of the fishing season and celebrate the renewal of the salmon runs. Although each tribe’s ceremony is unique, all ceremonies reflect the reverence and respect Northwest Native nations have for salmon.

---

53Mary Isely, Charles L. McEvers, and Pam Coe, “Preliminary Report on Indian Fishing Rights Dispute Involving the Muckleshoot, Puyallup, and Nisqually Tribes in Western Washington,” September 1, 1966, University of New Mexico, Center for Southwest Research, NIYC Papers, Box 19, Folder 5, 2.
Subsection: Origin Stories
Many oral traditions and cultural rituals reveal the importance of salmon to Northwest Indigenous communities. The origin story of Puget Sound Salish-speaking tribes describes how Moon, or the Transformer, called upon Salmon to be food for the humans Moon would go on to create.\textsuperscript{56}

A creation tradition of the Plateau tribes of the Columbia River Basin also reflects how humans’ survival is linked to salmon. Before creating the humans, the Creator gathered all the animals and plants and asked that each one of them give a gift for the humans. Salmon responded first, giving his body as food for the humans. Water answered next, promising to be the home for Salmon. All the animals and plants gave gifts, but because Salmon and Water gave their gifts first, Indigenous communities honor their gifts, or as they call them “First Foods,” by serving salmon and water first at tribal feasts.\textsuperscript{57}

Panel 3 Title: “Women Protecting Their Culture’s Legacy”

Pull Quote:
“I think that women of all of our Indian nations must take a more decisive role in the defense of our people if we are going to survive.” – Janet McCloud\textsuperscript{58}

Pull Quote:
“We’re dependent not just economically but culturally on the right to take fish. Fishing is part of our art forms and religion and diet, and the entire culture is based upon it.”—Ramona Bennett\textsuperscript{59}

Pull Quote:
“The entire culture is based around it…we’re talking about cultural genocide.” – Ramona Bennett\textsuperscript{60}

Primary Text:
By the early 1960s, Northwest tribes staged fish-ins in the name of cultural survival. Many believed that taking away their right to fish was a form of “cultural genocide”—direct attempts to wipe out Indigenous culture and by extension Indigenous communities.\textsuperscript{61}


\textsuperscript{60} Bennett, 147.

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid.
Traditionally, many Native communities were matriarchies. Women made key decisions, distributed food and material wealth, passed on cultural knowledge, and cared for their communities’ spiritual wellbeing. As mothers, they were granted the important task of educating the next generation in traditional Native practices. Indigenous women held the same authority as men. However, white settlers imposed their ideas of gender roles upon Native communities, disregarding their self-appointed, women leaders and forcing them to conform to settler gender norms.

Subsection: The Longhouse People
Ramona Bennett told the story of the Longhouse People on McNeil Island in the Puget Sound in a 1989 interview to illustrate how settlers manipulated Indigenous matriarchal societies.

In the mid-nineteenth century, white settlers from Boston traveled to the Longhouse People. Upon their arrival, they asked for the Longhouse People to “Send out your leaders.” The old women leaders came out because the Longhouse People were matriarchies. Upon seeing the old women, the Bostonian men said, “No, no, we want your leaders.” The old men were then sent out. Again, the white men said, “No, no, we want your leaders.” Eventually, the Longhouse People sent out their young men, and the Bostonians were satisfied.

Pull Quote:
“In our society it’s a matriarchy, it was never ever a patriarchy. The women gave birth, the women owned the house, the women taught the children.”—Nancy Shippentower-Games (Puyallup), daughter of Janet McCloud.

Secondary Text:
Assuming their traditional roles of cultural protectors, it was up to Native women—like Ramona Bennett (Puyallup), Janet McCloud (Tulalip), and Su’Zan Satiacum (Kaw)—to ensure the continuity of their cultures. Serving in both leading and supporting roles during the Fish Wars, these Native women continued a legacy of Indigenous women resisting settler encroachment and protecting their communities. Not only did they resist broken treaty promises, but they also resisted the gender roles imposed upon their communities by white settlers. Their actions as community organizers, women warriors, and mothers, shows how they modeled themselves after their ancestors by responding to the needs of their communities. They staged fish-in demonstrations, unified their communities, and fished in defiance while including their children in their efforts.

Panel 4 Title: “Empowering Her Community”

---

62 Winona LaDuke, from a talk delivered during International Women’s Week, University of Colorado at Boulder, April 1985, quoted in M. Annette Jamies and Theresa Halsey’s “American Indian Women: At the Center of Indigenous Resistance in North America.”
64 Nancy Shippentower-Games, 2017, “Still Fighting after All These Years: A Puyallup Tribal Member’s Perspective,” interviewed by Rachael Williamson.” Tacoma Community History Project.
Born on the Tulalip Reservation in 1934, Janet McCloud was a prominent leader of the Fish Wars. Janet and her husband Don (Nisqually) settled on a plot of land along the Nisqually River in Yelm, Washington, near Don’s stepfather, Billy Frank Sr. (Nisqually). Billy’s land became known as Frank’s Landing and was the site of many fish-in demonstrations. In January 1961, game wardens burst into Janet’s home, searching for deer meat. When she demanded if they had a warrant, they presented a warrant for “John Doe,” meaning they could “lawfully” search whichever house they chose. Angered and frustrated, Janet began looking for ways to protect and empower her community.

Living up to her gifted name—Yet-Si-Blue, meaning “The Woman Who Talks”—Janet used her voice to bring more attention to the fishing rights. The smaller tribes of the southern Puget Sound area often lacked internal organization, making them easy targets for state and federal agencies to violate their treaties. Janet was one of the many women who stepped up to lead, staging fish-in demonstrations and providing means of community organization.

In 1964, Janet helped establish the Survival of American Indians Association (SAIA), an organization that gave Native fishers necessary legal and financial support when arrested. The SAIA also sought to unify efforts by regularly publishing Indian Survival News, a newsletter intended to keep Indigenous communities informed of the fishing rights efforts. Selected as the first leader of the SAIA, Janet made her uncompromising position known.

Writing with future generations in mind, Janet wrote a letter to President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1965. She demanded that the United States honor their treaties with Indigenous nations, keeping their promise to protect Indigenous nations against further encroachment on their land and rights.

Pull Quote:
“When she spoke, everybody listened.”—Barbara McCloud, Janet’s daughter

Subsection: Sapa Dawn Center
In 1965, Janet and Don transformed their ten-acre property in Yelm into a spiritual retreat center, later called the Sapa Dawn Center, to be a place where Indigenous peoples could gather to practice traditional Native ceremonies, seek rejuvenation, and support one another in their collective struggle for recognition, rights, and cultural preservation. The retreat center hosted American Indian Movement activists as they planned their occupation of Wounded Knee in 1973, and later welcomed the Indigenous Women’s Network in 1985.

---

Su’Zan Satiacum was part of the Kaw tribe of Kansas and Arkansas, but she spent her teenage years living with relatives near Tacoma, Washington. In 1961, Su’Zan married Bob Satiacum (Puyallup), who had been involved in the fishing rights struggle since the 1950s. In 1957, after being arrested for violating state fishing regulations, Bob brought his case to the Washington Supreme Court, which ruled in his favor. Because Bob was often arrested and imprisoned, Su’Zan fished for the family and did so in active defiance of state regulations.

Even after enforcement officers became stricter and regulations became harsher in 1965, Su’Zan refused to stop fishing. Su’Zan’s lawyers and Washington State lawyers told her that if only women fished and did so at night, then the state would not bother them. So that’s what she did. Su’Zan and her sister-in-law Clara Satiacum (Puyallup) took their boat to the river and fished in the moonlight. However, by the end of summer 1965, enforcement officers began arresting them.

“They told us that if only the women fished, and if we only fished at night and didn’t make the sports fishermen mad again, they wouldn’t bother us.”—Su’Zan Satiacum

Like many nights before, Su’Zan and Clara pushed their boat into the Nisqually River under the cloak of darkness. The quiet, dark night was soon ablaze with sirens and headlights as state authorities chased them in cars along the riverbanks. Some officers commandeered a tugboat and chased the women down the river, but the women escaped the tugboat after hitting turbulent water. As the high-speed boat chase continued, Su’Zan and Clara were eventually overtaken and boarded by a policeman in a small launch boat. They were taken to the police station and held in an interrogation room from 12:25 AM to 5:30 AM before being released. That night gave Su’Zan new energy to protect her fishing rights.

Although she was arrested many times, and even drew a 90-day sentence for one of the arrests, she never served any jail time. She was typically released because she was the main caregiver of her seven children.

Although she was arrested many times, and even drew a 90-day sentence for one of the arrests, she never served any jail time. She was typically released because she was the main caregiver of her seven children.

William Sherman, “Case #9225339: Su’Zan Satiacum,” 1966, NIYC Papers, University of New Mexico Center for Southwest Research, Box 19, Folder 5, 25.
Throughout the 1960s, Native fishers staged fish-in demonstrations where they fished in active defiance of state regulations. These fish-ins had varying levels of impact individually, but together they created a campaign that gained national attention.

In the 1950s, tribal governments and councils attempted to resolve the fishing rights dispute through negotiation and compromise with state agencies. Frustrated by the constant arrests and lack of action by tribal authorities, a group of Native fishers decided that the fishing rights dispute could only be resolved through confrontation and direct action. These Native fishers formed the Survival of American Indians Association (SAIA) in January 1964. With Janet McCloud as their leader, the SAIA used civil disobedience to protect their fishing rights.

By February 1964, the SAIA was busy planning and staging fish-in demonstrations. They printed ads in local newspapers to attract fish-in participation at Frank’s Landing, property owned by Billy Frank Jr. on the shores of the Nisqually River, as well as to gain media attention.\(^{71}\)

**Subsection:**
Publicity increased when celebrities joined the cause. Actor Marlon Brando was arrested at a fish-in on the Puyallup River on March 2, 1964, and comedian Dick Gregory and his wife, Lillian, were later arrested at a fish-in on the Nisqually River on February 16, 1966.

**Subsection: October 1965: Tensions Boil Over**
In October 1965, tensions between Native fishers and state authorities rose to new heights, and a series of violent protests occurred at Frank’s Landing. Many Native fishers fished at night to avoid being arrested during the day. When enforcement officers discovered that Native fishers went to the rivers at night, they began conducting night raids.

On October 7, 1965, Billy Frank Jr. and Alvin Bridges were arrested for fishing near Frank’s Landing. Two nights later, state authorities cornered two teenage boys on a log jam in the middle of the Nisqually River after discovering them fishing.

Organized by Janet McCloud, eight men and nineteen women and children gathered on October 13, 1965, to fish in broad daylight to protest the night raids. With 30-50 officials and game wardens watching from both sides of the river, Janet announced the purpose of the demonstration to members of the press.

Don McCloud Sr., Alvin Bridges, Dorian Sanchez, and Janet’s children, Don Jr. and Jeffery McCloud, along with three cameramen boarded their fishing boats. As soon as the Native fishers cast their nets, officers ran to the river with two boats.

One boat rammed into the Native fishers’ boat and boarded it. Native women and children threw rocks at the other boat of state authorities.

---

\(^{71}\) “Indians Plan Fish-In at Nisqually Protest,” *The Seattle Times*, (Seattle, WA), February 27, 1964, 14.
A game warden grabbed teenagers Valerie and Alison Bridges by their hair, and Janet went to free them, being hit in the process.72

Pull Quote:
“Wardens were everywhere, and they all seemed to be eight feet tall...They were shoving, kicking, pushing clubs at men, women, and children. We were vastly outnumbered, yet we were all still trying to protect one another.” – Janet McCloud73

By the end of the day, state authorities arrested Alvin and Maiselle Bridges, Don and Janet McCloud, Su’Zan Satiacum, Don George Jr., Harold Gleason, and Joe Kautz.

Panel 7 Title: “Finding Other Ways to Protest”

Primary Text
By October 1966, a year had passed since the violent confrontation between Native fishers and state authorities at Frank’s Landing and since the last arrest of Native fishers for defying state regulations. Since October 13, 1965—a “day of infamy” to the people of the southern Puget Sound area—few fishing demonstrations had occurred.

However, the SAIA was still very active. The organization advanced their educational programs, teaching children Indigenous history, culture, and the facts of treaty rights. Several national and foreign publications printed articles from the SAIA’s newsletter, Survival Indian News. As more information of the fishing rights dispute circulated to a larger audience, more people supported the cause. People from around the world sent letters of support and donations.74

Subsection: January 1966: Going up in Flames
On January 29, 1966, over two hundred Native fishers and about fifty non-Native supporters gathered at Frank’s Landing. Unlike the other demonstrations of the Fish Wars, there was no fishing involved. Participants stood around a fire as rain poured down. Tensions were high as frustrated leaders spoke over loudspeakers and protested the violent actions of state authorities. Janet McCloud told the audience that they intended to burn effigies of Washington State Governor Daniel J. Evans for his indifference toward the violent tactics used by state authorities. The night concluded with Yakima dancers performing an authentic war dance around the fire as an effigy of Governor Evans was thrown into the flames.75

Subheading: Muckleshoot Treaty Treks: May and July 1966

73 Mark Trahant, “The Center of Everything—Native Leader Janet McCloud Finds Peace in Her Place, Her Victories, Her Family. It Has Taken Many Years to Get There,” Seattle Times (Seattle, WA), July 4, 1999. Quoting Janet McCloud during the interview he conducted with her for this article.
75 Janet McCloud, “The Last Indian War;” unpublished manuscript, 1966, NIYC Papers, University of New Mexico Center for Southwest Research, Box 19, Folder 18, 5-6.
The Muckleshoot tribe staged a unified front in their fish-ins, treaty treks, canoe treks, and marches.76

On the morning of May 13, 1966, nearly fifty Native fishers and supporters set off on a thirteen-mile “treaty trek” from Auburn to Federal Way. The marchers carried signs that read “State Actions Violate Federal Treaties!” and “Honor Our Commitment at Home!” and argued that the state did not have the right to prosecute any arrested fishers because their fishing rights were guaranteed by the Treaties of Medicine Creek (1854) and Point Elliot (1955).77

Only two months later, nearly thirty Native fishers and supporters marched to the King County Courthouse on July 13, 1966. Leading the march were Larry Maurice, Robert Moses, Sherman Dominick, and Cecil Moses, who were scheduled to go on trial later that afternoon for violating state fishing regulations.78

Subsection: Resurrection City No. 2

On June 20, 1968, a half-dozen people erected a teepee and pitched a tent on the lawn of the Washington State Capitol in Olympia in protest of their broken treaties.79 Led by Janet McCloud, the encampment grew to twenty-nine residents within a few days. “Resurrection City No. 2,” as Janet called the increasingly permanent encampment, attracted local and national supporters. Alvin Bridges and Herman Johns returned from the Poor People’s Campaign in Washington D.C. to serve as security. Semu Haute served as the camp’s medicine man. Groups of Native Hawaiians and Creek supporters also joined the camp.80 Janet said to reporters that they would remain there “as long as the sun shines and the rain falls and the mountains stand.”81 On June 28, state authorities tore down the camp, and less than a month later, Janet announced that fish-ins on the Nisqually would begin again that August.82

Panel 8 Title: “Taking a Militant Approach”

Primary Text

Born in Seattle, Washington in 1938, Ramona Bennett of the Puyallup Tribe was active in the Fish Wars from the start. Ramona co-founded the Survival of American Indians with Janet McCloud in 1964. Throughout the 1960s, she led fish-in demonstrations, working closely with other Native leaders to advance fishing rights and other sovereignty issues. In the summer of 1970, Ramona helped establish a fishing encampment along the Puyallup River and supported the possession of firearms by Native fishers. As a Puyallup Tribal Council chairwoman, Ramona illustrated the shift in governing councils that now embraced more confrontational and militant tactics.

76 Janet McCloud, “The Last Indian War Part II,” unpublished manuscript, 1966, NIYC Papers, University of New Mexico Center for Southwest Research, Box 19, Folder 18, 4-5.
77 “Fewer Than 50 Begin March for Indians’ Fishing Rights,” The Seattle Times (Seattle, WA), May 13, 1966, 2.
82 Mike Parks, “Gregory to Tour World,” The Seattle Times (Seattle, WA), July 17, 1968, 9.
On August 13, 1970, Charlie Cantrell (Puyallup) held a press conference at the Seattle Indian Center to announce that tribal organizations would police their fish-ins and fishing encampments to ensure the protection of their people.  

**Pull Quote:**
“If anyone lays a hand on the net, they are going to get shot,” –Ramona Bennett.  

**Subsection: Warrior Women**

The male-dominated, Native “warrior cultures,” perpetuated by Euro-American literature, film, and music, are rooted in historical inaccuracies. Historical records reveal numerous Indigenous female military commanders, such as the Lakota’s four women warrior societies. In some Indigenous nations, women like the “Beloved Women” of the Cherokees held the authority to wage war and decide the fates of captives. Coast Salish women were independent mariners, who used their trade networks and wage labor to combat settler encroachment. Similar to the independent women that came before them, Northwest Indigenous women took charge as they went to the riverbanks to protect their right to fish.  

**Subheading: A Scene of Chaos: September 9, 1970**

On the morning of September 9th, state authorities attacked the major fishing encampment along the Puyallup River. When officers tried to remove a tribal member’s fishnet, four shots were fired at them. A scene of chaos quickly erupted. Black smoke and tear gas filled the air as demonstrators set a wooden railroad ablate with a firebomb, and state authorities responded with clouds of tear gas.  

**Pull Quote:**
“Law enforcement agents came with the tactical squad, and just ran right over our people with high-powered boats,” –Ramona Bennett  

Officers arrested 60 men, women, and children and bulldozed the encampment site. After witnessing the events of September 9th, Stan Pitkin, a U.S. Attorney for western Washington, filed United States. v. State of Washington on behalf of the tribes.  

By 1971, Native fishers gained public and state favor. Their new militant tactics seemed to have shifted the tides. Fishers at Frank’s Landing fished the entire fishing season without any arrests, and four Native fishers arrested for interfering with the police were acquitted by an all-white jury.  

---

83 “Indians will Police Fish-Ins,” Seattle Post-Intelligencer, (Seattle, WA), August 14, 1970, B.
83 For additional readings on the debunking of the “warrior culture” myth, see D’Arcy McNickle’s The Surrounded and Paula Allen Gunn’s The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions.
86 Janet McCloud, “The Continuing ‘Last Indian War,’” unpublished manuscript, 1966, NIYC Papers, University of New Mexico Center for Southwest Research, Box 19, Folder 18, 4.
88 Bennett, “The Puyallup Tribe Rose from the Ashes,” 155.
On February 12, 1974, Judge George Boldt handed down his decision on *United States v. State of Washington*, after nearly four years of discovery, pretrial motions, and the trial. His decision, which became known as the Boldt decision, affirmed the rights of several western Washington tribes to fish off reservation in accordance with treaties signed in the 1850s. The Boldt decision also promised Native fishers half of the state’s fish harvest each year and protected their rights to regulate their own fisheries.

**Panel 9 Title: “Mothers of the Resilient”**

**Primary Text:**
Motherhood grounded Indigenous women’s activism. They drew authority from the ways of their ancestors’ matrilineal societies. An Indigenous matrilineal society meant people inherited their Native identity from their mothers rather than their fathers. The women of the Fish Wars understood that if previous generations gained their Indigenous identity through their mothers, then it was their duty, as mothers, to protect their children’s Native heritage. Many women brought their children of all ages to fish-ins and other demonstrations.

When these Indigenous women brought her children to the fish-ins and other demonstrations, they demonstrated how Indigenous women lived and worked as both mothers and activists, emphasizing the relationship between maternity, nation-building, and nation-protecting.

**Subsection: The Bridges Family**
The Bridges regularly fished in defiance of state regulations as a family. Alvin and Maiselle Bridges (Puyallup/Nisqually) lived at Frank’s Landing, and raised their three daughters Suzette, Valerie, and Alison against the backdrop of Fish Wars. Alvin was arrested so many times that his daughters started fishing in his absence.

**Secondary Text:**
At the age of nineteen, Alison Bridges (Puyallup) became a prominent figure in the fishing rights movement after photographs of her being arrested at a fish-in along the Puyallup River in 1970 drew national attention.

**Subsection: Educating the Next Generation**
Janet McCloud (Tulalip) frequently brought her children to the fish-in demonstrations and encouraged elders, women, men, and children alike to join in the resistance.

Su’Zan Satiacum (Kaw) and Elaine Wright, along with all their children, led a marching demonstration at the Federal Courthouse in Seattle in 1965.90

By taking their children to fish-ins and marches, these mothers exposed their children to the resiliency of their culture and Indigenous identity, educating the next generation of cultural protectors.

90 Janet McCloud, “The Last Indian War Part II,” unpublished manuscript, 1966, NIYC Papers, University of New Mexico Center for Southwest Research, Box 19, Folder 18.
By exploring the roles of Indigenous women in the Fish Wars, our understanding of Native activism expands. For many Indigenous women, their role as cultural protectors motivated their activism. They worked not to create new ways of life but to return to their traditional ways of life. Their duties as caretakers, cultural transmitters, and warrior activists illustrate how Native women continue to be essential to cultural healing, renewal, and resiliency.

Despite the Boldt decision of 1974 guaranteeing Indigenous fishing rights, the decimation of salmon populations continues to be a point of conflict in the Pacific Northwest. Many Native fishers argue that the right to fish includes having a plentiful population to fish from. Restoring lost salmon habitats and sharing the existing resource requires collaboration between the state and tribes. Collaborative decision-making includes valuing Indigenous knowledge and incorporating Indigenous practices into watershed and salmon management. Individuals living near salmon habitats can also get involved at the local level by participating in land use decisions.

As policymakers search for sustainable solutions, it remains important that they not only collaborate with Indigenous communities but also consult Indigenous women specifically. Indigenous women’s role as cultural protectors is intertwined with protecting their environment and ensuring access to healthy watersheds. The Fish Wars show us the many ways Indigenous women help protect not only their treaty rights, but also their waters and salmon. As we consider possible solutions to the salmon crisis, we must also reexamine how Indigenous women’s unique perspectives on salmon and watershed management are included in the decision-making process.

Panel 11 Title (Call to Action): “What Can You Do?”

Acknowledge Native treaties and the rights they protect.

Listen to Indigenous peoples and be willing to learn.

Support Indigenous knowledge and resource management.

Learn more about the Native communities and their histories where you live.

Seek out Indigenous-led and Indigenous-created materials.

Collaborate rather than consult with Indigenous partners.

Panel 12 Title (Visitor Participation): “Send a postcard!”

Write a postcard to a family member or friend describing what you learned today, or even write one to yourself to be reminded of your newfound knowledge. Write your letter, address the postcard, and we will send it for you!

Place the postcard in the basket when you are completed.
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Exhibit Script
*Stories of Cultural Survival and the Power of Native Women*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit ID</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel 1</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>What Were the Fish Wars?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Panel 1    | Primary Text | In 1854, the first governor of Washington Territory, Isaac Stevens, met with representatives of nine Native nations along the banks of the Nisqually River in the southern Puget Sound area of Washington State. There, they signed the Treaty of Medicine Creek, which moved the Native nations of the area onto three reservations but protected their right to fish in “all usual and accustomed grounds and stations.” This clause meant that Native fishers could fish on and off the newly established reservations.  

To the signers of the treaty, it seemed like the anadromous fish population was inexhaustible. The rivers of the Puget Sound region flowed with at least four different species of salmon each year, and Native fishers would set their nets out at the mouth of rivers, especially the Nisqually and Puyallup Rivers, to catch their annual bounty.  

However, by the 1930s, sportsmen and commercial fishing, the construction of dams, increased logging operations, and other industrial pollutants caused a sharp decline in the anadromous fish population, especially salmon and steelhead. To manage the depleted resources, Washington State established the Department of Fisheries to regulate food fish and the Department of Game to regulate game fish in 1932. Both departments declared that Native fishers wishing to fish off reservation would be subject to state regulations and had to abide by sport and commercial fishing regulations. | 224        |                              |
Panel 1 | Image 1001 | Courtesy of Smithsonian National Museum of the American Indian. | 9

Panel 1 | Definition | Anadromous: A type of fish that migrates from freshwater rivers to the ocean and then back to freshwater rivers to spawn. | 21

Panel 1 | Pull Quote | “The right of taking fish, at all usual and accustomed grounds and stations, is further secured to said Indians in common with all citizens of the Territory…” –Treaty of Medicine Creek, Article III | 33

Panel 1 | Image 1002 | Treaty of Medicine Creek (1854). Courtesy of the National Archives. | 10

Panel 1 | Secondary Text | Native fishers resisted these regulations, arguing that the Treaty of Medicine Creek protected their right to fish on and off reservation. State authorities argued that “in common with all citizens” meant that Native fishers fell within the definition of a citizen when it came to fishing practices. Although Native fishers resisted these regulations from the beginning, conflicts between Native fishers and state authorities amplified in the early 1960s. They staged fish-ins (fishing in active defiance), marches, and other demonstrations. As Indigenous peoples gathered along the riverbanks of the Pacific Northwest to protect their fishing rights, three tribes in the southern Puget Sound area |

Bolded words are intentional
entered the public spotlight—the **Nisqually**, **Puyallup**, and **Muckleshoot**—as they led fierce fishing rights campaigns.

Living alongside abundant salmon runs, many Indigenous tribes of the Pacific Northwest identify themselves as “Salmon People” and “Salmon Nations.” To this day, salmon contributes to the economic, social, and cultural foundations of many Northwest Indigenous groups.

By understanding the many ways in which salmon is central to Northwest Indigenous groups, we can better understand how state regulations threatened not only their traditional way of life but also their Indigenous identity. Indigenous women responded to this threat by assuming their traditional roles as cultural protectors and cultural transmitters.

Northwest Indigenous coastal family drying fish and clams at their beach encampment, ca. 1905.

Courtesy of University of Washington.

Coastal Indigenous groups formed communities based on their fishing waters. Indigenous peoples of the area typically lived in small groups that gathered at the mouth of rivers during the more sedentary, winter months. For that reason, the areas of river drainage were deemed areas of social unity. In this off season, coastal tribes traded and sold their salmon with inland tribes and white settlers.
The process of salmon fishing also established distinctive gender roles in Northwest Indigenous communities. Men fished while women cleaned and processed the salmon.

| Panel 2 | Image 2002 | Above: Snohomish couple in temporary summer house along the Puget Sound, ca. 1905. Courtesy of University of Washington. | 18 |
| Panel 2 | Image 2003 | Right: Fishing camp at Wing Point on Bainbridge Island in Puget Sound, ca. 1905. Courtesy of University of Washington. | 19 |
| Panel 2 | Image 2004 | Top Right: Men fishing from wooden platform in Puget Sound, ca. 1890-1895. Courtesy of University of Washington. | 17 |
| Panel 2 | Subheading 2.2 | Celebrating the First Salmon | 4 |
Many Northwest tribes host a “First Salmon Ceremony” to mark the first salmon of the fishing season and celebrate the renewal of the salmon runs. Although each tribe’s ceremony is unique, all ceremonies reflect the reverence and respect Northwest Native nations have for salmon.

Willie Frank III and Hanford McCloud prepare to take the First Salmon out to the river as part of the 2017 First Salmon Ceremony held along the Nisqually River. Reuben Wells (center) prepared the fish. Courtesy of Nisqually Tribal News.

Many oral traditions and cultural rituals reveal the importance of salmon to Northwest Indigenous communities. The origin story of Puget Sound Salish-speaking tribes describes how Moon, or the Transformer, called upon Salmon to be food for the humans Moon would go on to create.

A creation tradition of the Plateau tribes of the Columbia River Basin also reflects how humans’ survival is linked to salmon. Before creating the humans, the Creator gathered all the animals and plants and asked that each one of them give a gift for the humans. Salmon responded first, giving his body as food for the humans. Water answered next, promising to be the home for Salmon. All the animals and plants gave gifts, but because Salmon and Water gave their gifts first, Indigenous communities honor their gifts, or as they call them “First Foods,” by serving salmon and water first at tribal feasts.
attempts to wipe out Indigenous culture and by extension Indigenous communities.

Traditionally, many Native communities were matriarchies. Women made key decisions, distributed food and material wealth, passed on cultural knowledge, and cared for their communities’ spiritual wellbeing. As mothers, they were granted the important task of educating the next generation in traditional Native practices. Indigenous women held the same authority as men. However, white settlers imposed their ideas of gender roles upon Native communities, disregarding their self-appointed, women leaders and forcing them to conform to settler gender norms.

Panel 3  | Image 3001  | Ramona Bennett during meeting with church officials in Seattle, Washington on September 17, 1970.  | 19  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Courtesy of University of Washington.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel 3  | Pull Quote  | “We’re dependent not just economically but culturally on the right to take fish. Fishing is part of our art forms and religion and diet, and the entire culture is based upon it.”  | 43  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The entire culture is based around it…we’re talking about cultural genocide.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Courtesy of University of Washington.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel 3  | Pull Quote  | “I think that women of all of our Indian nations must take a more decisive role in the defense of our people if we are going to survive.”  | 28  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel 3  | Subsection 3.1 Title  | The Longhouse People  | 3  |
|---|---|---|---|

Panel 3  | Subsection 3.1 Text  | Ramona Bennett told the story of the Longhouse People on McNeil Island in the Puget Sound in a 1989 interview to illustrate  | 114  |
how settlers manipulated Indigenous matriarchal societies.

In the mid-nineteenth century, white settlers from Boston traveled to the Longhouse People. Upon their arrival, they asked for the Longhouse People to “Send out your leaders.” The old women leaders came out because the Longhouse People were matriarchies. Upon seeing the old women, the Bostonian men said, “No, no, we want your leaders.” The old men were then sent out. Again, the white men said, “No, no, we want your leaders.” Eventually, the Longhouse People sent out their young men, and the Bostonians were satisfied.

**Panel 3**  
**Secondary Text**

Assuming their traditional roles of cultural protectors, it was up to Native women—like Ramona Bennett (Puyallup), Janet McCloud (Tulalip), and Su’Zan Satiacum (Kaw)—to ensure the continuity of their cultures. Serving in both leading and supporting roles during the Fish Wars, these Native women continued a legacy of Indigenous women resisting settler encroachment and protecting their communities. Not only did they resist broken treaty promises, but they also resisted the gender roles imposed upon their communities by white settlers. Their actions as community organizers, women warriors, and mothers, shows how they modeled themselves after their ancestors by responding to the needs of their communities. They staged fish-in demonstrations, unified their communities, and fished in defiance while including their children in their efforts.

**Panel 4**  
**Title**  
Empowering Her Community

**Panel 4**  
**Primary Text**

Born on the Tulalip Reservation in 1934, Janet McCloud was a prominent leader of the Fish Wars. Janet and her husband Don (Nisqually) settled on a plot of land along the Nisqually River in Yelm, Washington, near Don’s stepfather, Billy Frank Sr. (Nisqually).
Billy’s land became known as Frank’s Landing and was the site of many fish-in demonstrations. In January 1961, game wardens burst into Janet’s home, searching for deer meat. When she demanded if they had a warrant, they presented a warrant for “John Doe,” meaning they could “lawfully” search whichever house they chose. Angered and frustrated, Janet began looking for ways to protect and empower her community.

Living up to her gifted name—Yet-Si-Blue, meaning “The Woman Who Talks”—Janet used her voice to bring more attention to the fishing rights. The smaller tribes of the southern Puget Sound area often lacked internal organization, making them easy targets for state and federal agencies to violate their treaties. Janet was one of the many women who stepped up to lead, staging fish-in demonstrations and providing means of community organization.

In 1964, Janet helped establish the Survival of American Indians Association (SAIA), an organization that gave Native fishers necessary legal and financial support when arrested. The SAIA also sought to unify efforts by regularly publishing *Indian Survival News*, a newsletter intended to keep Indigenous communities informed of the fishing rights efforts. Selected as the first leader of the SAIA, Janet made her uncompromising position known.

Writing with future generations in mind, Janet wrote a letter to President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1965. She demanded that the United States honor their treaties with Indigenous nations, keeping their promise to protect Indigenous nations against further encroachment on their land and rights.
Courtesy of Ronnie Farley. | 11 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pull Quote</td>
<td>“When she spoke, everyone listened.” – Barbara McCloud, Janet’s daughter.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Courtesy of University of Washington. | 21 |
Courtesy of Bill Templeton, *The Seattle Times*. | 34 |
Courtesy of M. Gouldhawke. |  |
Courtesy of University of Washington. | 26 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel 4</th>
<th>Image 4006</th>
<th>Subsection 4.1 Title</th>
<th>Subsection 4.1 Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sapa Dawn Center</td>
<td>In 1965, Janet and Don transformed their ten-acre property in Yelm into a spiritual retreat center, later called the Sapa Dawn Center, to be a place where Indigenous peoples could gather to practice traditional Native ceremonies, seek rejuvenation, and support one another in their collective struggle for recognition, rights, and cultural preservation. The retreat center hosted American Indian Movement activists as they planned their occupation of Wounded Knee in 1973, and later welcomed the Indigenous Women’s Network in 1985.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel 5</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Under the Cloak of Darkness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Text</td>
<td>Su’Zan Satiacum was part of the Kaw tribe of Kansas and Arkansas, but she spent her teenage years living with relatives near Tacoma, Washington. In 1961, Su’Zan married Bob Satiacum (Puyallup), who had been involved in the fishing rights struggle since the 1950s. In 1957, after being arrested for violating state fishing regulations, Bob brought his case to the Washington Supreme Court, which ruled in his favor. Because Bob was often arrested and imprisoned, Su’Zan fished for the family and did so in active defiance of state regulations. Even after enforcement officers became stricter and regulations became harsher in 1965, Su’Zan refused to stop fishing. Su’Zan’s lawyers and Washington State lawyers told her that if only women fished and...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
did so at night, then the state would not bother them. So that’s what she did. Su’Zan and her sister-in-law Clara Satiacum (Puyallup) took their boat to the river and fished in the moonlight. However, by the end of summer 1965, enforcement officers began arresting them.

Panel 5  Image 5001  Courtesy of William Sherman, University of New Mexico’s Center for Southwest Research. 12

Panel 5  Pull Quote  “They told us that if only the women fished, and if we only fished at night and didn’t make the sports fishermen mad again, they wouldn’t bother us.”—Su’Zan Satiacum 30

Panel 5  Subsection 5.1 Title  September 21, 1965: Night of Tugboat Number Nine 8

Panel 5  Subsection 5.1 Text  Like many nights before, Su’Zan and Clara pushed their boat into the Nisqually River under the cloak of darkness. The quiet, dark night was soon ablaze with sirens and headlights as state authorities chased them in cars along the riverbanks. Some officers commandeered a tugboat and chased the women down the river, but the women escaped the tugboat after hitting turbulent water. As the high-speed boat chase continued, Su’Zan and Clara were eventually overtaken and boarded by a policeman in a small launch boat. They were taken to the police station and held in an interrogation room from 12:25 AM to 5:30 AM before being released. That night gave Su’Zan new energy to protect her fishing rights.

Panel 5  Secondary Text  Although she was arrested many times, and even drew a 90-day sentence for one of the arrests, she never served any jail time. She was typically released because she was the main caregiver of her seven children. 37
| Panel 5 | Image 5002 | Left: Su’Zan Satiacum at the police station after being arrested.  
Courtesy of William Sherman, University of New Mexico’s Center for Southwest Research. | 22 |
| Panel 5 | Images 5003-5006 | Right: After being arrested at a fish-in along the Nisqually River, Su’Zan Satiacum was reluctant to cooperate with Washington State game wardens. She had to be forcibly subdued in a police car after demonstrating a strong left hook, October 13, 1965.  
Courtesy of William Sherman, University of New Mexico’s Center for Southwest Research. | 53 |
| Panel 6 | Title | Fishing in Defiance | 3 Panel Dimensions: 24” x 36” |
| Panel 6 | Primary Text | Throughout the 1960s, Native fishers staged fish-in demonstrations where they fished in active defiance of state regulations. These fish-ins had varying levels of impact individually, but together they created a campaign that gained national attention.  
In the 1950s, tribal governments and councils attempted to resolve the fishing rights dispute through negotiation and compromise with state agencies. Frustrated by the constant arrests and lack of action by tribal authorities, a group of Native fishers decided that the fishing rights dispute could only be resolved through confrontation and direct action. These Native fishers formed the Survival of American Indians Association (SAIA) in January 1964. With Janet McCloud as their leader, the SAIA used civil disobedience to protect their fishing rights.  
By February 1964, the SAIA was busy planning and staging fish-in demonstrations. They printed ads in local newspapers to attract fish-in participation at Frank’s Landing, property owned by Billy Frank Jr. on the | 163 |
shores of the Nisqually River, as well as to gain media attention.

|  |  | Courtesy of University of Washington.

Panel 6  | Image 6002  | Dick Gregory going to fish while Janet McCloud and others watch from riverbank, Nisqually River, March 1, 1966.  
|  |  | Courtesy of University of Washington.

Panel 6  | Subsection 6.1 Text  | Publicity increased when celebrities joined the cause. Actor Marlon Brando was arrested at a fish-in on the Puyallup River on March 2, 1964, and comedian Dick Gregory and his wife, Lillian, were later arrested at a fish-in on the Nisqually River on February 16, 1966.

Panel 6  | Subsection 6.2 Title  | October 1965: Tensions Boil Over

Panel 6  | Subsection 6.2 Text  | In October 1965, tensions between Native fishers and state authorities rose to new heights, and a series of violent protests occurred at Frank’s Landing. Many Native fishers fished at night to avoid being arrested during the day. When enforcement officers discovered that Native fishers went to the rivers at night, they began conducting night raids.

|  |  | On October 7, 1965, Billy Frank Jr. and Alvin Bridges were arrested for fishing near Frank’s Landing. Two nights later, state authorities cornered two teenage boys on a log jam in the middle of the Nisqually River after discovering them fishing.

|  |  | Organized by Janet McCloud, eight men and nineteen women and children gathered on October 13, 1965, to fish in broad daylight to protest the night raids. With 30-50 officials and game wardens watching from both sides of the river, Janet announced the purpose of the demonstration to members of the press.
Don McCloud Sr., Alvin Bridges, Dorian Sanchez, and Janet’s children, Don Jr. and Jeffery McCloud, along with three cameramen boarded their fishing boats. As soon as the Native fishers cast their nets, officers ran to the river with two boats.

One boat rammed into the Native fishers’ boat and boarded it. Native women and children threw rocks at the other boat of state authorities.

A game warden grabbed teenagers Valerie and Alison Bridges by their hair, and Janet went to free them, being hit in the process.

“Wardens were everywhere, and they all seemed to be eight feet tall…They were shoving, kicking, pushing clubs at men, women, and children. We were vastly outnumbered, yet we were all still trying to protect one another.” –Janet McCloud

By the end of the day, state authorities arrested Alvin and Maiselle Bridges, Don and Janet McCloud, Su’Zan Satiacum, Don George Jr., Harold Gleason, and Joe Kautz.
| Panel 6 | Image 6004 | Maiselle Bridges being arrested.  
Courtesey of University of New Mexico’s Center for Southwest Research. |
|--------|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Panel 6 | Image 6005 | Alvin Bridges being arrested.  
Courtesey of University of New Mexico’s Center for Southwest Research. |
| Panel 6 | Image 6006 | Alison and Valerie Bridges being grabbed by state authorities.  
Courtesey of University of New Mexico’s Center for Southwest Research. |
| Panel 6 | Image 6007 | Left: Don McCloud and his daughter, Nancy McCloud.  
Courtesey of University of New Mexico’s Center for Southwest Research. |
Panel 7 | Title | Finding Other Ways to Protest | 5 | Panel Dimensions: 24” x36”

By October 1966, a year had passed since the violent confrontation between Native fishers and state authorities at Frank’s Landing and since the last arrest of Native fishers for defying state regulations. Since October 13, 1965—a “day of infamy” to the people of the southern Puget Sound area—few fishing demonstrations had occurred.

However, the SAIA was still very active. The organization advanced their educational programs, teaching children Indigenous history, culture, and the facts of treaty rights. Several national and foreign publications printed articles from the SAIA’s newsletter, *Survival Indian News*. As more information of the fishing rights dispute circulated to a larger audience, more people supported the cause. People from around the world sent letters of support and donations.

Panel 7 | Subsection 7.1 Title | January 1966: Going Up in Flames | 6

Panel 7 | Subsection 7.1 Text | On January 29, 1966, over two hundred Native fishers and about fifty non-Native supporters gathered at Frank’s Landing. Unlike the other demonstrations of the Fish Wars, there was no fishing involved. Participants stood around a fire as rain poured down. Tensions were high as frustrated leaders spoke over loudspeakers and protested the violent actions of state authorities. Janet McCloud told the audience that they intended
to burn effigies of Washington State Governor Daniel J. Evans for his indifference toward the violent tactics used by state authorities. The night concluded with Yakima dancers performing an authentic war dance around the fire as an effigy of Governor Evans was thrown into the flames.

| --- | --- | --- |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel 7</th>
<th>Subheading 7.1 Title</th>
<th>Muckleshoot Treaty Treks: May and July 1966</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel 7</th>
<th>Subheading 7.1 Text</th>
<th>The Muckleshoot tribe staged a unified front in their fish-ins, treaty treks, canoe treks, and marches. On the morning of May 13, 1966, nearly fifty Native fishers and supporters set off on a thirteen-mile “treaty trek” from Auburn to Federal Way. The marchers carried signs that read “State Actions Violate Federal Treaties!” and “Honor Our Commitment at Home!” and argued that the state did not have the right to prosecute any arrested fishers because their fishing rights were guaranteed by the Treaties of Medicine Creek (1854) and Point Elliot (1955). Only two months later, nearly thirty Native fishers and supporters marched to the King County Courthouse on July 13, 1966. Leading the march were Larry Maurice, Robert Moses, Sherman Dominick, and Cecil Moses, who were scheduled to go on trial later that afternoon for violating state fishing regulations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel 7</td>
<td>Subsection 7.2 Title</td>
<td>Resurrection City No. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel 7</td>
<td>Subsection 7.2 Text</td>
<td>On June 20, 1968, a half-dozen people erected a teepee and pitched a tent on the lawn of the Washington State Capitol in Olympia in protest of their broken treaties. Led by Janet McCloud, the encampment grew to twenty-nine residents within a few days. “Resurrection City No. 2,” as Janet called the increasingly permanent encampment, attracted local and national supporters. Alvin Bridges and Herman Johns returned from the Poor People’s Campaign in Washington D.C. to serve as security. Semu Haute served as the camp’s medicine man. Groups of Native Hawaiians and Creek supporters also joined the camp. Janet said to reporters that they would remain there “as long as the sun shines and the rain falls and the mountains stand.” On June 28, state authorities tore down the camp, and less than a month later, Janet announced that fish-ins on the Nisqually would begin again that August.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel 7 | Image 7002 | Treaty Trek on May 13, 1966. Courtesy of Muckleshoot Tribe. | 10 |

Panel 8 | Title | Taking a Militant Approach | 4 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel 8</td>
<td>Primary Text</td>
<td>Born in Seattle, Washington in 1938, Ramona Bennett of the Puyallup Tribe was active in the Fish Wars from the start. Ramona co-founded the Survival of American Indians with Janet McCloud in 1964. Throughout the 1960s, she led fish-in demonstrations, working closely with other Native leaders to</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
advance fishing rights and other sovereignty issues. In the summer of 1970, Ramona helped establish a fishing encampment along the Puyallup River and supported the possession of firearms by Native fishers. As a Puyallup Tribal Council chairwoman, Ramona illustrated the shift in governing councils that now embraced more confrontational and militant tactics.

On August 13, 1970, Charlie Cantrell (Puyallup) held a press conference at the Seattle Indian Center to announce that tribal organizations would police their fish-ins and fishing encampments to ensure the protection of their people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel 8</th>
<th>Image 8001</th>
<th>Puyallup fishing camp.</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Courtesy of University of Washington.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel 8</th>
<th>Subsection 8.1 Title</th>
<th>Warrior Women</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Panel 8 | Subsection 8.1 Text | The male-dominated, Native “warrior cultures,” perpetuated by Euro-American literature, film, and music, are rooted in historical inaccuracies. Historical records reveal numerous Indigenous female military commanders, such as the Lakota’s four women warrior societies. In some Indigenous nations, women like the “Beloved Women” of the Cherokees held the authority to wage war and decide the fates of captives. Coast Salish women were independent mariners, who used their trade networks and wage labor to combat settler encroachment. Similar to the independent women that came before them, Northwest Indigenous women took charge as they went to the riverbanks to protect their right to fish. | 101 |
“If anyone lays a hand on the net, they are going to get shot.” – Ramona Bennett

### Panel 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pull Quote</th>
<th>“If anyone lays a hand on the net, they are going to get shot.” – Ramona Bennett</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subheading 8.1</td>
<td>A Scene of Chaos: September 9, 1970</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Subheading 8.2   | On the morning of September 9th, state authorities attacked the major fishing encampment along the Puyallup River. When officers tried to remove a tribal member’s fishnet, four shots were fired at them. A scene of chaos quickly erupted. Black smoke and tear gas filled the air as demonstrators set a wooden railroad ablaze with a firebomb, and state authorities responded with clouds of tear gas.

“Law enforcement agents came with the tactical squad, and just ran right over our people with high-powered boats,” – Ramona Bennett

Officers arrested 60 men, women, and children and bulldozed the encampment site. After witnessing the events of September 9th, Stan Pitkin, a U.S. Attorney for western Washington, filed United States. v. State of Washington on behalf of the tribes.

By 1971, Native fishers gained public and state favor. Their new militant tactics seemed to have shifted the tides. Fishers at Frank’s Landing fished the entire fishing season without any arrests, and four Native fishers arrested for interfering with the police were acquitted by an all-white jury.

On February 12, 1974, Judge George Boldt handed down his decision on United States v. State of Washington, after nearly four years of discovery, pretrial motions, and the trial. His decision, which became known as the Boldt decision, affirmed the rights of several western Washington tribes to fish off reservation in accordance with treaties signed in the 1850s. The Boldt decision also promised Native fishers half of the state’s fish.
harvest each year and protected their rights to regulate their own fisheries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel 8</td>
<td>Image 8006</td>
<td>Ramona Bennett being arrested at the September 9th raid. Courtesy of University of Washington.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel 9</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Mothers of the Resilient</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Panel Dimensions: 24” x 36”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel 9</td>
<td>Primary Text</td>
<td>Motherhood grounded Indigenous women’s activism. They drew authority from the ways</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of their ancestors’ matrilineal societies. An Indigenous matrilineal society meant people inherited their Native identity from their mothers rather than their fathers. The women of the Fish Wars understood that if previous generations gained their Indigenous identity through their mothers, then it was their duty, as mothers, to protect their children’s Native heritage. Many women brought their children of all ages to fish-ins and other demonstrations.

When these Indigenous women brought her children to the fish-ins and other demonstrations, they demonstrated how Indigenous women lived and worked as both mothers and activists, emphasizing the relationship between maternity, nation-building, and nation-protecting.


Courtesy of University of Washington. |
|---|---|---|

Courtesy of University of Washington. |
| Panel 9 | Image 9003 | Above: Suzette Mills (Bridges) with son, Powhatan, at Frank’s Landing, 1970.  

Courtesy of University of Washington. |
### 9.1 The Bridges Family

The Bridges regularly fished in defiance of state regulations as a family. Alvin and Maiselle Bridges (Puyallup/Nisqually) lived at Frank’s Landing, and raised their three daughters Suzette, Valerie, and Alison against the backdrop of Fish Wars. Alvin was arrested so many times that his daughters started fishing in his absence.

At the age of nineteen, Alison Bridges (Puyallup) became a prominent figure in the fishing rights movement after photographs of her being arrested at a fish-in along the Puyallup River in 1970 drew national attention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel 9</td>
<td>Subheading 9.1 Title</td>
<td>The Bridges Family</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel 9</td>
<td>Subheading 9.1 Text</td>
<td>The Bridges regularly fished in defiance of state regulations as a family. Alvin and Maiselle Bridges (Puyallup/Nisqually) lived at Frank’s Landing, and raised their three daughters Suzette, Valerie, and Alison against the backdrop of Fish Wars. Alvin was arrested so many times that his daughters started fishing in his absence. At the age of nineteen, Alison Bridges (Puyallup) became a prominent figure in the fishing rights movement after photographs of her being arrested at a fish-in along the Puyallup River in 1970 drew national attention.</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel 9</td>
<td>Image 9005</td>
<td>Alison Bridges arrested at the fish-in along the Puyallup River on September 9, 1970.</td>
<td>Courtesy of University of Washington.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

93
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel 9</th>
<th>Subsection 9.2 Title</th>
<th>Educating the Next Generation</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel 9</td>
<td>Subsection 9.2 Text</td>
<td>Janet McCloud (Tulalip) frequently brought her children to the fish-in demonstrations and encouraged elders, women, men, and children alike to join in the resistance. Su’Zan Satiacum (Kaw) and Elaine Wright, along with all their children, led a marching demonstration at the Federal Courthouse in Seattle in 1965. By taking their children to fish-ins and marches, these mothers exposed their children to the resiliency of their culture and Indigenous identity, educating the next generation of cultural protectors.</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel 10</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Why Are These Stories Important?</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel 10</td>
<td>Pull Quote</td>
<td>“We are the backbone of our communities—men are the jawbone.” Janet McCloud</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel 10</td>
<td>Primary Text</td>
<td>By exploring the roles of Indigenous women in the Fish Wars, our understanding of Native activism expands. For many Indigenous women, their role as cultural protectors motivated their activism. They worked not to create new ways of life but to return to their traditional ways of life. Their duties as caretakers, cultural transmitters, and warrior activists illustrate how Native women continue to be essential to cultural healing, renewal, and resiliency. Despite the Boldt decision of 1974 guaranteeing Indigenous fishing rights, the decimation of salmon populations continues to be a point of conflict in the Pacific Northwest. Many Native fishers argue that the right to fish includes having a plentiful population to fish from. Restoring lost salmon habitats and sharing the existing resource requires collaboration between the state and tribes. Collaborative decision-making includes valuing Indigenous knowledge and incorporating Indigenous practices into</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individuals living near salmon habitats can also get involved at the local level by participating in land use decisions. As policymakers search for sustainable solutions, it remains important that they not only collaborate with Indigenous communities but also consult Indigenous women specifically. Indigenous women’s role as cultural protectors is intertwined with protecting their environment and ensuring access to healthy watersheds. The Fish Wars show us the many ways Indigenous women help protect not only their treaty rights, but also their waters and salmon. As we consider possible solutions to the salmon crisis, we must also reexamine how Indigenous women’s unique perspectives on salmon and watershed management are included in the decision-making process.

Sisters Terrie Brigham and Kim Brigham Campbell, manager and owner of Brigham Fish Market in Cascade Lock, Oregon, preserve Native fishing traditions in the Pacific Northwest through their business. They also catch fish for ceremonial subsistence use for their tribe, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation. Their grandfather, father, and uncles fished at Celilo Falls before it was drowned in 1957 by the Dalles Dam. Fishing year-round, the sisters believe it is their responsibility to care for the rivers to secure their livelihood and ensure that there is a sustainable fish population for future generations to harvest.

Courtesy of Hood-Gorge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel 10</th>
<th>Image 1001</th>
<th>Sisters Terrie Brigham and Kim Brigham Campbell, manager and owner of Brigham Fish Market in Cascade Lock, Oregon, preserve Native fishing traditions in the Pacific Northwest through their business. They also catch fish for ceremonial subsistence use for their tribe, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation. Their grandfather, father, and uncles fished at Celilo Falls before it was drowned in 1957 by the Dalles Dam. Fishing year-round, the sisters believe it is their responsibility to care for the rivers to secure their livelihood and ensure that there is a sustainable fish population for future generations to harvest.</th>
<th>102</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel 10</td>
<td>Image 1002</td>
<td>Shares the photo caption with Image 1001.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel 11</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>What Can You Do?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel 12</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Send a Postcard!</td>
<td>Panel Dimensions: 5” x 7”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledge Native treaties and the rights they protect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listen to Indigenous peoples and be willing to learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Indigenous knowledge and resource management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learn more about the Native communities and their histories where you live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seek out Indigenous-led and Indigenous-created materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate rather than consult with Indigenous partners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write a postcard to a family member or friend describing what you learned today, or even write one to yourself to be reminded of your newfound knowledge. Write your letter, address the postcard, and we will send it for you!</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visitor Participation; Sign will be in a frame displayed on the folding desk/table next to basket where visitors can place postcard in once they are done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place the postcard in the basket when you are completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part of the proposed exhibit includes the showing of *As Long as the River Runs*, a 1971 documentary produced by Carol Burns and Hank Adams that examines the fishing rights dispute and emphasizes the civil disobedience of the Nisqually fishers of Frank’s Landing. The documentary is particularly strong on visualizing the fishing rights dispute, containing powerful images and videos from fish-in demonstrations. Narrated by Chumash actor, ceremonial performer, and orator Semu Haute, the documentary grounds its narrative with the voices of those who participated, including on-camera interviews with leaders of the Fish Wars. The video presentation will be featured on a continuous loop on the 30” flat screen television within the mobile humanities unit. During the Discovery stage, the project team will obtain the proper permission to show the documentary.

Salmon Defense, a nonprofit organization established by the twenty tribes in western Washington to “protect and defend Pacific Northwest salmon and salmon habitat.” currently holds the rights to the documentary and has launched the “As Long as the Rivers Run” project to conserve and redistribute the film as an educational tool. Salmon Defense updated and repackaged the film by digitally re-mastering it to meet today’s digital standards, and it has already been distributed to tribes, schools, and others.

The documentary is available on DVD by request as well as streaming at YouTube or through the Internet Archive.

Run Time: 1:00:04

Link to As Long as the River Runs:

  YouTube: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lN46NWkEFow

  Internet Archive: https://archive.org/details/AsLongAsTheRiversRun
Interpretive Panels Graphic Design

The following panels will be hung within the interior of the mobile humanities unit in the order they are listed. To read the panels in order, visitors can move in a clockwise direction, as indicated by having the introductory panel to the left of the unit’s entrance and the conclusory and call to action panel to the right of the unit’s entrance. Visitors will enter from a door in the rear of the truck.

The project team will also consider creating duplicates of each panel or retractable exhibit banners to be displayed outside at weather-permitting events. This will ensure that the mobile humanities unit does not become overcrowded and that the exhibit is accessible to those unable to use the stairs into the unit.

Panels 1-10 are 24” X 36” in dimension; Panel 11 is 16” by 20” in dimension; and Panel 12 is 5” X 7” in dimension and will be displayed in an easel frame on the folding desk in the mobile humanities unit. Panel 12 is accompanied with a postcard design that will serve as a Visitor Participation component of the exhibit.
THE FISH WARS

STORIES OF CULTURAL SURVIVAL &

THE POWER OF NATIVE WOMEN
Panel 1: “What Were the Fish Wars?”
Dimensions: 24” x 36

WHAT WERE THE FISH WARS?

In 1854, the first governor of Washington Territory, Isaac Stevens, met with representatives of nine Native nations along the banks of the Nisqually River in the southern Puget Sound area of Washington State. There, they signed the Treaty of Medicine Creek, which moved the Native nations of the area onto three reservations but protected their right to fish in “all usual and accustomed grounds and stations.” This clause meant that Native fishers could fish on and off the newly established reservations.

To the signers of the treaty, it seem like the anadromous fish population was inexhaustible. The rivers of the Puget Sound region flowed with at least four different species of salmon each year, and Native fishers would set their nets out at the mouth of rivers, especially the Nisqually and Puyallup Rivers, to catch their annual bounty.

However, by the 1950s, sportsmen and commercial fishing, the construction of dams, increased logging operations, and other industrial pollutants caused a sharp decline in the anadromous fish population, especially salmon and steelhead. To manage the depleted resources, Washington State established the Department of Fisheries to regulate food fish and the Department of Game to regulate game fish in 1952. Both departments declared that Native fishers wishing to fish off reservation would be subject to state regulations and had to abide by sport and commercial fishing regulations.

“The right of taking fish, at all usual and accustomed grounds and stations, is further secured to said Indians in common with all citizens of the Territory...”
–Treaty of Medicine Creek, Article III

Native fishers resisted these regulations, arguing that the Treaty of Medicine Creek protected their right to fish on and off reservation. State authorities argued that “in common with all citizens” meant that Native fishers fell within the definition of a citizen when it came to fishing practices.

Although Native fishers resisted these regulations from the beginning, conflicts between Native fishers and state authorities amplified in the early 1960s. They staged fish-ins (fishing in active defiance), marches, and other demonstrations. As Indigenous peoples gathered along the riverbanks of the Pacific Northwest to protect their fishing rights, three tribes in the southern Puget Sound area entered the public spotlight—the Nisqually, Puyallup, and Muckleshoot—as they led fierce fishing rights campaigns.
Panel 2: “How the Salmon People Lived”
Dimensions: 24” x 36

HOW THE SALMON PEOPLE LIVED

Living alongside abundant salmon runs, many Indigenous tribes of the Pacific Northwest identify themselves as ‘Salmon People’ and ‘Salmon Nations.’ To this day, salmon contributes to the economic, social, and cultural foundations of many Northwest Indigenous groups.

By understanding the many ways in which salmon is central to Northwest Indigenous groups, we can better understand how state regulations threatened not only their traditional way of life but also their Indigenous identity. Indigenous women responded to this threat by assuming their traditional roles as cultural protectors and cultural transmitters.

GATHERING AT THE WATER’S EDGE

Coastal Indigenous groups formed social structures based on their fishing waters. Indigenous peoples of the area typically lived in small groups that gathered at the mouth of rivers during the more sedentary, winter months. For that reason, the areas of river drainage were deemed areas of social unity.

In this off season, coastal tribes traded and sold their dried salmon with inland tribes and white settlers.

The process of salmon fishing also established distinctive gender roles in coastal tribes. Men fished while women cleaned and processed the salmon.

CELEBRATING THE FIRST SALMON

Many Northwest tribes host a “First Salmon Ceremony” to mark the first salmon of the fishing season and celebrate the renewal of the salmon runs. Although each tribe’s ceremony is unique, all ceremonies reflect the reverence and respect Northwest Native nations have for salmon.

Many oral traditions and cultural rituals reveal the importance of salmon to Northwest Indigenous communities. The origin story of Puget Sound Salish-speaking tribes describes how Moon, or the Transformer, called upon Salmon to be food for the humans Moon would go on to create.

A creation tradition of the Plateau tribes of the Columbia River Basin also reflects how humans’ survival is linked to salmon. Before creating the humans, the Creator gathered all the animals and plants and asked that each one of them give a gift for the humans. Salmon responded first, giving his body as food for the humans.

Water answered next, promising to be the home for Salmon. All the animals and plants gave gifts, but because Salmon and Water gave their gifts first, Indigenous communities honor their gifts, or as they call them “First Foods,” by serving salmon and water first at tribal feasts.
Panel 3: “Women Protecting Their Culture’s Legacy”  
Dimensions: 24” x 36”

Women Protecting Their Culture’s Legacy

By the early 1960s, Northwest tribes organized to fish in active defiance of state regulations in the name of cultural survival. Many believed that taking away their right to fish was a form of “cultural genocide”—direct attempts to wipe out Indigenous culture and by extension Indigenous communities.

Traditionally, many Native communities were matriarchies. Women made key decisions, distributed food and material wealth, passed on cultural knowledge, and cared for their communities’ spiritual wellbeing. As mothers, they were granted the important task of educating the next generation in traditional Indigenous practices. Indigenous women held the same authority as men. However, white settlers imposed their ideas of gender roles upon Native communities, disregarding their self-appointed women leaders and forcing them to conform to settler gender norms.

The Longhouse People

Ramona Bennett told the story of the Longhouse People on McNeil Island in the Puget Sound in a 1989 interview to illustrate how settlers manipulated Indigenous matriarchal societies.

In the mid-nineteenth century, white settlers from Boston traveled to the Longhouse People. Upon their arrival, they asked for the Longhouse People to “send out your leaders.” The old women leaders came out because the Longhouse People were matriarchies. Upon seeing the old women, the Bostonian men said, “No, no, we want your leaders.” The old men were then sent out. Again, the white men said, “No, no, we want your leaders.” Eventually, the Longhouse People sent out their young men, and the Bostonians were satisfied.

Assuming their traditional roles of cultural transmitters, it was up to Native women—like Ramona Bennett, Janet McCloud, and Su’Zan Satiacum—to ensure the continuity of their cultures. Serving in both leading and supporting roles, these Native women continued a legacy of Indigenous women resisting settler encroachment and protecting their communities. Not only did they resist broken treaty promises, but they also resisted the gender roles imposed upon their communities by white settlers. Their actions as community organizers, women warriors, and mothers, shows how they modeled themselves after their ancestors by responding to the needs of their communities. They staged fish-in demonstrations, unified their communities, and fished in defiance while including their children their efforts.
Panel 4: “Empowering Her Community”
Dimensions: 24” x 36”

EMPOWERING HER COMMUNITY

Born on the Tulalip Reservation in 1934, Janet McCloud was a prominent leader of the Fish Wars. Janet and her husband Don (Nisqually) settled on a plot of land along the Nisqually River in Yelm, Washington, near Don’s stepfather, Billy Frank Sr. (Nisqually). Billy’s land became known as Frank’s Landing and was the site of many fish-in demonstrations. In January 1961, game wardens burst into Janet’s home, searching for deer meat. When she demanded if they had a warrant, they presented a warrant for “John Doe,” meaning they could “lawfully” search whichever house they chose. Angered and frustrated, Janet began looking for ways to protect and empower her community.

Living up to her gifted name—Yet-Si-Blue, meaning “The Woman Who Talks” — Janet used her voice to bring more attention to the fishing rights. The smaller tribes of the southern Puget Sound area often lacked internal organization, making them easy targets for state and federal agencies to violate their treaties. Janet was one of the many women who stepped up to lead, staging fish-in demonstrations and providing means of community organization.

In January 1964, Janet helped establish the Survival of American Indians Association (SAIA), an organization that gave Native fishers necessary legal and financial support when arrested. The SAIA also sought to unify efforts by regularly publishing Indian Survival News, a newsletter intended to keep Indigenous communities informed of the fishing rights efforts. Selected as the first leader of the SAIA, Janet made her uncompromising position known.

Writing with future generations in mind, Janet wrote a letter to President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1965. She demanded that the United States honor their treaties with Indigenous nations, keeping their promise to protect Indigenous nations against further encroachment on their land and rights.


“When she spoke, everyone listened.”
— Barbara McCloud, Janet’s daughter

In 1965, Janet and Don transformed their ten-acre property in Yelm into a spiritual retreat center, later called the Sapa Dawn Center, to be a place where Indigenous peoples could gather to practice traditional Native ceremonies, seek rejuvenation, and support one another in their collective struggle for recognition, rights, and cultural preservation. The retreat center hosted American Indian Movement activists as they planned their occupation of Wounded Knee in 1973, and later welcomed the Indigenous Women’s Network in 1985.


Sapa Dawn Center
Panel 5: “Under the Cloak of Darkness”  
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UNDER THE CLOAK OF DARKNESS

S’Zan Satiacum was part of the Kaw tribe of Kansas and Arkansas, but she spent her teenage years with relatives near Tacoma, Washington. In 1961, S’Zan married Bob Satiacum (Puyallup), who had been involved in the fishing rights struggle since the 1950s. In 1957, after being arrested for violating state fishing regulations, Bob brought his case to the Washington Supreme Court, which ruled in his favor. Because Bob was often arrested and imprisoned, S’Zan fished for the family and did so in active defiance of state regulations.

Even after enforcement officers became stricter and regulations became harsher in 1965, S’Zan refused to stop fishing. S’Zan’s lawyers and Washington State lawyers told her that if only women fished and did so at night, then the state would not bother them. So that’s what she did. S’Zan and her sister-in-law Clara Satiacum (Puyallup) took their boat to the river and fished in the moonlight. However, by the end of summer 1965, enforcement officers began arresting them.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1965: NIGHT OF TUGBOAT NUMBER NINE

Like many nights before, S’Zan and Clara pushed their boat into the Nisqually River under the cloak of darkness. The quiet, dark night was soon ablaze with sirens and headlights as state authorities chased them in cars along the riverbanks. Some officers commandeered a tugboat and chased the women down the river, but the women escaped the tugboat after hitting turbulent water. As the high-speed boat chase continued, S’Zan and Clara were eventually overtaken and boarded by a policeman in a small launch boat. They were taken to the police station and held in an interrogation room from 12:25 AM to 5:30 AM before being released. That night gave S’Zan new energy to protect her fishing rights.

"They told us that if only the women fished, and if we only fished at night and didn’t make the sports fishermen mad again, they wouldn’t bother us."
—S’Zan Satiacum

A though S’Zan was arrested many times, and even drew a 90-day sentence for one of the arrests, she never served any jail time. She was typically released because she was the main caregiver of her seven children.

Left: S’Zan Satiacum at the police station after being arrested.

Right: After being arrested at a fish-in along the Nisqually River, S’Zan Satiacum was reluctant to cooperate with Washington State game wardens. She had to be forcibly subdued in a police car after demonstrating a strong left hook. October 15, 1965.

Courtesy of William Sherman, University of New Mexico’s Center for Southwest Research.
FISHING IN DEFiance

Throughout the 1960s, Native fishers staged fish-in demonstrations where they fished in active defiance of state regulations. These fish-ins had varying levels of impact individually, but together they created a campaign that gained national attention.

In the 1950s, tribal governments and councils attempted to resolve the fishing rights dispute through negotiation and compromise with state agencies. Frustrated by the constant arrests and lack of action by tribal authorities, a group of Native fishers decided that the fishing rights dispute could only be resolved through confrontation and direct action. These Native fishers formed the Survival of American Indians Association (SAIA) in January 1964. With Janet McCloud as their leader, the SAIA used civil disobedience to protect their fishing rights.

By February 1964, the SAIA was busy planning and staging fish-in demonstrations. They printed ads in local newspapers to attract fish-in participation at Frank’s Landing, property owned by Billy Frank Jr. on the shores of the Nisqually River, as well as to gain media attention.

OCTOBER 1965: TENSIONS BOIL OVER

In October 1965, tensions between Native fishers and state authorities rose to new heights, and a series of violent protests occurred at Frank’s Landing. Many Native fishers fished at night to avoid being arrested during the day. When enforcement officers discovered that Native fishers went to the rivers at night, they began conducting night raids.

On October 7, 1965, Billy Frank Jr. and Alvin Bridges were arrested for fishing near Frank’s Landing. Two nights later, state authorities cornered two teenage boys on a log jam in the middle of the Nisqually River after discovering them fishing.

Organized by Janet McCloud, eight men and nineteen women and children gathered on October 15, 1965, to fish in broad daylight to protest the night raids. With 50-50 officials and game wardens watching from both sides of the river, Janet announced the purpose of the demonstration to members of the press.

Don McCloud Sr., Alvin Bridges, Dorian Sanchez, and Janet’s children, Don Jr. and Jeffery McCloud, along with three cameramen boarded their fishing boats. As soon as the Native fishers cast their nets, officers ran to the river with two boats.

One boat rammed into the Native fishers’ boat and boarded it. Native women and children threw rocks at the other boat of state authorities.

A game warden grabbed teenagers Valerie and Alison Bridges by their hair, and Janet went to free them, being hit in the process.

“Wardens were everywhere, and they all seemed to be eight feet tall... They were shoving, kicking, pushing clubs at men, women, and children. We were vastly outnumbered, yet we were all still trying to protect one another.” – Janet McCloud

By the end of the day, state authorities arrested Alvin and Maiselle Bridges, Don and Janet McCloud, Susan Satlacum, Don George Jr., Harold Gleason, and Joe Kautz.
Panel 7: “Finding Other Ways to Protest”
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FINDING OTHER WAYS TO PROTEST

By October 1966, a year had passed since the violent confrontation between Native fishers and state authorities at Frank’s Landing and since the last arrest of Native fishers for defying state regulations. Since October 13, 1965—a “day of infamy” to the people of the southern Puget Sound area—few fishing demonstrations had occurred.

However, the SAIA was still very active. The organization advanced their educational programs, teaching children Indigenous history, culture, and the facts of treaty rights. Several national and foreign publications printed articles from the SAIA’s newsletter, Survival Indian News. As more information of the fishing rights dispute circulated to a larger audience, more people supported the cause. People from around the world sent letters of support and donations.

JANUARY 1966:
GOING UP IN FLAMES

On January 29, 1966, over two hundred Native fishers and about fifty non-Native supporters gathered at Frank’s Landing. Unlike the other demonstrations of the Fish Wars, there was no fishing involved. Participants stood around a fire as rain poured down. Tensions were high as frustrated leaders spoke over loudspeakers and protested the violent actions of state authorities. Janet McCloud told the audience that they intended to burn effigies of Washington State Governor Daniel J. Evans for his indifference toward the violent tactics used by state authorities. The night concluded with Yakima dancers performing an authentic war dance around the fire as an effigy of Governor Evans was thrown into the flames.

MUCKLESHOOT TREATY TREKS:
MAY AND JULY 1966

The Muckleshoot tribe staged a unified front in their fish-ins, treaty treks, canoe treks, and marches.

On the morning of May 15, 1966, nearly fifty Native fishers and supporters set off on a thirteen-mile “treaty trek” from Auburn to Federal Way. The marchers carried signs that read “State Actions Violate Federal Treaties!” and “Honor Our Commitment at Home!” and argued that the state did not have the right to prosecute any arrested fishers because their fishing rights were guaranteed by the Treaties of Medicine Creek (1854) and Point Elliot (1955).

Only two months later, nearly thirty Native fishers and supporters marched to the King County Courthouse on July 13, 1966. Leading the march were Larry Maurice, Robert Moses, Sherman Dominick, and Cecil Moses, who were scheduled to go on trial later that afternoon for violating state fishing regulations.

RESURRECTION CITY NO. 2

On June 20, 1968, a half-dozen people erected a teepee and pitched a tent on the lawn of the Washington State Capitol in Olympia in protest of their broken treaties. Led by Janet McCloud, the encampment grew to twenty-nine residents within a few days. “Resurrection City No. 2,” as Janet called the increasingly permanent encampment, attracted local and national supporters. Alvin Bridges and Herman Johns returned from the Poor People’s Campaign in Washington, D.C., to serve as security. Semu Haute served as the camp’s medicine man. Groups of Native Hawaiians and Creek supporters also joined the camp. Janet said to reporters that they would remain there “as long as the sun shines and the rain falls and the mountains stand.” On June 28, state authorities tore down the camp, and less than a month later, Janet announced that fish-ins on the Nisqually would begin again that August.
Panel 8: “Taking a More Militant Approach”
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TAKING A MILITANT APPROACH

Born in Seattle, Washington in 1938, Ramona Bennett of the Puyallup Tribe was active in the Fish Wars from the start. Ramona co-founded the Survival of American Indians with Janet McCloud in 1964. Throughout the 1960s, she led fish-in demonstrations, working closely with other Native leaders to advance fishing rights and other sovereignty issues. In the summer of 1970, Ramona helped establish a fishing camp along the Puyallup River and supported the possession of firearms by Native fishers. As a Puyallup Tribal Council chairwoman, Ramona illustrated the shift in governing councils that now embraced more confrontational and militant tactics.

On August 15, 1970, Charlie Cantrell held a press conference at the Seattle Indian Center to announce that tribal organizations would police their fish-ins and fishing encampments to ensure the protection of their people.

A SCENE OF CHAOS: SEPTEMBER 9, 1970

On the morning of September 9th, state authorities attacked the major fishing encampment along the Puyallup River. When officers tried to remove a tribal member’s fishnet, four shots were fired at them. A scene of chaos quickly erupted. Black smoke and tear gas filled the air as demonstrators set a wooden railroad abaze with a firebomb, and state authorities responded with clouds of tear gas.

“Law enforcement agents came with the tactical squad, and just ran right over our people with high-powered boats.”
—Ramona Bennett.

Officers arrested 60 men, women, and children and bulldozed the encampment site. After witnessing the events of September 9th, Stan Pittkin, a U.S. Attorney for western Washington, filed United States v. State of Washington on behalf of the tribes.

By 1971, Native fishers gained public and state favor. Their new militant tactics seemed to have shifted the tides. Fishers at Frank’s Landing fished the entire fishing season without any arrests, and four Native fishers arrested for interfering with the police were acquitted by an all-white jury.

On February 12, 1974, Judge George Boldt handed down his decision on United States v. State of Washington, after nearly four years of discovery, pretrial motions, and the trial. His decision, which became known as the Boldt decision, affirmed the rights of several western Washington tribes to fish off reservation in accordance with treaties signed in the 1850s. The Boldt decision also promised Native fishers half of the state’s fish harvest each year and protected their rights to regulate their own fisheries.

WARRIOR WOMEN

The male-dominated Native “warrior cultures,” perpetuated by Euro-American literature, film, and music, are rooted in historical inaccuracies. Historical records reveal numerous Indigenous female military commanders, such as the Lakota’s four women warrior societies. In some Indigenous nations, women like the “Beloved Women” of the Cherokee held the authority to wage war and decide the fates of captives. Coast Salish women were independent mariners, who used their trade networks and wage labor to combat settler encroachment. Similar to the independent women that came before them, Northwest Indigenous women took charge as they went to the riverbanks to protect their right to fish.

“If anyone lays a hand on the net, they are going to get shot.”
—Ramona Bennett.
Panel 9: “Mothers of the Resilient”
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Mothers of the Resilient

Motherhood grounded Indigenous women’s activism. They drew authority from the ways of their ancestors’ matrilineal societies. An Indigenous matrilineal society meant people inherited their Native identity from their mothers rather than their fathers. The women of the Fish Wars understood that if previous generations gained their Indigenous identity through their mothers, then it was their duty, as mothers, to protect their children’s Native heritage. Many women brought their children of all ages to fish-ins and other demonstrations.

When these Indigenous women brought her children to the fish-ins and other demonstrations, they demonstrated how Indigenous women lived and worked as both mothers and activists, emphasizing the relationship between maternity, nation-building, and nation-protecting.

The Bridges Family

The Bridges regularly fished in defiance of state regulations as a family. Alvin and Maiselle Bridges (Puyallup/Nisqually) lived at Frank’s Landing, and raised their three daughters Suzette, Valerie, and Alison against the backdrop of Fish Wars. Alvin was arrested so many times that his daughters started fishing in his absence.

At the age of nineteen, Alison Bridges (Puyallup) became a prominent figure in the fishing rights movement after photographs of her being arrested at a fish-in along the Puyallup River in 1970 drew national attention.

Educating the Next Generation

Janet McCloud frequently brought her children to fish-ins demonstrations and encouraged elders, women, men, and children alike to join in the resistance.

Suzi Satiaicum and Elaine Wright, along with all their children, led a marching demonstration at the Federal Court House in Seattle in 1965.

By taking their children to fish-ins and marches, these mothers exposed their children to the resiliency of their culture and Indigenous identity, educating the next generation of cultural protectors.
Panel 10: “Why Are These Stories Important?”
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WHY ARE THESE STORIES IMPORTANT?

By exploring the roles of Indigenous women in the Fish Wars, our understanding of Native activism expands. For many Indigenous women, their role as cultural protectors motivated their activism. They worked not to create new ways of life but to return to their traditional ways of life. Their duties as caretakers, cultural transmitters, and warrior activists illustrate how Native women continue to be essential to cultural healing, renewal, and resiliency.

Despite the Boldt decision of 1974 guaranteeing Indigenous fishing rights, the decimation of salmon populations continues to be a point of conflict in the Pacific Northwest. Many Native fishers argue that the right to fish includes having a plentiful population to fish from. Restoring lost salmon habitats and sharing the existing resource requires collaboration between the state and tribes. Collaborative decision-making includes valuing Indigenous knowledge and incorporating Indigenous practices into watershed and salmon management. Individuals living near salmon habitats can also get involved at the local level by participating in land use decisions.

As policymakers search for sustainable solutions, it remains important that they not only collaborate with Indigenous communities but also consult Indigenous women specifically. Indigenous women’s role as cultural protectors is intertwined with protecting their environment and ensuring access to healthy watersheds. The Fish Wars show us the many ways Indigenous women help protect not only their treaty rights, but also their waters and salmon. As we consider possible solutions to the salmon crisis, we must also reexamine how Indigenous women’s unique perspectives on salmon and watershed management are included in the decision-making process.

Sisters Terrie Brigham and Kim Brigham Campbell, manager and owner of Brigham Fish Market in Cascade Lock, Oregon, preserve Native fishing traditions in the Pacific Northwest through their business. They also catch fish for ceremonial subsistence use for their tribe, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation. Their grandfather, father, and uncles fished at Celilo Falls before it was drowned in 1957 by the Dalles Dam. Fishing year-round, the sisters believe it is their responsibility to care for the rivers to secure their livelihood and ensure that there is a sustainable fish population for future generations to harvest. Courtesy of Hood-Gorge.
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Displayed above the folding desk that exhibits the Visitor Participation.

WHAT CAN YOU DO?

Acknowledge Native treaties and the rights they protect.
Support Indigenous knowledge and resource management.

Listen to Indigenous peoples and be willing to learn.
Seek out Indigenous-led and Indigenous-created materials.

Collaborate rather than consult with Indigenous partners.

Learn more about the Native communities and their histories where you live.
Panel 12 (Visitor Participation): “Send a Postcard!”
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Displayed in an easel frame on the folding desk next to basket of postcards and pens for visitor usage.

SEND A POSTCARD!

Write a postcard to a family member or friend describing what you learned today. Or even write one to yourself to be reminded of your newfound knowledge.

Write your letter, address the postcard, and we will send it for you!

Place the postcard in the basket when you are done.
Postcard Design

Front Side:
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Back Side:

POSTCARD
Hello from the PNW Humanities Truck!

ADDRESS:

POSTCARD WIDTH: 6”
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Submission Guidelines from The Public Historian: Reports from the field are intended to convey the real-world work of public historian by highlighting specific projects or activities in which the author is directly involved. These articles may describe new or ongoing projects, introduce or assess new methodologies, or bring in-the-field dilemmas (methodological, ethical, and historical) into print. Reports from the field should be fifteen to twenty pages, double spaced, and following Chicago Manual of Style guidelines.
The Challenges and Opportunities of Student-led Decolonial Public History

The field of public history boasts many opportunities for collaboration and community-based research—historiographical buzz words that evoke images of intimate, on-the-ground, sustainable knowledge production. The collaborative nature of public history provides a platform to develop Indigenous and non-Indigenous partnerships that disregard historical colonial practices in favor of decolonial research methodology. Many public historians understand the many benefits that come from decolonial public history—sustainable partnerships that are culturally revitalizing, community-led research that pushes against colonial boundaries, projects that raise up Indigenous voices and peoples, to name a few benefits. Many public historians have experienced the challenges associated with decolonial public history. This master’s project acquainted me with the opportunities of decolonial practices while at same time revealing the unique challenges of student-led decolonial public history.

Undergraduate and graduate students may have participated in various stages of these decolonial, community-based projects through coursework or internship opportunities. Some may have even gained experience from working with professors on their ongoing research and project, performing oral histories, archival research, and other supportive tasks. However, it is one thing to be delegated tasks or assist a professor for a semester. It is another to initiate one’s

---

92 A note on the terminology: I will use “Native” and “Indigenous” interchangeably in this essay, and “Native American” when appropriately applied to Indigenous groups of the United States. It should be noted that these terms are broad, and within Indigenous identity there exists national (i.e. Native American or Māori) and tribal identities (i.e. Nisqually tribe). Tribal identities are diverse and widespread, so it must be acknowledged that Indigenous epistemologies and methodologies are varied. I also use “colonial” and “Western” to signify the colonized systems of the Western world. The term “Indigenous peoples” emerged out of the American Indian Movement of the 1970s to recognize a collective experience and struggles of colonized peoples. The final ‘s’ also serves to recognize the many difference groups that fall under that term. Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 1999), 7.

93 I, myself, benefited from being a graduate research assistant to my professor’s multi-year digital history project. Dr. Bob Reinhardt of Boise State University is working on capturing the stories of towns and communities inundated by river development projects through his digital humanities project known as *The Atlas of Drowned Towns*. 
own collaborative project while facing the challenges and constraints of being a student—impending graduation dates, lack of funding, and insubstantial resources, just to name a few. As I developed my project, I reflected on how students can create meaningful and sustainable public history projects that are grounded in decolonial methodology, concluding that the process of implementing decolonial practices is a significant outcome in itself.

Public history offers a unique space for collaboration between Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants, but these partnerships also confront preexisting colonial public history practices. Non-Indigenous public historians working with Indigenous communities have implemented decolonial research methodologies to avoid the harm inflicted upon Indigenous communities by previous historians and researchers. Historically, scholars took an ethnographic approach to their research, making deductions and inductions on Indigenous cultures without receiving input from members of the studied culture. This approach effectively severed Indigenous communities from the history-making process. Collaborative and community-focused public history projects provide a platform for scholars to implement decolonial practices, democratizing knowledge production in the process.

More recently, public historians—such as Katrine Barber and Donna Sinclair; Rosemary Georgeson and Jessica Hallenbeck; and Carole Lévesque, Denise Geoffrey, and Geneviève
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94 Indigenous research methodologies, such as storytelling, oral traditions, and ceremony, inform decolonial research methodologies. In the late twentieth century, Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars critiqued ethnography in favor of a research approach that incorporated Indigenous epistemologies and methodologies. Linda Tuhwai Smith’s *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (1999), a foundational text in Indigenous studies, begins with the line, “The word itself, ‘research,’ is probably one of the dirtiest words in the Indigenous world’s vocabulary.” Smith speaks to the distrust many Indigenous communities feel towards non-Indigenous research and researchers who appropriate their culture and ways of knowing while simultaneously reject the very people who developed those ideas. Linda Tuhwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 1999), 1.

95 Early twentieth century scholarship on Native communities often took an ethnographic approach. Scholars embedded their narratives with a rhetoric of victimization, validating the idea that Native culture and existence illustrated a vanishing America. For examples of early twentieth century scholarship, see Paul Radin’s *The Story of the American Indian* (1927) and Angie Debo’s *And Still the Waters Run: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes* (1940).
Polèse—have recognized the detrimental effects of colonial practices and shifted their research approaches. Professors at Portland State University, non-Indigenous scholars Barber and Sinclair, collaborated with the Chinook Indian Nation on a series of public history projects to dissipate colonial legacies and argue that purposeful decolonial practices can enhance cultural sustainability. Georgeson (Sahtu Dene/Coast Salish) and Hallenbeck explore how Coast Salish Indigenous women’s relationships to water, land, and family have persisted despite erasure, demonstrating both the resiliency of Indigenous women and the practicalities of non-Indigenous and Indigenous scholars working together. Non-Indigenous scholars Lévesque, Geoffrey, and Polèse examine the role Naskapi women of the subarctic region of Québec played in the cultural and ecological knowledge of their people, developing a “community of learning” through their community-based research. These projects are just a few examples of how public history projects embedded with collaboration, meaningful community engagement, and reflective practices present the opportunity to recover stories of the past, build trusting partnerships, and create a collective of co-creators and co-learners.

My master’s research focused on the roles and experiences of Indigenous women in the Fish Wars of Washington State in the 1960s and 1970s, which I envisioned would develop into a mobile humanities unit through a process steeped in decolonial research methodology.
Decoloniality requires that scholars dismantle their Western conception of what knowledge is and how it is obtained. To begin this process of unlearning and rebuilding, I needed to re-educate myself. As I explored the growing corpus of scholarship on decolonial methodology, key themes emerged: shared authority, storywork, respect, humility—all of which became my guiding principles as I navigated how to implement decolonial methodology.

The social movements of the mid-twentieth century raised global questions regarding the self-determination and sovereignty of Indigenous nations around the world. In academia, these questions led scholars to reexamine the ways in which they conducted research with and about Indigenous communities. In *A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History* (1990), Michael Frisch coined the term “shared authority,” which challenges scholars to reconsider how they collaborate with non-credentialed experts in knowledge production. The term’s coinage encouraged public historians to acknowledge the multiple subjectivities of historical interpretation and work towards expanding the ways in which scholars engaged audiences and partners. More recently, public historians considered how the principles of shared authority can be applied to projects with Indigenous communities. Western ideals of credentialed scholarships make collaborative practices challenging and require the mindful consideration of the power dynamics, subtle or not, existing between Indigenous and non-Indigenous collaborators. Asymmetrical relationships of authority reinvigorate colonization efforts, which thus threaten the essence of collaborative practices. “Shared authority” seeks to avoid asymmetrical relationships through the collaborative nature of public history. Often

102 As exemplified in Katrine Barber’s article, “Shared Authority in the Context of Tribal Sovereignty,” in which she explores how to apply Frisch’s principle of shared authority to Indigenous and non-Indigenous public history partnerships.
complex and nuanced, shared authority is crucial to creating an inclusive history and becomes a key element in decolonial public history methodology in that it abandons the authority of the dominant culture, recognizes Indigenous traditions and histories, and impedes the continuation of a colonial history.\textsuperscript{103}

In addition to shared authority, decolonial research methodology calls for the incorporation and validation of Indigenous epistemologies and methodologies. Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s (Ngāti Porou) preeminent work, \textit{Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples} (1999), emphasizes the role Indigenous scholars play in cross-cultural research as they implement Indigenous traditional knowledge and ways of knowing.\textsuperscript{104} Indigenous methodologies “can be summarized as research by and for Indigenous peoples, using techniques and methods drawn from the traditions of those people.”\textsuperscript{105} Smith proposes five Indigenous research principles: Indigenizing, connecting, writing, representing, and discovering. These principles are then displayed through Indigenous methodologies, such as storytelling, oral traditions, and ceremony. In \textit{Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Context} (2009), Margaret Kovach (Saulteaux and Plains Cree) continues to pursue Indigenous methodologies by exploring the epistemologies of Indigenous groups, reminding settler scholars of the positionality they bring to their research. For Kovach, her epistemic center, or her knowledge base, comes from “returning to [her] tribal core,” and informs her research methods.\textsuperscript{106}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{103} Katrine Barber, “Shared Authority in the Context of Tribal Sovereignty,” \textit{The Public Historian} 35, no. 4 (November 2013): 21.
\item \textsuperscript{104} Linda Tuhiwai Smith, \textit{Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples} (London: Zed Books, 1999).
\item \textsuperscript{106} Margaret Kovach, \textit{Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Context} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 45 and 129.
\end{itemize}
scholars cannot use Indigenous knowledge and approaches to inquiry, lacking the epistemic center that Kovach possesses, but they can be informed by Indigenous methodologies to better honor and share authority with the communities they work with.

Writing for both an Indigenous and non-Indigenous audience, Indigenous scholars consider the centrality of storywork and relationality to implementing Indigenous methodologies in Indigenous and non-Indigenous partnerships. Shawn Wilson (Opaskwayak Cree) articulates in his book, *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods* (2008), an Indigenous research paradigm that corresponds with Indigenous ways of being, knowing, and learning. His research approach values storytelling as a means to build connection, seeing value in the process of relating in itself rather than as a vehicle to convey and gain knowledge. To Wilson, stories ground decolonial methodology. As he states, “by getting away from abstractions and rules, stories allow us to see others’ life experiences through our own eyes.”

Jo-Ann Archibald’s (Stó:lô) *Indigenous Storywork: Educating the Heart, Mind, Body, and Spirit* (2008) also highlights the importance of storytelling as a way to implement decolonial methodology. Archibald, having researched the process of storytelling with Indigenous Coast Salish/Stó:lô Elders, asserts that storytelling is a form of cultural work. She contrives the term, “Indigenous storywork,” to call attention to the centrality of stories and relationality in Indigenous and non-Indigenous partnerships. *Decolonizing Research: Indigenous Storywork as Methodology* (2019), by editors Jo-Ann Archibald (Stó:lô), Jenny Lee-Morgan (Waikato/Ngāti Mahuta/Te Ahiwaru/Chinese) and Jason De Santolo (Garrwa/Barunggam), furthers Archibald’s *Indigenous Storywork* through multiple case studies that illustrate how storywork is used as a form of teaching and learning; how it serves as a historical record; and how it acts as an expression of
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Indigenous identity. These works, amongst others, created my working definition of decolonial public history methodology.\textsuperscript{108}

As an emerging non-Indigenous scholar, I was aware of the positionality I brought to my scholarship, and I actively sought to use that awareness to inform my process. I re-educated myself, seeking to deconstruct my notions of Western-centered research, ground my studies in decolonial research methodology, and learn from Indigenous scholars. Yet, I found myself asking: how is it possible to create meaningful and sustainable student-led public history projects that are grounded in decolonial methodology? To answer this question, I take the advice of Katrine Barber and Donna Sinclair, “the process may be a significant outcome of your project.”\textsuperscript{109} I argue that, despite the end result of one’s project, the process of pushing against the standard historical narrative, the willingness to be faced with uncomfortable truths, the intentionality to create relationships defined by shared authority, the humility to learn and be corrected are all essential to developing the skills necessary to conduct and expand decolonial public history.

Project origins

Evergreen lined roads that parallel forests of ancient ferns, days of gray, overcast skies, the faint smell of saltwater wafting in the air: this is how I would describe the Puget Sound area of Western Washington to anyone unfamiliar with the place. Having grown up in a small harbor town, crossing the Puget Sound on the bridge once known as “Galloping Gertie” every day to get to school, these sights and senses are familiar and comforting to me. However, amidst those

\textsuperscript{108} For further reading on Indigenous methodologies, see Norman k. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln, and Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s edited volume \textit{Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies}; Marie Battiste’s \textit{Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision}.

\textsuperscript{109} Barber and Sinclair, 166.
years of adolescence and young adulthood, I failed to recognize that the landscape I found so
gamiliar and considered home was the ancestral land of the Puyallup, Nisqually, and Squaxin
Island peoples. With a Hungarian immigrant father and a mother of Polish and Romanian
descent, I was an uninvited guest on this land.¹¹⁰

My early education did little to support any curriculum on local Indigenous histories. My
high school history classes were defined by moments of European history and featured books
like Jared Diamond’s *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies* (1997), which
follows an environmental determinism thesis.¹¹¹ There was no lesson on the Treaty of Medicine
Creek (1854), the treaty signed by Washington’s first governor, Isaac Stevens, which removed
nine Native nations onto three reservations in the Puget Sound area; no mention of the Fish Wars
that garnered intense media coverage in the 1960s and 1970 as Indigenous peoples sought to
protect their right to fish on “all usual and accustomed grounds and stations.”¹¹² Both the signing
of the treaty and the subsequent demonstrations to protect the promised treaty rights occurred
only forty minutes away from where I sat in my history class. When I first learned about the Fish
Wars in an undergraduate course on Pacific Northwest history, I was disheartened that both my
education and the historical record had failed to share such a crucial piece of the Pacific
Northwest story.

As I expanded my professional and academic experience, I noticed more gaps, silences,
and intentional oversights in the historical record. These observations inform my professional
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¹¹⁰ I currently reside and work on the ancestral homelands of the Shoshone, Bannock, and Paiute peoples.
¹¹¹ Jared Diamond, *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company,
1997). To explain the decline of the Native population upon the arrival of European settlers, Diamond argued that
Indigenous peoples’ fates were “determined” because they lacked the biological protection against European
diseases and lacked the proper technology. Not only does environmental determinism justify settler colonialism in
its extreme interpretations but it also resists the notion that Native peoples are adaptable and resilient.
¹¹² Article III of the Treaty of Medicine Creek, quoted in American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), *Uncommon
Controversy: Fishing Rights of the Muckleshoot, Puyallup, and Nisqually Indians* (Seattle: University of
goals, which evolved into the aspiration to create a more complete story of the past, recovering the stories of communities and individuals that have too often been marginalized and ignored in the historical narrative. This goal partners well with my already-established belief that history could serve as an agent of empathy.\textsuperscript{113} By expanding the historical narrative, I envisioned a more empathetic future. Propelled forward by my belief and goal, I set forth as an activist historian, seeking to craft a narrative that is more inclusive to past participants, present observers, and future readers.

My master’s program offered the platform I sought to enrichen the existing narrative through a combination of public history and decolonial methodology.\textsuperscript{114} My research explored the roles and experiences of Indigenous women in the Fish Wars of Washington State in the southern Puget Sound area.\textsuperscript{115} Traveling to archives, reading through old newspaper clippings, and searching through databases, I became familiar with the names of the Indigenous women that led the fish-in demonstrations. I turned to scholarship on Indigenous feminism to better understand the unique position Indigenous women hold within their communities as cultural protectors, evoking themes of motherhood, interconnectedness, and kinship in their

\textsuperscript{113} My philosophy that history acts as an agent of empathy is grounded in the idea that a better understanding of the past can better prepare us to make the moral decisions we are confronted by in the present.

\textsuperscript{114} I began my master’s program a few years after completing my undergraduate education. I reentered academia knowing that I wanted to pursue public history for its relational and collaborative qualities, but I was uncertain as to what specific area of history I wanted to study. I chose to attend Boise State University (BSU) for its Public History program and, frankly, because they offered the most financial assistance. During my first semester, I decided that the Fish Wars and the experience of Indigenous women would be my research focus. If I had known that the Fish Wars would be my chosen area of study before applying to graduate schools, I would have considered other universities in Washington State more seriously. BSU’s history department boasted experienced faculty in public history but lacks a vigorous Indigenous studies program. A critique I received early on when sharing my project idea and research focus with a Washington-based, Indigenous historian was “Why BSU?” His question points to one of the challenges I faced during my project—I did not have experienced faculty in Pacific Northwest Indigenous history to support me, and I lived miles away from the people I sought to collaborate with. To prospective graduate students: I encourage you to seriously consider your research interests when applying to graduate programs.

\textsuperscript{115} The Fish Wars of Washington State were a series of Indigenous-led demonstrations where Native fishers would fish on and off-reservation in “all usual and accustomed stations and grounds” in defiance of state fishing regulations. In the 1930s, Washington State implemented fishing policies and regulations as conservation measures. However, Native fishers argued that these regulations defied the fishing rights promised to them in the treaties of the 1850s.
demonstrations and activism. I learned how by acting as cultural protectors, these women adhered to their traditional roles and ensured their cultures’ survival and continuity. My research illustrated how the Pacific Northwest boasts a strong Native presence, yet their treaty rights continue to be threatened by a declining Pacific salmon population, ecosystem management policies, and state regulations. As an activist historian, I sought to incorporate the present landscape into my work, and public history seemed like an appropriate platform to do so.

I developed a public history project to not only be reflective of these multifaceted stories but also to be a means by which I could collaborate with Indigenous community members and scholars. My project proposes the development of a mobile humanities unit: a mobile platform that promotes exploratory cultural and historical community outreach. A mobile and flexible space, the proposed mobile humanities unit can be transformed into an exhibit gallery, maker and workshop space, recording studio, movie theater, and performance venue. The project is grounded in the goal to democratize the process of knowledge production by creating a platform
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116 For additional reading on Indigenous feminism and activism, see M. Annette Jaimes and Thersa Halsey’s “American Indian Women: At the Center of Indigenous Resistance in North America” (1992); Nancy Shoemaker’s Negotiators of Change: Historical Perspectives on Native American Women (1995); Devon Abbott Mihesuah Indigenous American Women: Decolonization, Empowerment, and Activism (2003); Andrea Smith’s “Native American Feminism, Sovereignty and Social Change” (2005); Andrea Smith and J. Kēhaulani’s “Native Feminisms Engage American Studies” (2008); Cheryl Suzack, Shari M. Huhndorf, Jeanne Perreault, and Jean Barman’s edited volume Indigenous Women and Feminism: Politics, Activism, Culture (2010); Kim Anderson’s “Affirmations of an Indigenous Feminist” (2010).

117 Elizabeth Archuleta’s (Yaqui/Chicana) “Indigenous feminist ethos of responsibility” greatly informed my analysis of Indigenous women and their activism during the Fish Wars. In her 2006 study on Indigenous women’s rhetorical practices, Archuleta describes how an “Indigenous feminist ethos of responsibility” compels Indigenous women to ensure cultural survival, empower their communities, and heal from collective trauma. By emphasizing “responsibility” within my analysis, Indigenous women’s activism and efforts situate themselves within a legacy of Indigenous women resistance. Their responsibility stemmed from the acts of their ancestors and the needs of their communities. An examination of Indigenous women with an ethos of responsibility lens suggests that all activism does not need to be, nor is it, motivated by altruism. For many Indigenous women, the responsibility of their position within their communities as cultural transmitters motivated their actions. By being informed by an ethos of responsibility, Indigenous women’s activities and efforts within the Red Power era indicate the need to expand the various motivations for “activism” to move beyond solely social and political reform motivations but also cultural responsibility. Elizabeth Archuleta, “‘I Give You Back’: Indigenous Women Writing to Survive,” Studies in American Indian Literatures 18, no. 4 (2006): 90

118 Many Native fishers argue that the right to fish includes the right to a sustainable fish population.
where ordinary people could share their stories with a wider audience. The project evokes principles of shared authority, inclusivity, and collaboration and was well-suited to sharing the stories of the Indigenous women of the Fish Wars. Indigenous communities distrust traditional academia for its history of colonial practices, and the mobile humanities unit seeks to be anything but traditional. It is driven by honest storytelling but with more emphasis on the relationships being built through the storytelling rather than the actual stories, and it meets people where they are most comfortable. The mobile humanities unit’s focus on community outreach and relationship-building reflects the Indigenous methodologies described by Wilson and Archibald, making it an adequate vehicle for Indigenous histories.\(^ {119} \) The vision was meaningful, grassroots community-based research, similar to the many accounts of decolonial public history projects I read. However, my position as a student led to moments that reshaped my project and challenged how I thought about student-led decolonial public history projects.

**Growing my network**

Student-led public history projects offer a unique medium to grow the practice of decolonial methodology. Students, who are actively involved in decolonization, develop creative ways to bridge the gap between historical institutions and the communities they serve, building a generation of historians dedicated to recovering the histories of marginalized communities. Many public history programs offer courses and experiential learning opportunities to introduce undergraduate and graduate students to decolonial and community-based research. Some students work alongside professors and professionals on their multi-year public history projects, who have built and tended to their community collaborations over the course of years and

\(^ {119} \) No pun intended.
created trusting partnerships. However, student-led public history projects often lack previously established partnerships and may not have multiple years to build a network of collaborators.

When I first envisioned this project, I had no community partners. Collaboration is at the core of decolonial practices, so I knew that my first steps needed to work towards developing partnerships. To begin, I composed a generic email in which I explained my project goals and methods and expressed my hopes for collaboration with community partners. Linda Tuhiwai Smith cautions non-Indigenous researchers to think more clearly about their objectives and clarify their research goals and intent. She noted that a lack of respect—be it through denial of human rights, denial of citizenship, denial of the right to self-determination—for Indigenous peoples has largely marred the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. I needed to be mindful of the preexisting colonial conditions I was working within. The tonality of the emails was honest and personal, sharing with the recipients my personal motivations and my positionality within the scholarship. I wanted to ensure that my words read as humble, so I often phrased statements as “I would like to learn from you…” or “I am interested in hearing your thoughts and discussing how a collaborative partnership could best fit your communities’ needs…” Historically, Indigenous communities have been viewed as subjects to be studied, but this project’s main goal is to uphold Indigenous individuals and communities’ active role in history-making and decision-making projects. I was not seeking their consultation but rather their collaboration.

I sought to ground my correspondences and conversations with representatives from the Nisqually and Puyallup Tribes in respect. Jo-Ann Archibald speaks of the practical application of
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120 Smith, 17.
121 Ibid., 120.
respect, responsibility, reverence, and reciprocity in decolonial public history. Respect honors the cultural knowledge shared; responsibility ensures accuracy of content; reverence creates a place for the heart, mind, body, and spirit to interact; and reciprocity sustains and perpetuates these narratives for future generations. These principles guide storytellers and listeners as they engage with Indigenous communities and create meaning of Indigenous narratives. When implemented intentionally, these principles encourage personal connections, and by practicing them regularly, they build the trusting partnerships that are essential to community-based research. They also serve as an ethical standard for decolonial public history projects, and as a non-Indigenous scholar, I need to carefully observe the ethics of my project so as to not perpetuate colonial practices.

I sent my initial emails to the Nisqually and Puyallup Tribes’ Historic Preservation Offices and Cultural Departments in efforts to respect the authority of tribal councils and governments. Indigenous partners hold ongoing relationships with colonizing, dominant governments, so going through the proper channels of tribal authority until told otherwise acknowledges their sovereignty and self-determination. As I continued to identify contacts within the Indigenous communities, I looked outside of traditional scholarly roles. Western ideals of credentialed scholarship often discredit the knowledge of ordinary Indigenous storytellers due to their lack of professional training, but decolonial practices call for the democratization of knowledge production. Re-engineering the relationship between the credentialed and non-credentialed partners ideally “creates an environment in which the virtual can thrive for all stakeholders and builds more holistic modes of knowledge production,” as
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123 Archibald, 125-126.
124 A special thank you to Amber Taylor at the Puyallup Tribe’s Historic Preservation Office for providing me with ample historical newspaper resources, particularly pertaining to Ramona Bennett, a prominent Puyallup leader in the Fish Wars.
archaeologist Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T.J Ferguson argued. It emphasizes the reflective nature of public history by articulating the public historian’s struggle to create collaborative projects within the confines of a traditionally colonial discipline.

The main challenge I encountered when attempting to build my network of collaborators was the lack of responses I received from my emails and other forms of communication. The difficulty of establishing contacts shed light on two insights: 1) colonial research practices have led Indigenous communities to be wary of outside researchers (— and rightfully so); and 2) even though they were my priority, I was not theirs. Non-Indigenous scholars cannot expect that their research ideas and needs will align with those of Indigenous communities. Collaborative partnerships require time, which is sometimes difficult for students to acquire. To combat the lack of responses, I sought support from others outside the Indigenous communities who had existing partnerships with the tribes. Because decolonial public history works within spaces of preexisting colonial conditions, often non-Indigenous scholars need to find a personal entry point, someone already involved in a trusting partnership with the tribe, to gain legitimacy with the community. I spoke with professors at the University of Washington and Evergreen State College who worked with the Indigenous communities on previous collaborations. I contacted someone who was a previous legal intern for the Nisqually Tribe. They then put me in contact with someone who had tribal affiliations; and the cycle continued. I became an experienced phone conversationalist, explaining my project in concise terms and sharing my goals of collaboration. At times, I felt disappointed that my efforts were not leading to the long-term collaborations I desired and worried that I was not doing enough. However, feelings of
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uncertainty are part of the decolonizing process for non-Indigenous scholars. Decolonial research methodology calls for non-Indigenous scholars to rethink their research goals. Many non-Indigenous scholars consider the completed research project to be the goal, but for decolonial public history projects, the process for reaching the finalized product is just as, or even more, important than the product. Even though many of my emails and conversations led to dead-ends, they were important in establishing my credibility as someone invested in the collaborative process.

Rethinking project scale and scope

Early critiques of the project addressed the scale of my project. My idea to convert a step van into a mobile humanities van that could be transformed into an exhibit gallery, creator space, recording studio, movie theater, and performance venue was grandiose. As a student, I lacked the funds and time to see a project of that scale to implementation. My advisory committee worked with me to create an appropriate project that could be completed by my graduation date while still retaining my original objectives. Students often face financial challenges and the reality of approaching graduation dates. We do not have the means to implement large-scale decolonial public history projects. However, small-scale projects that are paired back versions of original ideas are just as effective and meaningful.

Another warranted critique focused on the scope of the project. My research explored the experiences of Indigenous women in the Fish Wars of Washington State and my intended audience for collaboration included the Puyallup, Nisqually, and Muckleshoot Tribes of the southern Puget Sound area of Washington State. I unfortunately lived more than 500 miles away in Boise, Idaho. In their “best practices,” Katrine Barber and Donna Sinclair expressed the
importance of flexibility, and my community liaison through Evergreen State College shared that tribal partners often did not schedule meetings far in advance or often rescheduled. While virtual meetings offered a solution during the COVID-19 pandemic, they are not viewed as a valid alternative to meeting in-person with tribal collaborators. My lack of proximity to the communities I wished to collaborate with proved to be a challenge and limited the scope of my project. For students wishing to initiate decolonial public history projects, I encourage them to collaborate with their local and regional Indigenous communities, expanding the historical narrative of an area a little closer to home.

**Rethinking academic history writing**

Decolonial methodology requires non-Indigenous scholars to reconceptualize their understanding of what knowledge is and how it is obtained. An important aspect of my process was immersing myself in the literature on Indigenous methodology and decolonial methodology. Decolonial practices recognize the validity of Indigenous epistemologies and methodologies and seek to actively incorporate them within research and projects through shared authority and storywork. Non-Indigenous scholars must also understand that for non-Indigenous partners, research is political, and the stories need to reflect that. These principles guided my writing of the interpretive narrative that my research on the role of Indigenous women culminated in.

When a project has a diverse group of collaborators, questions of authority naturally arise. Who possesses the authority when differences emerge? Whose history is it? Who tells the story? Public historians understand that the answers to these questions are rarely absolute and have thus adopted shared authority.\(^{126}\) Colonial practices denied Indigenous individuals the right
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to narrate their historical experiences, and Indigenous narratives that were deemed authoritative were often measured on how assimilated the Indigenous narrator had become to mainstream culture.127 Michael Frisch’s principle of shared authority considers the perspectives of all stakeholders. It moves away from seeking only scholars’ analytical expertise and includes the interpretations of untrained collaborators to create a co-constructed narrative.128 In decolonial methodology, shared authority means including narratives that go against mainstream culture, which may leave some people unsettled. The narratives I developed discusses cultural genocide and the use of violence as both civil disobedience and policing effort, topics which may make readers uncomfortable. However, being unnerved by history indicates that empathy and relati

Shared authority not only dictated my interactions with Indigenous partners but also how I interpreted and wrote the historical narratives for my project. Although I cannot speak for the Indigenous scholars and storytellers, I sought to ground my work with their voices, acting as a messenger for and listener of their ideas. Shawn Wilson demonstrates how Indigenous methodology, while upholding an Indigenous epistemic foundation, becomes a ceremony of storytelling. Storytelling involves a deeper understanding of Indigenous traditional life and experiences.129 My interpretive narrative highlights the cultural practices and traditional beliefs of the tribes of the southern Puget Sound area in order to emphasize their epistemic center. My
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127 Barber, 26.
inclusion of their origin stories seeks to not only illustrate the centrality of salmon, but also honor an Indigenous way of knowing.130

Indigenous storywork, the term conceive by Jo-Ann Archibald, seeks for storytellers, listeners, and learners to pay greater attention to the principles of making stories, the art of telling stories, and the cultural understandings required of interpreting stories.131 I utilized storywork with the inclusion of a story told by Ramona Bennett (Puyallup), a leader of the Fish Wars and prominent activist for Native rights in the mid-twentieth to early twenty-first century. Her story of the Longhouse People demonstrates both the long history of women leaders in Native communities and the manipulation of Native gender roles by Western society.132 My interpretive writing took on new forms, and my public history project seeks to reflect the centrality of stories to knowledge production.
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130 Many oral traditions and stories of Northwest Indigenous groups revealed the centrality of salmon to Native communities. The origin story of Puget Sound Salish-speaking tribes described how Moon, or the Transformer, called upon the dog salmon to be the food for the humans Moon would later create. A creation tradition of the Plateau tribes of the Columbia River Basin also reflected how humans’ survival was linked to salmon. Before creating the humans, the Creator gathered all the animals and plants and asked that each one of them give a gift for the humans, believing that the humans would need the additional gifts in order to survive. Salmon responded first, giving his body as food for the humans. Water answered next, promising to be the home for the salmon. All the animals and plants gave gifts, but because Salmon and Water gave their gifts first, Indigenous communities honor their gifts, or as they call them “First Foods,” by serving salmon and water first at tribal feasts. The gift of Salmon for human’s survival reverberated in the rhetoric of the mid-twentieth-century fish-ins; Arthur Ballard, Mythology of Southern Puget Sound (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1929), 74. University of Washington Libraries Digital Collections. In 1916, Arthur C. Ballard began collecting the oral traditions of the Duwamish, Muckleshoot, Snoqualmie, and other nations of Puget Sound and translated them from Lushootseed, or Puget Sound Salish, into English; Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, “Spirit of the Salmon: Creation Story,” Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission. Accessed April 23, 2022. https://plan.critfc.org/2013/spirit-of-the-salmon-plan/about-spirit-of-the-salmon/creation-story/

131 Archibald, 3.

132 Ramona Bennett retold the history of the Longhouse People on McNeil Island in the Puget Sound in a 1989 interview to highlight the manipulation of white sexism upon their nation. In the mid-nineteenth century, white settlers from Boston traveled to the Longhouse People. Upon their arrival, they asked for the Longhouse People to “Send out your leaders.” The old women leaders came out because the Longhouse People were matrilineal societies. Upon seeing the old women, the Bostonian men said, “No, no, we want your leaders.” The old men were then sent out. Again, the white men said, “No, no, we want your leaders.” Eventually, the Longhouse People sent out their young men, and the Bostonians were satisfied. Bennett’s anecdote demonstrated how white societies imposed their ideas of gender norms upon Indigenous populations, disregarded their self-appointed leaders, and forced these Indigenous communities to accommodate the sexism of white people. Ramona Bennett, “The Puyallup Tribe Rose from the Ashes,” November 1-2, 1989. In Messengers of the Wind: Native American Women Teller Their Life Stories, ed. Jane Katz (New York: Ballantine Books, 1995), 150.
The act of recovering Indigenous stories from the historical record is not just an academic exercise but “an activity that has something at stake and that occurs in a set of political and social conditions,” as Linda Tuhiwai Smith suggests.\textsuperscript{133} Though their stories, communities, languages, and social practices have been pushed into the margins of history, Smith argued that within these margins Indigenous peoples found resistance. Originally set forth by Gerald Vizenor, “survivance” is common sense gained from the adverse experiences of colonization and cultural domination. He likens survivance to a “tragic wisdom” produced under such conditions which serves as the source of Indigenous agency and liberation. In other words, survivance is the Indigenous voice within stories that denies victimization and seeks to reassert Indigenous resilience in mainstream narratives.\textsuperscript{134} For my project, I emphasize the resiliency of Native women as they ensured cultural survival and continuity through protecting their fishing rights. I include a call to action at the end of my interpretive narrative to bridge the gap between the past and the present and identify ways in which the general public can apply their historical understanding to the moral choices they make in the present. Collaborative practices demonstrate how history can be used to inform the present, supporting the idea that a better understanding of the past can better prepare us to protect the rights, cultures, and legacies of Indigenous communities in the present. Decolonial methodology, particularly the principle of survivance, encourages scholars to consider the real-life applications of the histories they craft.

\textbf{Self-reflective practices}

\textsuperscript{133} Smith, 5.
In public history projects, content and process interact, and these points of intersection create opportunities for scholars and community members to build trusting partnerships and infuse their projects with relationality.\textsuperscript{135} Relationality encourages participants to engage in meaningful conversations with the intention to create sustainable collaborations. Gerald Vizenor (Minnesota Chippewa) reminds scholars that stories by nature require participation, both through “telling and listening.”\textsuperscript{136} To Jo-Ann Archibald, efforts to implement relationality are often catalysts of dialogue and dynamism. The historical narrative and history-making process are enriched by moments of truth, honesty, and humility between scholars and community members. Building trusting partnerships requires a willingness to learn and be corrected, and students are often well-versed in asking questions and receiving feedback. Although I used my historical expertise to develop this project, I emphasized my position as a student, hoping to highlight my desire to be a learner and listener. Dialogue not only needs to occur between project participants but also on a personal level. Archibald describes how relationality can also be established through self-reflective practices, such as drawing, video blogging, or journaling.\textsuperscript{137}

As I uncovered the stories of the Fish Wars and delved into the scholarship on decolonial methodology, I was faced with challenging questions: What is my positionality? How have I benefited and contributed to settler colonialism? How has my worldview shaped my agenda and decision-making in this project? What are areas that we should adjust to avoid a colonial representation of Indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing? How might differing groups—Indigenous and non-Indigenous—benefit from the process and product of this project?

\textsuperscript{135} Stanton et al., 211.
\textsuperscript{137} Archibald, 122 and 134.
Throughout the project, I kept a regular journal, nothing formal or public facing, but the action of journaling provided an outlet to wrestle with the answers to these questions. As Eve Tuck (Unangax) and K. Wayne Tang explain, “settler colonialism, and its decolonization, implicates and unsettles everyone.”138 At times, I was uncomfortable and unsettled by the answers, but the self-reflection did not deter me from continuing my pursuit of decolonial methodology. Contrary, it fueled me to better articulate not only my project goals and methods but also my personal motivation.139 Relationality through dialogue between project partners and self-reflective practices offers insight on the importance of curiosity and humility to decolonial methodology.

**Moving forward**

Aware of the positionality I brought as a non-Indigenous scholar, the most challenging question I encountered was whether or not I was doing enough. As Tuck and Yang suggest with their statement that “decolonization is not a metaphor,” too often universities, institutions, and other groups call to “decolonize methodology” or “decolonize schools” without any mention of Indigenous individuals, their struggle for sovereignty and self-determination, and works of Indigenous scholars already working within the given field. Tuck and Yang believe “decolonization” has become a statement lacking substance, lacking action. Only until land, power, or privilege is relinquished can decolonization said to be accomplished; critical consciousness does nothing and continues to perpetuate colonial legacies.140 I feared that I had fallen prey to this critique—my project was not as collaborative or large-scale as I had initially

---

139 Smith, 17.
140 Tuck and Yang, 19.
envisioned; I retained the privileges of white settler descent; and I did not prioritize efforts to return land to Indigenous ownership.¹⁴¹

I still struggle with Tuck and Yang’s valid criticism, but I respond by restating the words of Katrine Barber and Donna Sinclair, “the process may be a significant outcome of your project.”¹⁴² The process of steeping myself in Indigenous scholarship, taking the steps towards collaboration, and critically considering the best practices of decolonial methodology were instrumental to reshaping my approach to historical research and recognizing my positionality as an emerging non-Indigenous scholar. By doing so, I believe I achieved some semblance of decolonial methodology. It might not have been accomplished how I originally believed it would be, but the process of decolonization certainly began.

Student-led decolonial public history projects may face more unique challenges than those led by professors or historical institutions, but they offer students opportunities to formulate their foundational methodologies—methodologies will inform them as the next generation of history makers. If I were to begin this project anew, I would do numerous things differently, but I only know that having gone through the process. I have already applied some of the lessons I learned through this project towards other historical and professional endeavors; the most important lesson being that decolonization is an ongoing process of deconstructing, relearning, and rebuilding. To students: I encourage the use of decolonial research methodology, regardless of how daunting it may appear. It is work that needs to be done in order to rectify the relationship between Indigenous communities and the academy. To professors and educators: I encourage the development of coursework and programs that support students in their decolonial

¹⁴¹ Although I do not own property or have the financial means to buy property with the purpose of returning it to rightful Indigenous owners, I could have more thoroughly sought out ways to support efforts of land reparation.
¹⁴² Barber and Sinclair, 166.
endeavors, giving them the flexibility they need and the understanding that their process may be the most significant outcome of their projects. Students who initiate decolonial public history projects embark on a lifetime of learning and are well-prepared to develop a network of collaborators intent on creating a historical narrative that is representative of the entire human experience.
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