

**Documentation and Recommendations Concerning**

**Determination of Eligibility  
For the National Register of Historic Places**

**of**

**Haskell Indian Nations University  
And the Baker Wetlands**

**Douglas County, Kansas**

**Brockington and Associates, Inc.  
HNTB Engineers and Planners, Inc.**

**December, 2001**

**Documentation and Recommendations Concerning**

**Determination of Eligibility  
For the National Register of Historic Places**

**of**

**Haskell Indian Nations University and the Baker Wetlands  
Douglas County, Kansas**

**Prepared for**

**Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Kansas City District  
Kansas Department of Transportation**

**Prepared by**

**Paul E. Brockington, Jr., Ph.D.  
Bruce G. Harvey, Ph.D.  
Brockington and Associates, Inc.**

**In Association with  
HNTB Engineers and Planners, Inc.**

**December, 2001**

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to recognize the assistance of a number of individuals and organizations. Mr. Dick Pankratz, Dr. Tim Weston, Dr. Robert Hoard, and Mr. Will Banks of the Kansas State Historical Society shared their knowledge about the archaeology and history of Haskell and the Baker Wetlands during a number of discussions. Ms. Marsha King of the Kansas Department of Transportation also provided significant historical and archaeological information for the area, and Mr. Scott Vogel, Environmental Coordinator for the Kansas Department of Transportation, made available documents and research findings important to this study. Ms. King, Mr. Vogel, Mr. Mike Rees, and others at KDOT were always helpful and responsive to our requests for information.

Ms. Judy Sweets carried out archival research at the Watkins Community History Museum in Lawrence, the Spencer Research Library and the Anschutz Library at the University of Kansas, and the Kansas State Historical Society in Topeka. Ms. Sweets located many of the historic photographs presented in the figures of this document, and we would like to thank her for her detailed work assisting this study.

Ms. Bobbi Rahder, Archivist for Haskell Indian Nations University, assisted in locating documents and sources at the HINU library and graciously provided work space for hours of review of library materials. We would also like to thank the library staff for their courtesy and assistance, in making photocopies, locating documents, and providing research advice. Dr. Chuck Haines of HINU took time to have several discussions concerning Haskell history and the Baker Wetlands. The Haskell community, from President Swisher and Board of Regents members to students met during lunch at the Eagles Nest, were at all times helpful and gracious to us during our several visits.

Dr. Roger Boyd of Baker University gave us a detailed tour of the Baker Wetlands, answering many questions there and during follow up telephone calls. Dr. Boyd also provided a written history of the Baker Wetlands since 1968 and graciously allowed us to reproduce that history as an appendix to this document. His assistance was very important in understanding a number of historical and integrity issues, and we thank him for his help.

Mr. Craig Weinaug, Administrator for Douglas County, provided historical information and pointed me to several informants. One of the many pleasures in this study project was working with Mr. Weinaug.

I would also like to thank the staff of the Lawrence Public Library. The study was aided by their assistance in locating materials in their local history collection.

Dr. Don Stull of the Department of Anthropology, University of Kansas shared materials he had developed over several years of research concerning Haskell and the history of Indian

education. Dr. Dave Frayer, also of the Department of Anthropology, helped by searching records for any evidence of Baker Wetlands human remains at the University of Kansas, as did Dr. Mary Adair of the Kansas Museum of Anthropology.

Mr. John Pasley, Mr. Ken Bechtel, Mr. Terry Flanagan and others at HNTB Engineers and Planners, Inc. provided documents and photographs from files of the environmental studies undertaken for the South Lawrence Trafficway project. These maps and photographs appear in several of the figures here.

Finally, Dr. Sherri Deaver, of Ethnoscience, Inc. in Billings, Montana, worked closely with me on earlier phases of this study project. Dr. Deaver provided an early orientation for the study and shared her independent research from 1999 and 2000.

## Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgments .....	ii
List of Figures .....	v
Introduction .....	1
History of Haskell Indian Nations University and the Baker Wetlands .....	3
Historic Context–Indian Policy and Education in the Period 1880 to 1940 .....	8
Development of Policy .....	8
Carlisle As a Model .....	10
Program Expansion .....	11
Allotment .....	12
Impacts of the Education Program .....	13
Twentieth Century Evolution and Reform of the Program .....	16
The Haskell Campus Today .....	17
Land Acquisition History .....	18
Building/Landscape Arrangement and Style .....	19
Consideration of Spiritual Values for the Main Campus Area .....	21
Recommendations .....	21
The Baker Wetlands .....	23
Integrity and Association Issues .....	24
Spiritual Issues and Traditional Cultural Property Consideration .....	32
Rural Historic Landscape Consideration .....	31
Recommendations .....	32
Conclusion .....	32
Bibliography .....	33

### Figures

Appendix A. National Historic Landmark and National Register Forms.

Appendix B. Kansas State Historic Preservation Officer Correspondence, 1997.

Appendix C. Buildings on the Haskell Indian Nations University Campus.

Appendix D. Baker University Wetlands–History Since 1968, by Dr. Roger Boyd.

## List of Figures

- Figure 1. Location of Haskell Indian Nations University and Baker Wetlands. After Carter Burgess (2001).
- Figure 2. Baker Wetlands in Relation to Haskell Campus. After U.S. Department of Transportation (2000).
- Figure 3. Postcard View of Haskell Main Campus-Quadrangle Area, C. 1898. Haskell Farm Area in the Distance behind the Stone School Buildings and Dormitories. From Haskell files, Watkins Community History Museum, Lawrence.
- Figure 4. Beers Atlas, 1873, Prior to Haskell's Establishment. From Watkins Community History Museum, Lawrence.
- Figure 5. Ogle Atlas, 1902, Showing Haskell/U.S. Government Lands. Armstrong Sold Parcel to Government in 1902. From Watkins Community History Museum, Lawrence.
- Figure 6. Shanklin Atlas, 1909, Showing Haskell/U.S. Government Lands. Armstrong Parcel Had Actually Been Sold to Government in 1902. From Watkins Community History Museum, Lawrence.
- Figure 7. Ogle Atlas, 1921, Showing Haskell/U.S. Government Lands. From Watkins Community History Museum, Lawrence.
- Figure 8. Central North-South Drainage Canal Under Construction in the Baker Wetlands, 1919. From The Indian Leader, June 1920; Watkins Community History Museum, Lawrence.
- Figure 9. Layout of Upper and Lower Haskell Farm in 1919, after Construction of the Northern Dike and Central North-South Canal. From Haskell Indian Nations University Library files.
- Figure 10. View of the Upper (Northern) Portion of the Haskell Farm, 1910, Prior to Drainage Improvements in the Bottom Lands. View Looking North toward Central Campus. From Haskell Files, Watkins Community History Museum, Lawrence.
- Figure 11. Students Hoeing in the Upper Farm, c. 1915. From Haskell Files, Watkins Community History Museum, Lawrence.
- Figure 12. Tractor Pulling Demonstration at the Haskell Farm, 1920. From Haskell Files, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.
- Figure 13. Haskell Farm, View Looking North, 1920. From The Indian Leader, June 1920; Watkins Community History Museum, Lawrence.
- Figure 14. 1920 View of the Haskell Farm. From The Indian Leader, June 1920; Watkins Community History Museum, Lawrence.
- Figure 15. 1925 View of the Haskell Farm. From Haskell Files, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.
- Figure 16. The 1926 Powwow Tent Village at the Haskell Farm. From The Indian Leader, January 1927; Watkins Community History Museum, Lawrence.

- Figure 17. View of the Haskell Main Campus, 1937, with the Stadium Complete. View is to the West, with the Upper Farm at the Left Margin of the Photo. From Haskell Files, Watkins Community History Museum, Lawrence.
- Figure 18. National Historic Landmark Properties at Haskell, 1986 Form. After U.S. Department of Transportation (2000).
- Figure 19. Government Indian Schools, 1899. Off-Reservation Boarding Schools in Red. From Coleman (1993).
- Figure 20. Birdseye View of the Haskell Campus and the Northern Portion of the Baker Wetlands as They Exist Today, Looking North. From Files at HNTB Engineers and Planners, Inc., Kansas City, Missouri.
- Figure 21. Medicine Wheel Area, Looking South. From Files at HNTB Engineers and Planners, Inc., Kansas City, Missouri.
- Figure 22. Looking West from South End of Baker Wetlands near Wakarusa River. From Files at HNTB Engineers and Planners, Inc., Kansas City, Missouri.
- Figure 23. Looking East from South End of Baker Wetlands near Wakarusa River. From Files at HNTB Engineers and Planners, Inc., Kansas City, Missouri.
- Figure 24. 35<sup>th</sup> Street at Center of Baker Wetlands - Looking West. From Files at HNTB Engineers and Planners, Inc., Kansas City, Missouri.
- Figure 25. 35<sup>th</sup> Street at Center of Baker Wetlands - Looking East. From Files at HNTB Engineers and Planners, Inc., Kansas City, Missouri.
- Figure 26. View of the Northeast Portion of Baker Wetlands from Haskell Avenue (South on Left, West in Center and North on Right). From Files at HNTB Engineers and Planners, Inc., Kansas City, Missouri.
- Figure 27. View of the Eastern Portion of Baker Wetlands, Looking West along 35<sup>th</sup> Street at Left, North along Eastern Boundary at Right. From Files at HNTB Engineers and Planners, Inc., Kansas City, Missouri.
- Figure 28. Locations of the Haskell Dump, Canals/Levees, and Water Control Structures. From Weston and King (2001).
- Figure 29. Concentration of Construction Debris, Haskell Dump, West End. From Weston and King (2001).
- Figure 30. View North at North-South Canal with Water Control Structure #1 in Foreground, Baker Wetlands. From Weston and King (2001).
- Figure 31. View West at East-West Canal and Levee, from Bridge at Center of Northern Baker Wetlands Boundary. From Weston and King (2001).
- Figure 32. View South at Water Control Structure #1. From Weston and King (2001).
- Figure 33. View Southeast at Water Control Structure #2. From Weston and King (2001).
- Figure 34. View Northeast at Water Control Structure #3. From Weston and King (2001).
- Figure 35. Aerial Photo from October 1937 Showing Haskell Farm. From U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- Figure 36. Aerial Photo from 2001 Showing Baker Wetlands.. From Files at HNTB Engineers and Planners, Inc., Kansas City, Missouri.
- Figure 37. Proposed Haskell Indian Nations University and Haskell Farm Historic District. After U.S. Department of Transportation (2000).

## Introduction

This document addresses the National Register of Historic Places eligibility of an area known today as the Baker Wetlands, along with the adjacent Haskell Indian Nations University campus, in the city of Lawrence, Douglas County, Kansas. The Baker Wetlands form a 573 acre area adjacent to, and formerly part of, Haskell Indian Nations University, one of the first off-reservation Indian boarding schools built and operated by the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Several alternatives of the proposed South Lawrence Trafficway cross the Baker Wetlands, and it is thus necessary under the National Environmental Policy Act and the National Historic Preservation Act to make a determination of the wetlands' National Register eligibility. Portions of the HINU campus have previously been determined National Register eligible, and consideration is made here of the campus as an historic district. Figures 1 and 2 show the Baker Wetlands area and Haskell Indian Nations University.

The South Lawrence Trafficway project has been proposed for a number of years, and the National Register eligibility (and potential boundaries) of HINU and the Baker Wetlands have been controversial. For the HINU campus, the major National Register consideration issue involves integrity of the campus as a district. A number of modern buildings have replaced historic structures, making a district determination complex and difficult. For the Baker Wetlands (formerly the Haskell Farm), the major National Register consideration issue involves integrity concerns—do today's Baker Wetlands retain sufficient integrity from the Haskell Farm period? A second issue for the Baker Wetlands involves consideration of proposed Native American spiritual significance as a National Register criterion.

In developing this document, we followed guidance in a number of National Register Bulletins, including *How to Apply the National Register Criteria*, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes*, and *Defining Boundaries for National Register Properties*. Research methods included secondary and primary records searches in various libraries and repositories in Kansas (HINU Library, Lawrence Public Library, Watkins Community History Museum in Lawrence, Spencer and Anschutz libraries of the University of Kansas, and the Kansas State Historical Society in Topeka). A number of documents and comment responses relating to environmental study of the South Lawrence Trafficway were also reviewed carefully; these included several studies and presentations developed by HINU faculty and students. We also carried out interviews with HINU faculty, staff, and students, and discussed several topics of concern with HINU Board of Regents members. Dr. Roger Boyd, biologist at Baker University and director of the university's Baker Wetlands program, was interviewed extensively.

Also as part of our research for this study, we surveyed the HINU campus and recorded reconnaissance level information on the buildings and landscapes there. Several visits were made to examine the Baker Wetlands, including an extensive inspection tour with Dr. Boyd.

The Baker Wetlands were originally part of Haskell Institute (as Haskell Indian Nations University was known through most of its history). The wetlands were used as agricultural land (crop farming and cattle pasturage) in the vocational training of Indian students at Haskell. In the 1930s, vocational training in farming was discontinued by Haskell; by the 1950s the Baker Wetlands were transferred by the BIA to other federal agencies and finally given to Baker University, a local private college, in 1968. Baker University worked to redevelop the area as wetlands and today carries out field research and education programs in wetlands biology. The area is recognized as a National Natural Landmark as a wetland. Small areas within the Baker Wetlands are owned by the University of Kansas and by the Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks. These areas are managed in coordination with the Baker University program. The University of Kansas and Haskell Indian Nations University also carry out research and educational activities in the wetlands.

Several buildings (and the Haskell cemetery) in the northern portion of the Haskell campus have been listed together as a National Historic Landmark (1961—see Appendix A), but the entire campus was not designated as an historic district at the time of that listing, or after a 1986 revisit, because of the many modern buildings within the campus. This document revisits the issue of the campus of Haskell as an eligible historic district, especially in consideration of its combination with the Baker Wetlands as a single, large, integrated historic district.

This document contains several sections. First is a basic outline of the history of Haskell Indian Nations University, followed by a more general historic context statement. A description of the modern Haskell campus is then presented, followed by an evaluation of the campus as an historic district. A final section provides a description of the Baker Wetlands and an evaluation of its eligibility for the National Register. References cited are included in the Bibliography; other works consulted for general historical and policy guidance are also listed there. Referenced figures are grouped following the Bibliography. Finally, appendices contain referenced NHL and NRHP forms, correspondence, HINU campus building descriptions, and a history of the Baker Wetlands by Dr. Roger Boyd.

The recommendation of this document is that the modern campus of Haskell, together with the Baker Wetlands, should be considered an historic district eligible for the National Register. While there are significant integrity issues for both parts of this district, we believe that these issues do not detract from the strong sense of place conveyed by the campus and the adjacent wetlands and representing the historical significance of Haskell Institute. This recommendation is based on National Register Criterion A, with a period of significance of 1884 to 1940, and historic themes of Politics/Government, Social History, Education, and Ethnic Heritage--Native American. Very important historical events and patterns are exemplified and represented by, and occurred at, Haskell. The significance of these events and patterns is national, and an understanding of them can still be gained by visiting the buildings and landscapes of the campus and the Baker Wetlands.

## **History of Haskell Indian Nations University and the Baker Wetlands**

This brief summary of the history of Haskell Indian Nations University is based in part on a number of outline histories developed over the years by Haskell students and faculty and produced by the school's print shop. These are on file at the Haskell Library on campus, along with bound volumes of the student newspaper, the "Indian Leader," Haskell yearbooks, newspaper clippings, donated photographs, and other materials. Also utilized in developing this summary were documents prepared by students and faculty at Haskell and submitted to the Federal Highway Administration during the development of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement during the late 1990s. In addition, the Superintendent's annual reports to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in Washington were also reviewed. Secondary histories including detailed information regarding Haskell are also available. These materials and sources are listed in the bibliography for this document.

Haskell Institute opened its doors to students in September 1884 (Marvin 1885). Beginning two years earlier, the citizens and businesses of Lawrence had raised money through donations and bought 280 acres for the school. This land was on the south side of the city; it was flood plain of the Wakarusa River and adjacent uplands. With lobbying by Kansas' Congressman D.C. Haskell, the Department of Interior accepted the land and issued contracts for design and construction of the school. Construction was carried out in late 1883 and in 1884, with the three main buildings ("school" building, boys' dorm, girls' dorm) complete at the opening in 1884. The original name of the school, "United States Indian Industrial School," was changed to Haskell Institute in 1890 (Ames 1936).

The school was intended as a boarding institution for Indian students generally in the age range of first graders through fifth graders, although younger and older students were common (Ames 1936). In a few years, upper (including high school range) grades were added. The curriculum was focused on learning to speak, read, and write English; on a general liberal arts introduction; and on vocational training (Ames 1936). Girls and boys were accepted; by January, 1885, students included 219 boys and 61 girls. Girls' vocational training centered on sewing, cooking, and household arts (including processing much of the farm's milk into butter and cheese). Boys' vocational training included farming and dairying, although students could select between these and construction, plumbing, blacksmithing, wagon making, and leather work (Ames 1936). Many boys worked in agriculture--in crop, vegetable, and fruit production or in dairying (agriculture was the predominant vocation in America, especially in the Midwest and West).

The "Haskell Farm" was initially developed in 1883 and 1884 along with the buildings and school grounds so that the farm would be ready for students as they entered in the fall of 1884 (Marvin 1885). A local farmer was hired as the first staff member to plow and plant crops and gardens in the spring, to supervise barn, outbuildings, and fence construction, to plant orchards, and to begin assembling a dairy herd.

The Office of Indian Affairs organized the boarding schools along military lines, partly because of the historical origins of the boarding schools following the success of Carlisle school in Pennsylvania, and partly because it was widely believed that military discipline was important, and even necessary, for success in Indian education (Adams 1995). The school day was highly regulated, with little free time for the students. Marching (“drilling”) was a regular activity for both girls and boys; uniforms were worn. Vocational training meant work for the students, with longer hours spent during some periods of the year (e.g., harvest times on the farm).

Haskell had a number of problems in its early years. Life for the students was harsh, although life for most rural and small town Americans, especially Indians on reservations, was also severe. The facilities were not complete at Haskell by the first winter, and a number of students died from disease, probably related in part to poor heating in the buildings (Ames 1936; Elzea 1978; HINU Students and Alumni 1996). Much of the farm’s production was sold, and sometimes food supplies/diets were not adequate. Health care standards were of course lower than today, but an 1886 government report showed that conditions (facilities, health supplies, food) were substandard. While there was kitchen staff to prepare food, other staff was limited; teachers also served as dormitory managers and as nurses (Marvin 1885; Grabowskii 1886; Leonard 1889; Granzer 1937).

Throughout its first 30 years of existence, there were a number of student deaths from epidemic disease, especially pneumonia and influenza. Tuberculosis was also a problem. In its first year, Haskell started a student cemetery (Marvin 1885; Ames 1936). Most burials were from the first 15 years, when death rates were high and shipment of bodies home to reservations was more difficult.

In the 1880s and 1890s, additional land was purchased, and additional buildings were added, including horse and dairy barns; by 1902 the last large tract of land had been added (see Figures 3-7). Electric lights were installed in the 1890s, including dorms by 1897 (Elzea 1978). A print shop was added to the vocational training facilities, and in 1897 a school newspaper (“The Indian Leader”) was begun. Athletic activity was part of the school curriculum from the beginning, with organized teams in several sports. Football was prominent by the early 1900s, with Haskell playing local (and later, more distant) colleges (Ames 1936). The Haskell band was organized early in the school’s history and by 1900 was participating in local and regional parades. In 1904 the band appeared at the St. Louis World’s Fair and at Coney Island in New York (Elzea 1978).

Haskell was a stop for visiting politicians from Washington, and a number of prominent officials visited and made speeches there in the late 1800s and early 1900s. President William Howard Taft visited in 1911. “Flying machine” demonstrations generated great excitement and crowds in the early 1900s (Elzea 1978).

In the 1880s and 1890s, the Haskell farm was probably focused on the upland areas, generally north of where 31<sup>st</sup> Street is today (see Figure 2), because of the wetland nature of the

bottom lands and the frequent flooding of the Wakarusa River. Although the bottom lands could be used in dry years for crop production, wet springs and falls could disrupt planting and harvesting. Early reports (Swett 1894; Peairs 1899, 1901, 1903, 1906) indicated that portions of the farm were not as productive as desired because of wet conditions. The Armstrong tract added in 1902 was generally higher and better drained and could be more successfully farmed (Dr. Roger Boyd, Personal Communication, 2001), but others areas were described as “wet meadow” or “swamp” and were primarily used for pasturage and hay production. Drainage to increase land available for crops was a goal of the Superintendents from the earliest years. Federal appropriations for drainage projects, however, were not available until the early 1900s, and the small measures used to provide flood protection and drainage were not very successful (Peairs 1899, 1901, 1903, 1906) .

Superintendent Peairs reported in 1919 that, after approval of significant funding, major drainage improvements, including dikes and canals Peairs 1919), were underway. Dikes were constructed adjacent to the Wakarusa to slow over bank flooding there, and along the northern and western edges of the bottom lands. Canals were dug outside the northern, eastern, and western dikes to assist removal of runoff from upland streams as well as the drained interior. Water control gates were placed in the dikes to allow water in when needed. A central large canal, running north-south, was constructed to provide water when necessary but primarily to drain the diked-in area directly south to the Wakarusa (Figure 8). Subterranean drainage tile lines were placed in several fields to drain into the north-south canal and to the Wakarusa River, and it is likely that surface ditches, spaced at 20-30 feet (“W-ditches”) were excavated at this time (Dr. Roger Boyd, Personal Communication, 2001). The dikes and canals are shown in a detailed 1919 map of the campus and farm (Figure 9).

After this extensive drainage improvement system was in place, agricultural production in the bottom lands was probably greatly increased, with crop production possible even in relatively wet years. Some areas remained as wild hay fields, probably because drainage continued to be poor in those areas (Figure 9–inset table). Major floods from the Wakarusa still greatly affected farming in the bottom lands and required repair of the dikes, canals, and water control gates after each flood, but the water control measures installed in 1919 appear to have been quite successful and were still functioning well in part in the early 1970s when Baker University began modifying the area to become wetlands. The period between 1919 and 1934 (when agricultural education was ended at Haskell), was probably the most productive time for the Haskell Farm. Figures 10-15 present views of the farm in the early 1900s.

By the early 1920s, Haskell was strongly supported by alumni who had returned to their tribes and were beginning to assume leadership positions. Haskell was seen by Indians, the government, and the public as a flagship school for Indian education and for Indian participation in the nation and the world. Some of the pride in Haskell was expressed in the growing prominence of its football teams. Haskell’s teams traveled nationally to play major colleges; its own facilities, however, did not encourage other teams to travel to Haskell. The government

bought land for a stadium, but private donations from tribal members throughout the country, especially Kansas and Oklahoma tribes, created a stadium fund (Ames 1936) .

In 1926 a stadium dedication was held at Haskell; all Indians in the United States were invited for a “Great Powwow” (Haskell Institute 1927; Ames 1936). An estimated 4,000 tribal members attended, many of them camping in a tent city established on the Haskell Farm (with streets, running water, and electric lights put in for the occasion—see Figure 16). Visitors participated in and enjoyed dances, speeches, presentations by the Haskell band and others, demonstrations, fireworks, and the famous Haskell production of the play “Hiawatha.” Over 100,000 white visitors attended from the nation and region for the festivities and ceremonies over several days. Senator Charles Curtis gave the dedication speech, with remarks by Secretary of Interior Herbert Work, Superintendent of Indian Affairs H.B. Peairs (former Haskell Superintendent), and Haskell Superintendent Clyde Blair. A number of notable chiefs of Indian nations were present and recognized during the ceremonies. The final event was the football game in the completed stadium between Haskell and Bucknell University (which Haskell won to the delight of most of the crowd). This event was national news, and was the largest pan-Indian gathering to that date. Figure 17 shows the main campus of Haskell in 1937, with the stadium at the northern edge of the campus.

Beginning in the early 1900s, there was increasing criticism of the government’s boarding school program, and in the 1930s, reform changed federal Indian policy (Adams 1995). Off-reservation boarding schools were de-emphasized, and over the next several decades many were closed. Haskell’s relatively strong position as a leading Indian school (now with post-high school curriculum), as well as its influential alumni, enabled the school to stay open. Shifts were made toward a more academic curriculum, with vocational training being adjusted to reflect industries of the day. Agricultural vocational training was transferred from Haskell to the Bureau of Indian Affairs Chilocco School in Oklahoma. Portions of the former agricultural fields were leased to local farmers after the farming program was ended in 1934 (Ames 1936).

From the 1950s to the present, Haskell evolved rapidly. It was in the 1950s primarily a high school; during the 1960s most courses were post-high school, and it was renamed Haskell Indian Junior College in 1970. The name was changed again in 1992 to Haskell Indian Nations University, recognizing Haskell’s accreditation as a four-year university which granted baccalaureate degrees in a number of academic areas. Today, Haskell is the only all-Indian university in the nation. It is administered still by the BIA, with an advisory Board of Regents appointed by tribes (in geographic regions) throughout the nation. Many of Haskell’s programs include strong Native American perspectives within academic history, arts, and science curricula.

Also from the 1950s to the present, there has been development and redevelopment of the campus and its facilities. The earliest buildings are now all gone, destroyed by demolition or fire over the years—the last major fire in 1971 destroyed the 1891 Sacajewea Hall. In 1961 the National Park Service listed Haskell as a National Historic Landmark because of its importance to national events in American history. Precise boundaries were not detailed in the documents

filed at that time. In 1986, the NPS reviewed the NHL status of Haskell. The original buildings were all gone at that time, as were most listed in the 1961 form. Buildings dating from 1898 through 1931, along with the Haskell Cemetery, were described in the 1986 form; these buildings were determined to represent well Haskell's period of national historical significance (1884-1940). The 1961 and 1986 forms are attached as Appendix A.

An important part of the 1986 restudy by the NPS was to define boundaries for the historic property—this became an important element of NHL and National Register listings after the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act. Defining an historic district for Haskell was carefully considered, but it was decided at that time by the NPS that there were too many modern buildings, structures, and landscape elements mixed within the campus to allow definition of a district. The NHL (and National Register) listing was defined as 12 discontinuous properties (11 buildings and the Haskell Cemetery)—see Figure 18 and Appendix A.

In the early 1950s, the BIA and Congress declared some lands at Haskell (and other Indian schools) to be surplus and eligible for donation to state and other organizations for public benefit. In 1957 and 1958, the BIA transferred several small tracts of the Haskell Farm to the city of Lawrence, Wakarusa Township, Douglas County, the Kansas Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission, and the University of Kansas. These lands were used to build schools, parks, and a fire station on the west side of the Haskell campus. The University of Kansas and the State of Kansas received small tracts within the bottom lands for biology research. Most of the bottom lands were transferred from the BIA to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife (also in the federal Department of the Interior) for management. Haskell retained about 320 acres, its main campus area and much of the farm lands in the upland areas (north of the northern bottom lands dike--see Figure 2).

In 1968, the Department of the Interior transferred the 573 acre tract previously given to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which then conveyed the land to Baker University for public benefit and education. Baker University began a strong program to modify the abandoned farm lands. This included repairing broken levees, removing a portion of the drainage tile system, and planting prairie/wetland grasses. This area now became known as the Baker Wetlands. Baker University, by agreement, also manages the University of Kansas tract (about 20 acres) and the Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks tract (about 20 acres)--see Figure 2.

Baker University continues to maintain an extensive educational and research program in the wetlands area. Haskell cooperates in that program, also utilizing for its research and educational programs both the portions of wetlands on the southern portion of its campus (just north of 31<sup>st</sup> Street—see Figure 2) and the Baker Wetlands. Baker University, in cooperation with local organizations, has developed public education programs within the wetlands; these include plant and wildlife education, as well as bird watching (U.S. Department of Transportation 2000).

## **Historic Context–Indian Policy and Education in the Period 1880 to 1940**

This section provides the background information for understanding the historically important events occurring in the nation and expressed at Haskell. A number of excellent histories have been written in the last 20 years detailing the changes in government policy toward Indians after the early and middle 1800s war and reservation eras. Prucha's (1984) *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians* is the most often cited review of Federal Indian policy in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Adams' (1995) *Education for Extinction, American Indians and the Boarding School Experience 1875-1928* is an excellent summary of the details of the Indian education program and the many factors which led to policy development and changes.

Prucha (1979) provides important views showing competition between Protestant and Catholic missions to the Indian reservations and how this competition influenced government policy and life in the schools. Statements concerning school life by Indian students were analyzed by Coleman (1993); Coleman's reviews of "autobiographies" of Indians talking and writing about their experiences at off-reservation boarding schools provide a rich and balanced understanding of the impacts of the schools on the children and their parents. Child (1998) provides additional detail and interpretation of school life, as well as child/parent impacts, through her analysis of letters between parents and children at school (and to the school administrators). McBeth (1983) also provides experiences of school life, noting especially the role of boarding schools in the development of "Pan-Indianism." Several recent histories of off-reservation boarding schools offer descriptions of life at the schools which would probably also characterized life at Haskell; Carlisle School is described by Cooper (1999), Riney (1999) provides a history of the Rapid City School, and Lomawaima (1994) tells of life at Chilocco School.

These histories mentioned above focus directly on Indian boarding schools, their origins and their impacts to Indians and to the nation. These works summarize and rely on the hundreds of more general histories regarding Indians in America in the late 1800s and early 1900s; the studies cited above contain detailed notes and bibliographic references to those more general histories.

### **Development of Policy**

As the 1870s drew to a close, the era of Indian wars in the United States ended. Indians had been forced onto reservations—some reservations were larger than others, but most, especially in the Plains, were not large enough for traditional subsistence. It was soon noted that many reservation tribes were characterized by poverty and disease, and "reformers" began to lobby for federal assistance. Food rations were provided as part of most treaties establishing reservations. Reformers advocated expanding this program; there was publicly expressed opinion that most tribes would simply die out without immediate, more effective assistance.

Reformers also pointed out the corruption in federal Indian assistance programs; Indian agents were thought primarily to be minor political appointments, doing little for the tribes they were supposed to represent and to assist while they lived (in some style) from federal appropriations.

Much of the reformers' information about reservations came from those involved in church mission schools. Protestants of various denominations had begun mission schools as reservations were created. The Catholic Church also recognized the significance of missionary activities for the Indians and was particularly active in establishing mission schools in the 1870s and early 1880s. Prucha (1979) details the rivalry between Protestants and Catholics. Catholics were rising in number in the United States as Catholic immigration from Europe (especially Ireland and southern Europe) increased in the middle and late 1800s, especially after the Civil War. Protestants became defensive about the growth in numbers and political power of Catholics; the activism of Catholic mission schools to Indians was noted as another worrisome area leading to more Catholic power. Within this overall context, Protestant reformers organized societies to lobby for government programs to assist Indians (Adams 1995).

Under pressure from public criticism President Grant in 1869 embarked on a "Peace Program" (expensive Indian wars were still going on). Part of this program would appoint a Board of Indian Commissioners" to work with the Secretary of the Department of the Interior in administering Indian reservations and policy. This board was appointed from church councils and was thought to be a way to excise, or at least reduce, the corruption in the Indian office. In 10 years, there was little real change, and reform movements began to gain public support—public attention was shifting away from the Civil War and Reconstruction. There were three major thrusts: a more humane general policy to guide responses to specific problems and incidents at reservations, movement away from the political appointment "spoils" system (to a Civil Service system) for Indian office positions, and increased attention to economic assistance, health services, and education for Indians (Adams 1995).

The thinking was that it was necessary to educate the Indians to become "civilized," that is, to learn modern culture and practices so that they could be economically self sufficient. This meant teaching Indians a variety of vocational skills for industrial, commercial America, including modern scientific farming. Farming would allow Indians to produce directly the food they needed—and would introduce the Indians to what was thought at the time to be the capitalistic, democratic society's basic building block, the entrepreneurial farmer and his family (Adams 1995).

Through the 1870s mission schools had been contracted by the government; the Catholics had been particularly effective at establishing mission schools, and then, after they were running, securing government funding. Prucha (1979) notes the concern that Protestants had that they were falling behind, and sees the lobbying for government day schools rather than contract mission schools as affected by this competition. Government day schools (non-boarding) on the reservations taught supposedly non-denominational Christianity—this was an important aspect of their "civilizing" mission. In actuality, however, the non-denominational religious training at the

government schools was primarily Protestant, in keeping with the large Protestant majority that controlled government. Catholic priests were not allowed at most government schools, even for short visits to their declared parishioners, who were numerous on many reservations by the 1870s and 1880s.

The day schools that were initiated during the 1870s were not seen as successful in training Indian children. Many teachers and superintendents complained that they did not control the children long enough during the day (or the year) to inculcate civilizing education. The children returned to their families each afternoon, weekend, and vacation. This was seen as encouraging too much their native languages, their “superstitious” religious beliefs, and their generally “savage” ways. On-reservation boarding schools were attempted, but these, too, were seen as not having enough control of the students’ lives. The solution to these problems began to appear to be another system for education, the off-reservation boarding school (Adams 1995). An apparently successful model for this new system was the Carlisle Indian School in Pennsylvania, started and led by Captain Richard Henry Pratt.

### **Carlisle As a Model**

Pratt (then a Lieutenant) had been an Army Indian fighter in the West. In 1875 he was detailed to lead a transfer of 72 Indian prisoners from Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas to St. Augustine, Florida where they were to be imprisoned for their various crimes. After arriving in Florida and settling in to the Castillo de San Marcos, where security was not a problem, Pratt began to liberalize the prisoners’ confinement, first with recreational outings and then with passes allowing them to mix with the local population. After involving them in local work (with the prisoners earning money), Pratt began to think of education. He recruited teachers who began with instruction in English. As soon as possible, there was instruction about the world and, of course, about Christianity. The entire program was successful with the Indians, the local community, and the Army (Adams 1995).

By 1878, Pratt was able to talk the Army into paroling most of the Indians back to their tribes—they were “civilized” to a degree that they were no longer considered dangerous. Twenty-two younger Indians volunteered to stay with Pratt for more education. Pratt quickly secured sponsors for five individuals, along with donated funding to support the expenses of the entire group. The remaining 17 Indians were invited by Hampton Institute in Virginia to enroll in its program; Pratt accompanied his students there in the spring of 1878. The Hampton Institute program was immediately successful, and Pratt lobbied the Army for a school dedicated to Indians. This idea was approved, Pratt was made Captain and superintendent, and the school was soon established (October, 1879) in unused Army barracks in Carlisle, Pennsylvania (Adams 1995).

Pratt recruited students by traveling to reservations throughout the West, bearing testimonials from his original students and seeking the assistance of Indian agents and other

reservation staff. The curriculum was developed by Pratt and his hand-picked teachers. It included military discipline (along with uniforms, marching, and strong punishment for offenses), as well as general “civilization” courses in English, the arts, and history. Vocational education was included; and, of course, strong Christian (i.e., non-denominational Protestant) training was a significant part of the program (Adams 1995; Cooper 1999).

## **Program Expansion**

Pratt and Carlisle were quickly successful. Pratt’s students were largely motivated volunteers, as were his teachers. There was good support from the Army and the government in general, and the success caught the public’s attention. Congress moved fast to promote the Carlisle model into a larger program. By 1880 there was a second off-reservation boarding school established in Oregon, and by 1884 four more schools were established—in Oklahoma, Nebraska, New Mexico, and Kansas (Haskell). By 1899, there were 25 off-reservation boarding schools, all on the Carlisle model, administered by the Office of Indian Affairs. Figure 19 shows the locations of these schools.

The rapid expansion of the Indian education program was a major domestic federal program. It seemed to follow logically the period of Western Indian wars and reservation establishment. In many ways, it was a big public story at the time, analogous to the earlier Civil War and its succeeding Reconstruction period, covered extensively by newspaper and magazine journalists. There was much discussion and even dissent over the program as it developed.

It was an expensive federal program, and many worried that it would not work. Some thought this program would lead the government to intrude in other “private” affairs of the people of the nation. Others were not supportive of any assistance to Indian tribes, either because of general racism or because of enmity from the period of wars with tribes (Adams 1995).

Among general supporters of education assistance for tribes, Catholics were suspicious of the rapid growth of off-reservation boarding schools (Prucha 1979). Catholic involvement at these schools was highly restricted, as this was seen officially by the government as inappropriate mixing of church and state. In fact, government funding of contract mission schools was steadily cut back after 1880, disappearing completely by the early 1900s. Catholics protested that the so-called “non-denominational” Christian training at boarding schools was really just general Protestantism, and that the schools and their program had an anti-Catholic bias. They lobbied and protested actively to Congress, to the Department of the Interior, and at specific schools. There was strong Catholic opposition to Haskell Superintendent Peairs’ appointment as Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1909, because he had been so pro-Protestant and anti-Catholic at Haskell—restricting access by priests to the students. (In 1907 there were 337 Catholics, 316 Protestants, and 106 “no church” students listed at Haskell.) In the early 1900s,

accommodation in this long competition was slowly reached, with government rules relaxed regarding priests participating in visitation and services at the schools (Prucha 1979).

During the 20 years from 1880 to 1900, the Indian education program and the boarding schools were generally seen as a success by the public, the reformers, and the government (Adams 1995; Coleman 1993). Indian tribal population had been stabilized, and social integration was beginning. Boarding schools were not widely supported by the tribes, although they acquiesced for the most part in the program. Tribes' lack of any political power circumscribed their complaints; tribes also recognized their desperate situation and their need for help to survive. Most of the public thought that Indians were being treated fairly and were being given opportunity in society.

### **Allotment**

The Indian education movement, especially the off-reservation boarding schools but also the mission and day schools, were part of the general policy of integration of Indians into the cultural and economic life of the United States. This was not a "multi-cultural" integration, however. The thought was that there should be one culture; the tribal cultures should be abandoned as this was what was holding Indians back. These thoughts fit well with the generally prevailing social evolution theory of the time—Social Darwinism.

The direct, political expression of this policy was the Dawes Act—officially the General Allotment Act—of 1887. This statute authorized the President to identify appropriate reservations, survey them, and allot the land to individual Indians and their families (and then recognize the Indians as citizens). Later acts (e.g., the Curtis Act of 1898 and various Indian Office appropriation acts after 1893) included more detailed allotment provisions and set up bureaucracies to implement the program (Carter 1999). This breaking of the common tribal ownership of land was seen to be essential in destroying the tribal cultural hold on the Indians and in allowing integration into society (and eventual self sufficiency). Liberal reformers hailed the act as humanitarian and as key to solving problems of Indian poverty, disease, and eventual extinction—along with education, of course.

For most reservations, the total of family (160 acres) and individual (80 acres) allotments did not account for all the tribal land. Excess land could be sold to the public by the government, with the funds from sales kept in trust for the tribes' "civilization and education." To keep speculators from enticing sales of allotted lands, the allotment deeds were restricted from sale for 25 years. Over the next 40 years, reservations were allotted in a fitful manner; many large reservations were broken up—especially where land was highly desired by whites. Other reservations survived until policy and laws were changed in the 1930s.

By the 1930s this general policy was seen as generally ineffective and by many as a cruel dismemberment by the government of reservation lands. Most Indians today see the allotment

period as the time of the greatest attack on their tribal institutions, language, culture, and religion. In many ways the allotment period was seen as worse for Indians than the preceding eras of wars, forced migrations, and reservation establishment.

At the time, however, liberal reformers thought allotment was the progressive, humanitarian approach (Adams 1995). Many thought that it was wise “to release unproductive lands” from reservations for higher social and economic uses—it was not seen as just a greedy land grab. It was thought that educated, citizen Indian families could make a better living on their individually owned lands, where self interest would motivate productivity. Common land ownership was seen as a hindrance to participation in the democratic, capitalistic society of the United States, where active pursuit of self interest made success possible. Under this thinking, an effective education program was the other part of the government’s promise to the Indians. Many Indians today see the education program of the late 1800s and early 1900s as just another part of a series of cruel attempts at destruction of their cultures.

### **Impacts of the Education Program**

In addition to the overall impacts of changing the tribal cultures, the education program often had harsh personal effects on individual Indians—the children and their families. Coleman (1993) describes the separation of children from their families and their homes. Based on a sample of 69 statements of Indian “autobiographers,” who commented on why they went to off-reservation boarding schools, 25 percent said they had been compelled by authorities—50 percent said they were sent by their families and tribal members, and 10 percent made their own personal choice. More detailed analysis of this by Coleman and by Child (1998) and others indicates that compulsion included searching for the children by the reservation agent and his assistants (sometimes tribal police), as well as threats of taking away rations from the families if they did not send their children to boarding school. Official government policy in the 1884-c.1900 period was that the children had to go to school, and that the families could choose day or boarding schools on the reservation if they did not want to send their children off the reservation; parents could change their minds and request that boarding school students be sent home if they were enrolled in reservation schools (Coleman 1993: 63; Granzer 1937: 55-56).

It is evident, however, that there were a number of incidents where there was true compulsion separating children from families against their wishes (see Adams 1995:210ff). Some schools were more mistrusted than others by tribes; tribes sometimes hid students to keep them from being shipped off to these schools (Child 1998:90-91). Tribal communities also hid runaways from authorities. Child (1993:87-90) notes that the Iowa of northeast Kansas gained a reputation for harboring runaways, especially from Haskell.

The late 1800s and early 1900s was a period of growth in compulsory public education in general. State laws were passed throughout the nation compelling children to attend school, first through the early grades, and eventually through high school. There was considerable debate in

the nation as individual states considered these laws, with concern that government should not so intrude into family decisions. The federal government, in regard to Indians on reservations, led most of the nation in this movement toward compulsory education.

If we accept Coleman's (1993) estimates of compulsion, we should also consider the 50 percent of the "autobiographers" who reported that they were sent to schools by their families and by tribal members. Some of this may also represent more subtle compulsion efforts. Recruiters for the schools visited the reservations in the spring and summer, signing up students for the coming year. Competition among recruiters grew as the number of schools increased, and it is likely that recruitment also involved promises and threats of varying degree.

Many of the autobiographers' statements, however, indicate that the decision was made by the families because the family thought such schooling would be good for the children, equipping them better for modern life (providing vocational skills, etc.). Also, reservation life was often harsh, with poverty and disease common in many places; many families undoubtedly saw better chances for their children at the expenses-paid off-reservation boarding school, as well as seeing some relief of the families' and the tribes' support burdens.

Life on reservations in the late 1800s and early 1900s was not always severe; some tribal communities were better off than others, and even where life was demanding, there were friends, family and activities to be enjoyed. Similarly, at off-reservation boarding schools, friendships developed and activities could be enjoyable. School life could also be harsh. Students' daily schedules were highly regulated, and work in the vocational classes could be long and hard. Especially in the early years (before 1900), the military style discipline was strict, with corporeal punishment and confinement for infractions. An early Haskell teacher roughly handled a student in class, accidentally breaking his leg. It should be noted that the teacher was fired for this incident. (It should also be noted that this teacher, H.B. Peairs, was later rehired, then became Superintendent at Haskell, and eventually was appointed Commissioner of the Office of Indian Affairs.) Haskell established a "jail" for offenders, especially for those caught trying to run away. Confinement to quarters or to jail was severe, and often included food restrictions—even to just bread and water. Coleman's (1993:150-151) review of autobiographers' statements led him to conclude that, overall, corporeal punishment at the schools, while harsh by today's standards, was not out of kilter with those of the time, and perhaps was more moderate.

Stories of rebellion and resistance by students were common, as documented in Coleman's autobiographical statements and by letters researched by Child (1998). Students refused to participate or do the work required; if punishment failed to encourage the students, they would eventually be sent home. Students and their parents would complain of conditions, treatment, food, and other matters, as documented in letters reviewed by Child (1998). These letters, most from parents, were written to the schools and to other government officials.

Runaways occurred each year at the boarding schools; a number of reasons were documented for runaways—students often did not like the school conditions generally, or they

reported a specific incident or pattern of humiliation. Most commonly, the students were homesick. Runaways most often tried to make their way home, but they also went to visit friends in other tribes. Sometimes they went to nearby (or even distant) cities, obtaining jobs with their newly-learned vocational skills (Child 1998:87ff). Particular children were watched carefully as potential runaways (or repeat offenders); warnings were given by school officials to the public, and especially to the railroads, to watch for and report runaways—and to hold them if possible while contacting the school. Parents often notified the schools that their children were considering running away and asked the school to watch them and keep them from leaving school, especially in the winter months when travel could be dangerous for runaways.

Child (1998:93-94) reports an overt example of rebellion. In 1919, students at Haskell conspired and organized a general revolt, actually taking over the campus for a short while (an afternoon and night). It is uncertain what the issues involved in this revolt were—perhaps general dissatisfaction and rebellion. Four boys and five girls were expelled after the authorities regained control.

Suicide by students was very rare, although it did occur. Coleman (1993:164) reports that his autobiographers knew of suicide stories, but none of them (102 individuals) knew personally anyone who committed suicide.

Most of Coleman's autobiographers enjoyed the off-reservation boarding school experience. Most returned to their tribes, although some moved to cities nearby or to their newly-allotted land. Many became leaders in their tribes and communities, supporting their schools by encouraging others to attend (see also Child 1998:98-100).

Adams (1995:273ff) and Coleman (1993) note that while it was true that most students enjoyed their boarding school experience, there were often many conflicts between students and their families after completing education and returning home. Sometimes the returning students looked down on their families and traditional tribal members; sometimes the students, under peer pressure or as relief from school teachings, returned to traditional tribal dress and habits. The government was concerned about Indian students reverting to traditional ways after completing schooling and returning to their communities. Schools carried out studies to determine the effectiveness of school on the later lives of graduates. The school studies concluded that, overall, the educational program was effective.

Over time, and especially after 1900, the influence of school graduates grew in their communities. The widespread and general tribal support of the schools, and even pride in them, was demonstrated in the Great Powwow held at Haskell in 1926, and in other scheduled activities and parent-child visits such as annual homecoming events at fall football games, gatherings at the beginning of the school year, and graduation ceremonies. The hardships of the period 1880-1900, when travel and communication between tribal communities and the boarding schools was especially difficult, were ameliorated somewhat in the twentieth century.

## **Twentieth Century Evolution and Reform of the Program**

Part of the amelioration in the strictness and hardships of the off-reservation school program was due to its criticism by a new wave of reformers after 1900. Some of these new reformers saw the large amounts of money being spent as ineffective in acculturating the Indians; these critics pointed to the continuing problems of poverty and disease on reservations and the fact that many of the students returned to reservations and continued to receive government rations. For many of these critics, the solution was rapid destruction of the reservation system and tribal governments, which would force assimilation of individual Indians and their communities.

Other new reformers (of a more liberal bent) saw the program as too harsh in its implementation (the strict military style and discipline) and too cruel in taking children from their home and families (Adams 1995). The Office of Indian affairs adapted to this criticism in stages from 1900 through 1930 by de-emphasizing boarding schools and increasing the number of day schools on the reservations. Strict regimentation at schools were relaxed to some degree, and compulsion to attend boarding schools was more strongly frowned upon. The federal government also began to encourage states and school districts to accept Indian students into public schools by paying them a per capita fee. This worked relatively well for areas of the country where Indians lived close to white communities.

In the 1920s, as criticism of the government's overall Indian program, especially the allotment policy and the education system, continued to mount, a study of the "Indian problem" was commissioned (Szasz 1974; Adams 1995). Its report, known as the Meriam Report, was released in 1928; the report's section on education condemned the conditions at many of the Indian schools, particularly the off-reservation boarding schools. Severely criticized were the inadequate diets and health facilities, the still strict regulation of student life, and the use of student (child) labor at the school in the guise of vocational training. Of even greater significance was its criticism of the basic curriculum of all Indian schools as emphasizing destruction of Indian culture. The report recommended involving Indian cultures in education, using them to support history, science, art, and other topics. This recommendation was in line with developing education theories in the early 1900s, and it eventually led to a major shift in curricula throughout the Indian school system. Also of importance was the Meriam Report's recommendations that more Indians be involved in administration of government Indian programs (including education), and that pay be increased to national standards for these positions.

In general response to the Meriam Report, and after the election of Franklin Roosevelt and his appointment of John Collier as Superintendent of Indian Affairs, the allotment program was halted (1934), more funding was allocated for Indian health services, and the boarding school system was greatly de-emphasized over the next two decades. Haskell was scheduled for closing in 1933, but this order was rescinded later in the year after appeals from the Lawrence

and Kansas community, and especially from Haskell alumni and tribes. Collier (1934) appointed Henry Roe Cloud, a well known educator, to be the first Indian superintendent at Haskell, reinvigorating the school as part of Roosevelt's "Indian New Deal" program (Ames 1936). Haskell evolved from essentially a high school to a college from the 1930s to the 1970s, and is today the only all-Indian university in the nation.

Throughout its history, Haskell, as well as the other off-reservation boarding schools, brought together Indians from all over the nation. Both children and parents met and formed friendships with individuals from other tribes throughout the United States. The curriculum and their general treatment from 1884 forward emphasized the fact that they were Indians, placing little distinction on their tribal identification. It can be argued that the Pan-Indian political movement began in large part at Haskell and the other off-reservation boarding schools (McBeth 1983).

### **The Haskell Campus Today**

The Haskell campus is today a mixture of old and new buildings, as well as old and new landscape elements. The National Park Service visited the campus in 1986 to establish boundaries for the 1961 National Historic Landmark listing of the campus. The NPS noted (see Appendix A) that many of the buildings recorded in 1961 had been lost; they listed 11 buildings and the Haskell Cemetery as now constituting the NHL listing, but declined to draw district boundaries because of the new construction on the campus. We revisit that decision here and consider two new data sets: (1) the significant new historical information published showing Haskell's major national importance, and (2) landscape elements on the main campus.

There have been several new historical analyses of the American Indian education program in the last 15 years (see bibliography and the discussion above) showing Haskell's great importance to highly significant historical movements and events. Although the NPS was aware of Haskell's national historical significance (see Appendix A), much additional context information has been developed since 1986 from archival research, informant interviews, and new analyses of published accounts and documents. This additional information provides a new perspective in considering Haskell's importance as an historic place. In short, Haskell has very high historical significance, and that significance is tied to the entire campus as an historic place as a result of the broad educational mission of the school, not just to the historic buildings remaining. We believe this great importance as an historical place should cause us to reconsider carefully the historic and non-historic elements on the modern campus and their impact on defining a district.

Landscape elements on the campus do not appear to have been considered in detail in 1986. Several major landscape elements are important here: the quadrangle area of the main

campus, the space between the quadrangle area and the Haskell Stadium (Figure 18—building 8), the open area northeast of the Stadium, and open lands on the east, south, and west margins of the campus. These open lands on the east, south, and west margins of the campus represent the orchards, vegetable gardens, stock pens, and crop lands of the former Haskell Farm. These lands are no longer used for stock or agriculture (although wetland and other biology study conducted on the south campus area could be considered as an evolved continuation of agricultural use). The recreation, gathering (powwow), and spiritual uses of these lands continue—for individual play or meditation, small group activities, and large annual events. We believe these open area landscape elements provide a strong continuation for consideration of the modern campus as an historic district. The location of these areas also assists in defining the boundaries of such a district.

It should be noted that the Kansas State Historic Preservation Officer, responding to a request from the Kansas City District, Corps of Engineers (regarding a Federal Highway Administration determination), previously concurred that the entire modern Haskell campus was eligible as a district (see Appendix B). The status of that determination is uncertain, as little documentation exists for the basis of the determination. Our consideration here does not rely on that previous determination.

### **Land Acquisition History**

The earliest buildings for Haskell Institute were located in the northeastern portion of the present campus. The Federal government began acquiring land for Haskell Institute in 1883, with the purchase of 280 acres from Oscar and Mary Leonard (Douglas County Deed Book [DCDB] 43:206). This land was described as the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of Section 7, the west half of the southeast quarter of Section 7, and the northeast quarter of Section 18. The first buildings, constructed in 1884, were located in the recently purchased lands in Section 7, where much of the present campus buildings are present today .

The next acquisition was in 1887, when the Federal government purchased 200 acres from James and Adaline Alderman (DCDB 45:109). This land was described as the southwest quarter of Section 7, and the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of Section 7. This land, then, lay immediately west of the original campus purchase, and was used for expansion of the original campus buildings and for agricultural purposes.

Three years later, in 1890, Oscar and Mary Leonard sold to the Federal government 153 acres which constituted the fractional northwest quarter of Section 18 (DCDB 52:535). The remaining lands of Section 18, a portion of what is now the Baker University Wetlands, were acquired in 1902 in two separate purchases (DCDB 71:79; DCDB 72:316). The Armstrong tract, acquired in 1902, was the last major addition to the Haskell Farm; Dr. Roger Boyd (Personal Communication, 2001) believes that this relatively high farmland was retained by Armstrong through the late 1800s because of its better drainage and agricultural productivity.

## **Building/Landscape Arrangement and Styles**

It is clear from this property history overview that the complete Haskell Institute campus, including lands for buildings and for agricultural fields, was intact by 1902. It is also certain that the present main quadrangle occupies the space where the campus was originally planned. What is less clear, however, is whether there was an original plan to the campus, and who designed and built the buildings. From the buildings that remain, and in the absence of nineteenth century maps or photographs of the campus, no formal plan or arrangement of the buildings can be discerned. Instead, the arrangement of the Haskell Institute/Haskell Indian Nations University campus can be seen approximately as a series of concentric half-circles with their open ends pointing north. Each of these circles contains buildings which were built at various times between 1898 and the 1990s.

The innermost half-circle is an informally arranged quadrangle area in the northern portion of the campus. The eastern edge of the quadrangle is formed by four buildings which are arranged in a single row running north and south. From the north, this line comprises the Auditorium (1933), Hiawatha Hall (1898), Tecumseh Hall (1915), and Sequoyah Hall (1961). The southwestern edge of the quadrangle is formed by Curtis Hall, which was originally constructed in 1902 but which was replaced by a modern version in the same place after 1975. The western edge of the main quadrangle is formed by Tommaney Hall (post-1975), Stidham Union (1965), and Pushmataha Hall (1930). The northern edge of the main quadrangle is open, and looks out toward Osceola-Keokuk Hall (1962, renovated c. 1995) and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. Appendix C presents a map of these buildings, along with descriptions and photographs.

A second semi-circle surrounds the main quadrangle. Moving clockwise from the northeast corner, this includes the Haskell Stadium and Arch complex (1926), the Coffin Sports Complex (c. 1995), Navarre Hall (1972), Jim Thorpe Hall (1958), the Dairy Barn/Warehouse (1907/1929), Ross Hall (1972), Pontiac Hall (1934), Powhatan Hall (1932), Roe Cloud Hall (c. 1995), Blue Eagle Hall (1957), Kiva Hall (1900), Minoka Hall (1957), Pocahontas Hall (1931), and Winona Hall (1962, renovated c. 1995).

Farther outward is open land that continues to be used for a variety of purposes. In the early twentieth century this land served primarily agricultural purposes associated with Haskell Institute. Barns for various types of animals lay where the Coffin Sports Complex and Navarre Hall now stand, while land south and west of the main campus were taken up primarily in planted fields and orchards. These lands are now used as Pow Wow grounds on the west, recreation lands in the southwest, and managed wetlands in the southeast, with a Medicine Wheel directly south of the campus.

This conceptualization of space at Haskell, however, is approximate and does not appear to be part of a historical design. Rather than an original design which has been corrupted by subsequent unplanned accretions, the present Haskell campus is the product of an organic

process of growth, with new buildings added as needed and older ones razed when they have outlived their purposes (some destroyed by fire), all without regard to a formal plan. The style, plan, materials, and massing of the buildings, moreover, shows little consistency over time. The earliest buildings which survive, Hiawatha Hall (1898) and Tecumseh Hall (1915), are two story buildings, massive in proportions and generally Romanesque in style, and constructed of rough-cut limestone blocks. As was fitting for institutional buildings, these buildings were all two stories in height. The Haskell Stadium and Arch complex, built in 1926, is strongly classical in design and was constructed of concrete.

The buildings at Haskell began to use yellow brick for their exterior surfaces from the 1920s, and represented the styles which were popular at the time and which were suitable for their intended purposes. Pushmataha Hall (1920), for example, is a small building which originally had Arts and Crafts details, particularly in the windows. The Auditorium (1933) has strong Art Deco influences, which is appropriate for an institutional building. Pocahontas Hall (1931), meanwhile, which was built as a dormitory, was designed in the Colonial Revival style, which was appropriate for a domestic building.

The use of yellow brick continued in the late 1950s, when a new phase of construction at Haskell was inaugurated. Blue Eagle Hall and Minoka Hall were completed in 1957, in time for Haskell's 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary. While the material remained the same, the styles and the proportions changed dramatically. Both are one story buildings that lie close to ground, and show influences of the Prairie Style with their flat roofs and wide overhanging eaves along the sides, supported by projecting 1 x 8 rafter tails. Both Winona and Osceola-Keokuk Halls, which were built in 1962, continued to use yellow brick. These two story buildings were originally designed in a spare style influenced by the International Style, though a new and more colorful surface treatment was added to these buildings in the mid 1990s.

The Haskell campus shows little consistency in either architectural or landscape design. The significance of Haskell as an overall landscape, therefore, does not rest with the design of its buildings and individual landscape elements, or with the integrity of its original plan. Instead, its significance lies with its integration of academic, industrial, and agricultural training. As described in the Haskell and contextual history summaries in previous sections, this approach to integrated training was vital to the Federal government's approach to Native American education, and bore a clear relation to the approach to African American education after the Civil War at such schools as Hampton Institute in Virginia, Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, and the Penn School in South Carolina. While many other Native American off-reservation boarding schools sent their students out to neighboring farmers for primarily agricultural training, Haskell created an integrated campus which could accommodate all of the wide-ranging educational activities. The entire campus, therefore, including the buildings and the open land, contributed to the significant educational mission of Haskell Institute.

### **Consideration of Spiritual Values for the Modern Campus Area**

In conversations with Haskell students, faculty, and others, the Haskell campus or portions of it have been described as having spiritual values, aside from the historical importance of the campus. According to this view, the campus or parts of it are sacred to Indian students, alumni, and others associated with Haskell. This is difficult to evaluate here. The discussion in the sections above certainly indicate that individual Indians (especially alumni, students, and staff), as well as tribes throughout the nation, have a strong historical connection to Haskell. That connection, however, would appear to be primarily secular.

Secular activities dominated the Haskell campus historically, as they do today. These activities include working, eating, sleeping, class attendance, social gatherings, recreational and spectator sports, band practice, marching, and formal meetings and ceremonies. Christian services, especially at the Haskell Cemetery, were conducted historically, but these did not dominate or characterize general campus life. Similarly, secret (historically forbidden) religious gatherings were carried out by students throughout Haskell's history according to many accounts of former students, but these did not dominate or characterize general campus life. There are no known tribal or school designated areas dedicated historically to religious or spiritual activities (other than the modern Medicine Wheel and Sweat Lodge areas on the southern portion of the campus).

The Medicine Wheel (Figures 18, 20, 21) is a structural landscape element built in 1992 to provide a focus in gathering together tribal groups and the general community, and to provide a place to express the spiritual feelings of the Haskell Community (Herd 1994; Greiser 1995). Sweat Lodges (small, relatively temporary and portable structures) were first constructed on the south Haskell campus in the middle or late 1960s, in the area west of the more recent Medicine Wheel (Greiser 1995). While the Medicine Wheel and Sweat Lodges are significant to the Haskell community, they are not historic due to their recent construction. While they are thus not contributing elements of a potential historic district, their low profile presence does not alter the historic views and feelings of the south campus area.

Consideration of the Haskell campus as historically significant for its secular connections does not deny that there were (and are) areas of personal and small group meditation or spiritual seeking. The historic connection, for individual Indians and for tribes, appears to be primarily secular; this does not minimize or make the historic connection less important. In fact, it recognizes that Indians as well as non-Indians throughout the nation can share the important historic feelings and connections of Haskell to the country's past.

## **Recommendations**

It is recommended here that the Haskell campus is eligible for the National Register as a district, and that the district boundaries should (at least) correspond with the current boundaries of the campus. This recommendation is based on National Register Criterion A, with a period of significance of 1884 to 1940, and historic themes of Politics/Government, Social History,

Education, and Ethnic Heritage--Native American. We recommend that the events discussed in previous sections are nationally significant, and that the Haskell campus is very strongly associated with those events.

While there do exist on the Haskell campus a number of modern, non-historic buildings, these are not seen as destroying the integrity of the campus as an historic place. The National Register Bulletin *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (1997:44ff) defines integrity as the “ability of a property to convey its significance,” and describes seven aspects of integrity to consider: *location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association*. For a district to be eligible, the majority of the elements or space within the district must possess integrity, and the relationships among the proposed district’s components must be substantially unchanged since the period of significance.

We believe that the Haskell campus possesses most of the relevant aspects of integrity listed above. *Location* of the campus is of course unchanged since the period of significance (this aspect applies primarily to buildings or structures which can be moved). *Design* is the “combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.” Design issues for the Haskell campus are discussed above; spatial relationships among buildings and landscape elements, are substantially unchanged since the period of significance—although some individual elements have been removed and others added, both during and after the period of significance. For the proposed Haskell district, consideration of *setting* is similar to that of *design* for areas within the proposed district. The areas surrounding the proposed district, including residential/commercial development and agricultural fields, are generally similar in appearance and scale in comparison to the period of significance.

Integrity of *materials* usually refers to the physical elements of a building or structure. For the proposed Haskell campus district, buildings within the period of significance show an evolution in materials use (related also to style and building function), from early stone, to later concrete, and then to yellow brick. Buildings from the period of significance have not been altered in terms of materials (or general appearance—see Appendix C).

Landscape elements are also largely unchanged in their composition since the period of significance. Plantings are generally similar in the important quadrangle area of the central campus, and other areas of former open space continue to be open. Orchard areas generally on the west side of campus historically, however, are now primarily open fields (although some trees are present), and historically open fields on the south side of campus, while primarily still open (in grass), do have areas of trees (see Figures 18, 20, 21). Overall, we believe that the landscape elements are substantially similar to the period of significance in composition and appearance.

Integrity of *workmanship* would not seem to apply to the proposed district. *Association* and *feeling* aspects of integrity appear to us to be very strong for the proposed district. Visitors to the campus, while aware that Haskell is a modern university, can readily recognize its historic

character and nature; this recognition is deepened as the visitor learns more of the details and broad context of Haskell's history.

In considering integrity of proposed districts, the National Register Bulletin *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (1997:46) states that "the majority of the components that make up the district's historic character must possess integrity even if they are individually undistinguished," and that a proposed district "is not eligible if it contains so many alterations or new intrusions that it no longer conveys the sense of a historic environment." While there are a number of non-contributing buildings within the proposed district (see Appendix C), their size and location does not greatly diminish the conveyance of a sense of historic place for the campus. Especially when considering the number, location, and size/extent of the historical (contributing) landscape elements within the proposed district, the "majority" of the campus should be considered as contributing to the historical character of the proposed district.

"A basic integrity test for a property associated with an important event ... is whether a historical contemporary would recognize the property as it exists today" (National Register Bulletin *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* 1997:48). We believe that such a person would surely recognize the Haskell campus today, and we thus conclude that the campus has integrity for district consideration.

Following guidance from National Register Bulletin *Defining Boundaries for National Register Properties* (Seifert, et al. 1999), the district boundary recommendation considers the historical property lines of the campus, as well as the distribution of contributing buildings and the locations of significant landscape elements and views (see Figures 18 and 20; Appendix C). The landscape elements, in particular, are important to defining the district boundaries, as several of these landscape elements form the northeastern, eastern, southern, and western margins of the present campus. We next consider if this district should include the Baker Wetlands area.

### **The Baker Wetlands**

The Baker Wetlands area encompasses about 600 acres of flood plain just south of the Haskell campus and extending south to the Wakarusa River (see Figure 2). Formerly crop lands of the Haskell Farm, the area is today dominated by prairie and wetland grasses and managed by Baker University for research and educational purposes. Figures 22-27 show the general appearance of the Baker Wetlands and the adjacent south campus area today. Figure 20 provides an aerial view of a portion of this area.

The Baker Wetlands were closely associated with Haskell's history from its earliest days until 1934 when farming was terminated as a part of the vocational training at Haskell. It is well documented in accounts by former students that occasional use continued after that time for recreation and personal meditation (Wetlands Preservation Organization 1994; HINU Students

and Alumni 1996). Today, this use continues, and the area is also utilized by Haskell (along with Baker University) for formal research and education programs. There is little doubt that because of the Baker Wetlands' strong association with Haskell that it should be carefully considered as an addition to the Haskell campus historic district recommended in the section above.

Analysis here is focused on two major issues pertaining to the National Register eligibility of the Baker Wetlands. First is the question of integrity. Does the Baker Wetlands area today have sufficient integrity in relation to its historic appearance to be considered National Register eligible? A previous consideration of integrity issues (see Appendix B) resulted in a determination that the Baker Wetlands had lost its integrity as a farm landscape and thus was no longer eligible. We believe additional information concerning the integrity of the Baker Wetlands is now available, and that this decision should be reconsidered in light of the new data.

Second, there is a question of what should be the basis for National Register eligibility consideration. The Baker Wetlands could potentially be considered as a Traditional Cultural Property, a Rural Historic Landscape, or an historic district (independently or together with the Haskell main campus).

Some have asserted that the Baker Wetlands should be considered a Traditional Cultural Property because of its strong cultural and spiritual connections to individual Indians and/or to Indian nations. This line of reasoning involves consideration of the Baker Wetlands as a place for spiritual meditation and for performance of (once forbidden) sacred and ritual activities. Of major importance to consideration of the area as a TCP is the thought by many Haskell students and others that the Baker Wetlands have been "consecrated" by the systematic and widespread burial there of large numbers of Haskell students who died under suspicious circumstances

### **Integrity and Association Issues**

Integrity issues can often be quite subjective, and some leeway in their consideration is often given based on the historical significance of the property being reviewed. Haskell and the Haskell Farm, as discussed above, are of great, national historical importance. Because of the relatively unique history and appearance (historically and today) of the Haskell Farm as a landscape feature, however, there are few precedents, and integrity judgements are difficult. The discussion below focuses on what we consider to be the two major integrity issues, general appearance (views within and of the area), and the preservation of structures and features present during the Haskell Farm period.

What is now the Baker Wetlands were an integral part of the Haskell campus from the earliest years, as the Federal government acquired the various tracts that constitute the lower farm in 1883, 1890, and 1902. Indeed, the Baker Wetlands area was agricultural land prior to the establishment of Haskell, and portions of it were used for crop production from the earliest years.

There are no references in early reports that the bottom lands of the farm (now the Baker Wetlands) were not considered an integral part of the campus/farm complex.

Certainly, however, some portions of the bottom lands were not as productive as other parts, because of wet conditions. Even generally “wetter” areas could be utilized for some purposes however (pasturage), and marginal areas could probably be productively cropped in dryer years.

Haskell moved early to drain the wetter areas to provide more acreage for crops and pasture. The first superintendent reported in 1885 that the farm lands consisted of 80 cultivated acres and 200 acres of meadow and pasture of unbroken prairie (Marvin 1885). A detailed listing by Superintendent Grabowskii (1886) described 180 acres of “wet pasture” out of 280 acres total. By 1889 there were over 100 acres in active cultivation, and there was a recommendation to drain wetter (hay/pasture) areas to increase their utility (Leonard 1889). Appropriations were made in 1902 to continue the draining operation (Haskell Institute 1959). Throughout the early years of Haskell, acres were added to the farm, both for cultivation and for the development of a dairy herd. By 1903, farm land had been increased to 1000 acres (Peairs 1903). Superintendent reports throughout the late 1800s and early 1900s show increasing crop and dairy (milk, butter) production (Marvin 1885; Grabowskii 1886; Leonard 1889; Meserve 1893; Swett 1894; Peairs 1899; Peairs 1901; Peairs 1903; Peairs 1906).

From the first year of Haskell, the farm lands were well tended and maintained, with daily work throughout the year. Cow herds were moved from area to area, with fenced pasturage and hay storage in barns; milking and herd tending was a continual, daily activity. Similarly, fields were drained, plowed, planted, and maintained through daily activity. Figures 8-16 show the overall general appearance of the Haskell Farm in this early period.

Agricultural activities continued to expand into the 1930s at Haskell, with increasing acreage under cultivation and in active pasture. In 1934, however, it was decided to cease agricultural education. Farm lands were leased to local farmers, who continued the agricultural activities on Haskell lands, with some areas farmed under lease into the early 1970s (Dr. Roger Boyd, Personal Communication, 2001).

Historically, the Haskell Farm was open land, often closely cropped (see Figures 8-17). Available historic photographs show fields in winter, during spring planting, or after fall harvest, and the views show wide vistas of clear land. Views today also show open land and wide vistas (Figures 22-27), although grass is high. A few trees are present today, primarily along remnant dikes and canals; these trees do not appear in historic photographs. After careful consideration, it is recommended here that these differences in appearance are relatively minor and do not constitute a significant loss of integrity. In fact, integrity loss may be even less than apparent in the historic and modern photographs; in the summer, Haskell Farm crops and hay/grass may have more closely approximately today’s appearance of the Baker Wetlands.

It should also be noted that there is little modern (structural) intrusion on the viewshed with and of the Baker Wetlands. There are two small, low profile equipment pods associated with underground pipelines through the area; there are no buildings or other large structures within or immediately adjacent, except for 31<sup>st</sup> Street, a paved, two lane county road on HINU property just north of the Baker Wetlands' northern boundary (Figures 20, 28). This road does provide significant traffic noise in the northern portion of the Baker Wetlands area. Similar two lane, paved roads form the eastern (Haskell Avenue) and western (Louisiana Street) boundaries for the Baker Wetlands and also introduce traffic noise in adjacent areas of the Baker Wetlands. These latter two roads have been improved from county/township unpaved roads existing in the late 1800s prior to Haskell's establishment (see Figure 4). When 31<sup>st</sup> Street was constructed in 1971, an active township road at 35<sup>th</sup> Street (east-west through the center of Baker Wetlands) was closed to public use.

During the historic period, especially during and after 1919, drainage structures were built and maintained in the Haskell Farm lands. These include dikes, canals, water control structures (dams with gates), underground drainage tiling, and surface "W" ditching. Weston and King (2001) in a recent reconnaissance of the Baker Wetlands identified significant remnants of these historical features still in place (Figure 28). Most prominent are an east-west levee and associated canal on the northern boundary of the Baker Wetlands, a north-south canal (now known as Mink Creek) draining to the Wakarusa River, and east and west side levees with shallow canals. The levees contain relict culverts, and associated with the canals and culverts are water control structures.

The Haskell Dump feature was also identified adjacent to the Wakarusa River (Figures 28, 29). Twentieth century debris (cans, bottles, and reinforced concrete fragments) is visible on the surface, in what appear to be wagon or truck loads. This area was an active dump (by the public) by at least the 1950s (Dr. Roger Boyd, Personal Communication, 2001); access by the public was stopped with the closing of 35<sup>th</sup> Street in 1971. It is unknown if this dump was actually established by Haskell; non-modern debris was not seen on the surface in the area (Weston and King 2001). Subsurface (archaeological) examination of the dump deposits could address this question.

The historic dikes, canals, and water control structures maintain today relatively good integrity. Figures 30-34 show views of these features as they appear today. Boyd (2001—see Appendix D) presents a summary of the current water control systems in place in the Baker Wetlands. According to Boyd (Personal Communication, 2001), the intact historical features of the Haskell Farm period include the features discussed above, the bridge over the north (east-west) levee and canal, the "W" ditches, the stop gates on the north-south canal (Mink Creek) at 35<sup>th</sup> Street. The extensive underground drainage tile piping system is still largely in place, although a small section was removed by Baker University to render it ineffective. In addition, an early but undated windmill with an associated cattle watering tank (concrete) remains on the ground near 31<sup>st</sup> Street.

The historic road system within the Baker Wetlands is still in place and in use. The dirt road at 35<sup>th</sup> Street still provides east-west access within the wetlands. Its original (1919) concrete bridge over the north-south canal (Mink Creek) is still in place, as is a smaller concrete bridge/culvert (now chained closed) at this road's juncture with Haskell Avenue on the east. The north-south road through the central part of the wetlands area is still in place, although it has been raised with additional fill placed on it. This road was the major access from the Haskell Farm to the northern campus area. The large concrete bridge on this road (dating from 1919) traversing the northern (east-west) canal and levee is still in place and in use.

The only section of the Baker Wetlands that was significantly altered is the far northwest corner near the intersection of 31<sup>st</sup> Street and Louisiana Street, where dikes/levees and the associated canal features were rebuilt to allow construction of 31<sup>st</sup> Street in 1971 (see Figure 28). The original low, west side levee was destroyed in 1971 and rebuilt (as a larger structure) slightly to the west to allow county construction of a large drainage ditch along Louisiana Street. Ponds were dug by Baker University in some areas (especially along the upper north-south road—compare Figures 35 and 36), and beavers have created large ponds in the northeastern portion of the wetlands area (Figures 26 and 36).

While the levees and canals have been improved and restored to manage the land for wetland purposes, these improvements have taken place within the original plan. Of equal importance with the remaining structures is the field patterns. “W” ditches create a distinctive landscape and are still present in a number of former field areas. These ditches, spaced at 20-30 feet, increased surface drainage of water, feeding it into the larger canals and ultimately the Wakarusa River. The “W” ditches resulted in striations evident from the air in the northeast, southeast, and southwest quadrats; these remain intact and clearly visible both on the ground and in aerial photographs (compare the earliest available air photo [from 1937, Figure 35], with a modern view [Figure 36]). The “W” ditches are most apparent in the 2001 air photo (Figure 36) as east-west lines in a large field in the southeast quadrat of the wetlands area. Dr. Roger Boyd (Personal Communication, 2001) dates the “W” ditches to the 1919 period, as these were a significant and integral element of the canal and levee systems constructed then—also, farmers leasing the lands after 1934 would not likely invest in installing “W” ditches.

Boyd (2001—see Appendix D) describes in detail the elements and workings of the 1919 drainage improvement system and how they have been modified by the Baker University program since 1968. It is important to note that several of the major structures, after modification by Baker University, are still in use today—but to keep water within the wetlands area rather than to remove it.

These features are certainly of sufficient integrity to allow detailed observation, recording, and study, and to allow cleaning/clearing for public interpretation if desired. It is recommended here that the trees now growing along the canals and dikes do not represent significant integrity loss for historical appreciation of these drainage structures.

In summary, it is recommended here that visual and structural integrity alterations from the historic Haskell Farm to today's Baker Wetlands are not major. The design, setting, feeling, and association aspects of integrity for this historically important area are still present, and visitors can readily recognize and appreciate the strong historic connection to the activities and landscape of the Haskell Farm.

As quoted above from the National Register Bulletin *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* 1997:48), a "basic integrity test for a property associated with an important event ... is whether a historical contemporary would recognize the property as it exists today". We believe that such a person would surely recognize today's Baker Wetlands as the Haskell Farm, and we thus conclude that the Baker Wetlands has integrity for district consideration.

### **Spiritual Issues and Traditional Cultural Property Consideration**

Consideration of spiritual issues in regard to the National Register significance of the Baker Wetlands should first involve a review of the assertion that there were a large number of Haskell students buried in the area and that their remains are present throughout the wetlands. A number of individuals and groups have asserted that, beginning early after the 1884 establishment of Haskell, Indian children were secretly buried in the Baker Wetlands. Deaths may have been from disease, suicide, mistreatment, or during attempts to run away, and burial may have been undertaken by fellow students, parents, or Haskell officials.

Many deaths of Haskell students occurred in the late 1800s and early 1900s and have been officially described as occurring from disease, especially from pneumonia, tuberculosis, and influenza, all common epidemic diseases in the United States during this time. The Haskell Cemetery contains 103 graves, most of which date to the period 1884-1903. As many as 400-500 other student deaths may have occurred—this number represents students once listed as attending but for whom no later documentation (e.g., of graduation, quitting school, or death) now can be found.

Official policy was to return bodies of students to their home for burial, except when communication with family was not possible or other circumstances did not permit shipping of the body. As stated in early Superintendent reports to the Secretary of the Interior, policy was for the Superintendent to send a telegram to the Indian Agent responsible for the student's home tribe stating that the student was seriously ill. The Indian Agent was to request information from the student's family so that if the student died, the Superintendent would have on hand the family's wishes concerning shipment of the body or, alternatively, local burial. Superintendents complained in their reports that Indian Agents were poor in their communication with the students' families, as well as back to the Superintendent. Although government funds were available for shipment of the body and burial, families may not have been told this by the Indian Agent, and responses may not have been as forthcoming as the Superintendents would like. An

instance was described in which later correspondence by families resulted in the Superintendent considering disinterment and shipping of remains after initial burial in the Haskell Cemetery (this later proved unnecessary).

In the late 1800s, communication was generally poor, especially to and within reservation lands, and it is not surprising that most interments were made into the Haskell Cemetery during this time. Communication and travel became more regular in the early 1900s. It is likely that this improvement accounts for the fact that, although deaths continued during this period, only a few students were buried in the Haskell Cemetery.

It should also be noted that, as discussed in sections above, Indian schools in the late 1800s operated in a general military/bureaucratic framework in which adherence to procedures was of great importance. Students' daily activities were highly regimented, and data were taken by teachers and school officials regarding students' behavior and performance. There were established procedures for the school officials to follow when students died, and it might be argued that not following these procedures would result in significant trouble for school officials.

Student deaths were an unfortunate reality for Haskell, but these deaths were foreseeable, and it was a regular function of the school officials to deal with student deaths. School officials, and the federal government in general, had tremendous power over Indians and students during this period, and there would seem to be little incentive to hide student deaths by secret burials, rather than to follow prescribed procedures.

Reports of Superintendents and early accounts of Haskell indicate that student deaths were treated seriously and with care. A cemetery was established during the first year of the school. Headstones were placed, and the cemetery was well tended. There were annual Memorial Day services carried out which involved faculty, staff, and students (Haskell Institute 1959). This type of attention and care to deaths of students argues against school officials participating in secret burials in the wetlands. It might be argued that school officials would be watchful for unusual activities (like secret burials) and would take immediate action to stop such actions if they became aware of it.

Given the intensive agricultural use of the Baker Wetlands, and its continuous expansion, it might be expected that, if burials had been placed in the wetlands, there would have been inadvertent finds of remains throughout the late 1800s and 1900s up until 1954. There are no reports of these finds, although similar inadvertent finds throughout the county are reported in newspaper accounts, sheriff and coroner reports, and funeral home records reviewed and compiled by Snedeger (1979) in a thorough two-volume description of Douglas County cemeteries, graveyards, and individual burial finds. A number of probable Indian burials are described by Snedeger as found by farmers and construction workers; none of these are within or near the Baker Wetlands. While there were certainly small areas here and there where secret

burials could have been placed, the overall setting of the Baker Wetlands does not appear conducive to systematic burial of students from Haskell.

There is an account that during pipeline construction in the early 1990s human skeletal material was found in the Baker Wetlands. According to the story, these remains were taken to the Department of Anthropology at the University of Kansas for identification and are kept in storage there. Dr. David Frayer, physical (forensic) anthropologist was interviewed regarding this account. Dr. Frayer was department chairman at that time and would have been the point of contact as well as the person to provide identification. Dr. Frayer has no remembrance of such an event, and there are no records or remains indicating this actually occurred (David Frayer, personal communication, 2001). Further, interviews with pipeline companies indicate no such discoveries (Kenneth Gambrill, personal communication, 2001). University of Kansas Museum of Anthropology collections of human remains, in preparation for repatriation under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, do not contain any remains discovered in the Baker Wetlands (Mary Adair [Museum director and NAGPRA program manager], personal communication, 2001).

How does one explain the gap in records regarding student—the several hundred “missing” students? It appears likely that these missing student represent runaways for whom the school never developed definitive data. Runaways were common at Haskell and other off-reservation boarding schools. The schools would make inquiries of the home reservation Indian agent, the families, and others, but often would not find an answer. Files would remain open on these students.

In summary, the lack of inadvertent finds of human remains in such an historically active area would indicate that numerous burials are not present in the area. Similarly, the setting of the Baker Wetlands from 1884 through 1954 would not appear to be conducive to systematic burial of students. The detailed policies and procedures of Haskell, within the overall context of disease and death patterns at the time, would argue against systematic burial of students in the Baker Wetlands. Finally, other reasons may account for the students thought to be missing from the Haskell documentation.

More intensive research into Haskell records and other sources would likely provide additional support for these arguments, although it should be noted that this type of research could not prove that isolated burials do not exist within the wetlands area. Attempts to obtain credible, specific information regarding burials were largely unsuccessful (see also Connolly 2001). One credible (and confidential) informant did relate that he/she had personally seen at least one burial and was aware of one or two others. These were in a location near the Haskell Dump (adjacent to the Wakarusa River) or nearby in an unfarmed area within a river meander loop, in a grove of trees. This knowledgeable individual also stated that she/he did not have information indicating widespread, numerous burials.

In addition to asserting the existence of widespread burials in the Baker Wetlands, a number of individuals have reported (for themselves and others) that the wetlands area has served as a place of spiritual seeking, of meditation, and of performance of religious ceremonies forbidden historically at Haskell. There is no reason to doubt these accounts. They probably occurred over a wide area of the old Haskell campus, as they do today at Haskell and at other similar public or publicly accessible areas. While these spiritual associations are certainly important to specific individuals, they do not appear to characterize or define the historical importance of the Baker Wetlands/Haskell Farm. The Haskell Farm is of great historical significance because of the secular activities that took place there as part of the farm's integral association with the overall mission of the school. These include all types of daily farm work by thousands of students over the history of the school. Certainly, the farm lands had multiple work, recreation, gathering, camping, and meditation uses during this history. The National Register significance of the Baker Wetlands involves consideration of all these uses. The role of the Haskell Farm in the history of Haskell, and its integral importance to Haskell as an historic place, however, appear to be primarily secular. After considering in detail the guidance presented by Parker and King (1998) in National Register Bulletin *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, it is recommended here that the Baker Wetlands do not have as primary the long standing, continuing, cultural associations characteristic of, and defining for, a Traditional Cultural Property as a National Register property type.

### **Rural Historic Landscape Consideration**

The Baker Wetlands could be considered utilizing National Register Bulletin *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes* (1999). Rural Historic Landscapes are usually seen as representative of an area's or a region's development history (for example, in agriculture, forestry, or mining). This is certainly not the focus of the significance of the Baker Wetlands/Haskell Farm area. In fact, the Baker Wetlands area is not typical or representative of agricultural development in the region—it was quite distinctively different in the manner it was acquired, designed, managed, and improved over the years. The Baker Wetlands area gains its significance from its association with Haskell Institute's history and place in national events.

If the present-day Haskell campus had been so modified that it was not eligible as a National Register district, the Baker Wetlands could be appropriately considered as an independent Rural Historic Landscape, significant for its association with the national events in Haskell's history. We do not, however, believe this property type is appropriate for consideration of the Baker Wetlands in view of the presence of an adjacent (recommended) eligible Haskell campus area.

### **Recommendations**

As noted above, Haskell's significance lies with its integration of academic, industrial, and agricultural training. This approach to integrated training was essential to the Federal government's approach to Native American education. Under this approach to understanding Haskell's significance, the presence of the Baker Wetlands is vital to the National Register eligibility of the Haskell campus (as the campus is essential to eligibility of the Wetlands). The evidence gathered during the present survey indicates that the Baker Wetlands retain sufficient integrity to represent and provide an historic connection to the Haskell Farm and its period of significance 1884-1940. The Haskell Farm was an integral part of the school, its operation and its significance in Indian education and in political events/movements during that period. Its historical significance under Criterion A appears to be primarily secular in regard to National Register consideration, although individual views of its spiritual importance are not discounted or denied.

The present boundaries of the Baker Wetlands match well the historic extent and former property lines of the Haskell Farm. These boundaries also include the significant dike, canal, water control, and other features described above.

It is recommended here that the Baker Wetlands, representing the Haskell Farm, be included with the Haskell campus in a single National Register eligible historic district. Proposed boundaries for this district, termed the "Haskell Indian Nations University and Haskell Farm Historic District," are presented in Figure 37.

## **Conclusion**

Haskell is an historic place for individual Indians and for tribes throughout the nation, both in its own right—for its own history—and for its close association with a movement and the events of an important period of Indian and American history. In this latter sense especially, it is an historic place for all Americans, Indian and non-Indian alike. Haskell is an example, unique in many ways, of the good and the bad in American history. Haskell well represents the large policy questions in American history and the roles of individuals, interest groups, bureaucracies, and ethnic groups, as well as church and reform organizations, in the development of major national movements. Haskell also represents, and can connect today's citizens with, the impacts of these complex and sweeping policies on the individuals most affected, Indian students, their families, and their communities.

## Bibliography

Adams, David Wallace

- 1995 Education for Extinction, American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928. University Press of Kansas, Lawrence.

Ames, Rev. William P.

- 1936 Highlights of Haskell Institute. A Brief Sketch of the Half Century of Indian Education at Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas. Works Progress Administration manuscript on file at Haskell Indian Nations University Library, Lawrence, Kansas.

Beers, F. W.

- 1873 Atlas of Douglas County, Kansas. F. W. Beers & Co., New York, New York

Boyd, Roger L.

- 2001 Baker University Wetlands—History Since 1968. Unpublished manuscript (included here as Appendix D).

Carter, Kent

- 1999 The Dawes Commission and the Allotment of the Five Civilized Tribes, 1893-1914. Ancestry.com, Incorporated, Orem, Utah.

Carter Burgess

- 2001 Issues Identification Report, South Lawrence Trafficway. Prepared by Carter Burgess for the Kansas Department of Transportation.

Child, Brenda J.

- 1998 Boarding School Seasons, American Indian Families, 1900-1940. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

Collier, John

- 1934 Commissioner Collier's Address Given at the Fiftieth Annual Ceremonies of Haskell Institute, November 10-12. Printed in Indians at Work, A News Sheet for Indians and the Indian Service. Office of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C.

Coleman, Michael C.

- 1993 American Indian Children at School, 1850-1936. University Press of Mississippi, Jackson.

- Cooper, Michael L.  
1999 Indian School, Teaching the White Man's Way. Clarion Books, New York.
- Connolly, Michael L.  
2001 Analysis of Issues of Cultural Sensitivity Associated with Haskell Indian Nations University and the Baker Wetlands. Appendix B in Issues Identification Report, South Lawrence Trafficway. Prepared by Carter Burgess for the Kansas Department of Transportation.
- Dary, David  
1982 Lawrence, Douglas County, Kansas: An Informal History. Allen Books, Lawrence, Kansas.
- Elzea, Bill  
1978 Haskell Highlights. Haskell Indian Junior College. Lawrence, Kansas.
- Gagne, Frank, and Timothy Weston  
1999 Letter report describing cultural resource investigations along the proposed South Lawrence Trafficway alignment south of the Wakarusa River. Manuscript submitted to the Kansas Department of Transportation by the Kansas State Historical Society.
- Grabowskii, Arthur  
1886 U.S. Department of the Interior, Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, Washington, D.C.
- Granzer, Loretta Mary  
1937 Indian Education at Haskell Institute, 1884-1937. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of History, University of Nebraska, Lincoln. On File at Library, Haskell Indian Nations University.
- Greiser, T., Weber  
1995 South Lawrence Trafficway and Haskell Indian Nations University Traditional Cultural Practices and Properties. Historical Research Associates, Inc., Missoula, Montana
- Haskell Indian Nations University  
1994 Response to the 31<sup>st</sup> Street Alignment, South Lawrence Trafficway, Lawrence, Kansas.  
  
1996 Response to the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

Haskell Indian Nations University Students and Alumni

- 1996 Interconnectedness. Prepared by Students and Alumni of Haskell Indian Nations University in Response to the South Lawrence Trafficway.

Haskell Institute

1890-1940 The Indian Leader. Student Newspapers on file at Library, Haskell Indian Nations University, Lawrence, Kansas.

1927 The Haskell Annual for 1927. The Great Powwow and Stadium Dedication. On file, at Library, Haskell Indian Nations University, Lawrence, Kansas.

1959 Haskell Institute U.S.A 1884-1959. Writers' Sub-Committee of the 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration. Manuscript on file, Haskell Indian Nations University Library, Lawrence, Kansas.

Hawley, M. H.

1994 A Phase II Survey of a High Potential Area in the South Lawrence Trafficway, Douglas County, Kansas. Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.

Herd, Stan

1994 Crop Art and Other Earthworks. Henry N. Abrams, Inc., New York.

Lees, William B.

1986 Results of a Phase II Cultural Resources Survey of the Preliminary Location Study Corridor, South Lawrence Trafficway, Douglas County, Kansas. Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.

Letters on File

1993 Tribal Nation and Organization Letters and Resolutions on File Opposing the South Lawrence Trafficway on 31<sup>st</sup> Street. On File at the Federal Highway Administration Division Office, Topeka, Kansas.

Leonard, O. E.

1889 U.S. Department of the Interior, Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, Washington, D.C.

Lomawaima, K. Tsianina

1994 They Called It Prairie Light, The Story of Chilocco Indian School. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

Marvin, James

- 1885 U.S. Department of the Interior, Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, Washington, D.C.
- McBeth, Sally J.  
 1983 Ethnic Identity and the Boarding School Experience of West-Central Oklahoma American Indians. University Press of America. Lanham, Maryland.
- Meserve, Charles Francis  
 1893 U.S. Department of the Interior, Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, Washington, D.C.
- Ogle, George A.  
 1902 Standard Atlas of Douglas County, Kansas. Geo. A. Ogle & Co., Chicago, Illinois.  
 1921 Standard Atlas of Douglas County, Kansas. Geo. A. Ogle & Co., Chicago, Illinois.
- Parker, Patricia L., and Thomas F. King  
 1998 Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties. National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. [Originally published in 1990 as Bulletin 38]
- Peairs, H. B.  
 1899 U.S. Department of the Interior, Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, Washington, D.C.  
 1901 U.S. Department of the Interior, Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, Washington, D.C.  
 1903 U.S. Department of the Interior, Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, Washington, D.C.  
 1906 U.S. Department of the Interior, Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, Washington, D.C.
- Prucha, Francis Paul  
 1979 The Churches and the Indian Schools, 1888-1912. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.  
 1984 The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians. Two Volumes. University Press of Nebraska, Lincoln.
- Redmond, Louis, and Ben Rhodd

- 1995 Anthropological Assessment of Effects of the Proposed South Lawrence Trafficway Project on Haskell Indian Nations University Administered Lands, Lawrence, Kansas. United First Peoples' Anthropological Association and Haskell University Foundation, Lawrence, Kansas.
- Riney, Scott  
 1999 The Rapid City Indian School 1898-1933. The University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- Seifert, Donna J., and Barbara Little, Beth L. Savage, and John Sprinkle, Jr.  
 1999 National Register Bulletin Defining Boundaries for National Register Properties. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.
- Shanklin, Frank M.  
 1909 Plat Work and Survey of Douglas County, Kansas. Frank M. Shanklin, Topeka, Kansas.
- Snedeger, B. Jean  
 1979 Complete Tombstone Census of Douglas County Kansas. Volume II All Cemeteries and Burial Sites in Douglas County Excluding Oak Hill and Maple Grove in the City of Lawrence. Plus Histories, Maps, Photographs, Obituaries from Douglas County Newspapers-1861-1863, German Obituaries and Indian Burials, Names from Plat Maps and Written Records, Unmarked Graves. Bound Manuscript on File, Lawrence Public Library, Local History Room, Lawrence, Kansas. Compiled by Friends, Family, Volunteers, B. Jean Snedeger, Chairman.
- Swett, J. A.  
 1894 U.S. Department of the Interior, Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, Washington, D.C.
- Szasz, Margaret Connell  
 1974 Education and the American Indian, The Road to Self-Determination since 1928. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque. Third Edition, Revised 1999.
- U.S. Department of Transportation  
 2000 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, South Lawrence Trafficway, Douglas County, Kansas. Prepared by HNTB Engineers and Planners, Inc. for the Federal Highway Administration, the Kansas Department of Transportation, and Douglas County. On file at the Federal Highway Administration Division Office, Topeka, Kansas.
- Weston, Timothy

- 1993 Phase III Archaeological Investigations at Site 14DO317, South Lawrence Trafficway, Douglas County, Kansas. Kansas State Historical Society.
- 1995 Phase III Archaeological Testing at Sites 14DO322 and 14DO323, South Lawrence Trafficway, Douglas County, Kansas. Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.
- 2001 Phase II Investigations South of and Adjacent to the Wakarusa River Associated the the K-10 South Lawrence Trafficway, South of Lawrence in Northern Douglas County, Kansas. Kansas State Historical Society.

Weston, Timothy, and Marsha K. King

- 1995 Phase II Archaeological Survey of the Proposed 35<sup>th</sup> and 38<sup>th</sup> Street Alignments of the South Lawrence Trafficway, Douglas County, Kansas. Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.
- 2001 Surface Examination of the Haskell Dump Area and Water Control Structures within the Baker Wetlands South of Lawrence, Douglas County, Kansas [Draft Report]. Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.

Wetlands Preservation Committee

- 1996 Letter to Ms. Patty Henry, National Historical Landmark Survey, National Park Service. Wetlands Preservation Committee, Haskell Student Senate, Haskell Indian Nations University, Lawrence, Kansas.

Wetlands Preservation Organization

- 1994 Report. Haskell Indian Nations University, Lawrence, Kansas.

## Figures