

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Casino and Museum: Representing Mashantucket Pequot Identity. By John J. Bodinger de Uriarte.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8594r4g6>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 32(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Harvey, Sioiux

Publication Date

2008

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

to hoard anything,” that “people on the path to enlightenment need the reinforcement and encouragement that the experiences of others can give them” (194, 240, 215). He admits that “many of the big wheels of the Longhouse might get after me for telling too much,” but then he defiantly talks “taboo” (185, 187). As I grew more and more wary of turning pages, I came to three that stuck together fairly emphatically, which made it a challenge to separate them. Leading into this section had been Williams’s most hesitant disclaimer to date, so I decided not even to glance at those reluctant pages, nor will I reveal their page numbers here.

Williams’s own rationale for his loose lips (aside from his shrug that such behavior was only to be expected from sevens on the Enneagram) is simply to “trust” that “this book will hide like the Snakeroot flower” from the wrong people, so that they might “never come near” it (185). Somehow, this seems inadequate to me, but I do not even pretend to be big medicine. Perhaps Williams knew something that I do not.

Because the free spirit of the 1970s that feted Williams’s *Reservation* is pretty conclusively dead in academia these days, I do not think that *Big Medicine from Six Nations* will make the same splash as its predecessor. However, his family and friends, who very obviously loved him dearly, and his Native and New Age admirers will treasure this book.

Barbara Alice Mann
University of Toledo

Casino and Museum: Representing Mashantucket Pequot Identity. By John J. Bodinger de Uriarte. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2007. 241 pages. \$50.00 cloth.

The lives of the Mashantucket Pequot have received a great deal of attention in recent years due to the success of Foxwoods Casino. This tribe, under Richard Hayward’s leadership, excelled to a level beyond any gaming tribe in America in a very short period of time. Foxwoods Casino employs ten thousand people and has annual revenues of more than \$1 billion. The tribal members live in a gated community with an \$18 million golf course, and the driveways are filled with luxury cars. Each tribal member more than eighteen years of age receives an average income of \$100,000 a year. Tribal leaders receive an average income of \$1.5 million per year. In 1975, there were two people who lived in a trailer on the reservation. Today, with the success of the casino, eight hundred tribal members call the reservation their home (Sarah Kershaw, *The New York Times*, 22 June 2007).

With the financial power Foxwoods Casino brought to a newly gathered tribe came freedom and the challenge of how to express their sovereignty as a people. “Sovereignty is power and it goes by organization,” the Lummi tribe announced in 1998 at the Sovereignty Summit in San Francisco. Sovereignty gives tribes the right to choose how to proceed culturally and economically, which differs with each tribe’s history and culture. The older

Pequot tribal members grew up off-reservation in the dominant culture of America and accepted capitalism. The Mashantucket Pequot took advantage of the National Indian Gaming Act to gain financial self-sufficiency at an unprecedented level.

The tribe's success offered a unique opportunity to tell its story. It did so by building the Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Center (MPMRC). MPMRC was completed in 1998 and is part of a 4.7 million square feet tribal gaming complex, which includes restaurants, shops, and hotels. In his book, *Casino and Museum: Representing Mashantucket Pequot Identity*, John J. Bodinger de Uriarte examines the tribe's material and symbolic culture through two tribal institutions, MPMRC and Foxwoods Casino. He finds the institutions mutually supportive, despite having different strategies to achieve their goal of controlling the tribes' image, identity, and cultural agency. Bodinger de Uriarte uses photographs and essays to support his thesis.

Gaming has given tribes sovereignty and freedom to tell their own story, but why and how do they choose to exercise that right? In writing my dissertation on Indian self-determination from 1946 to 1996, I spoke to John Christman of the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay, located in San Diego County. He said that tribes' spiritual beliefs were to be lived by the believers and not to be explained to outsiders. However, my experience with the Mashantucket Pequot was completely different. They welcomed the opportunity to discuss their spiritual beliefs. When I asked Christman why that would be, he said, "They are new." Christman said the "academic" descriptions were inaccurate; they did not represent the tribe. As a result, his tribe decided to stop allowing scholars to "tell their story" and take that power back.

This is a different philosophy from another successful gaming tribe. Both tribes are economically self-sufficient—sovereign—but they emphasize different aspects of their sovereign power in how they reach out to the public. One tribe, the Viejas Band, holds their history close. There is no museum on the Viejas Reservation to do this job—the casino is where non-Indians experience their culture. They do not have the desire to tell their story to outsiders. The Mashantucket Pequot have invested tremendous sums to tell their story by building a museum. This would support Bodinger de Uriarte's claim that the Mashantucket Pequot continue to "develop this narrative of cultural community and belonging for a reinforced sense of community on the reservation as a counter to critiques of their cultural legitimacy." Tribes such as the Viejas do not have this need; thus no museum resides on their land.

De Uriarte argues that the National Museum of the American Indian in Washington in 2004 and, subsequently, museums such as MPMRC have drastically increased the profile of Indian people. For the first time Indian people have control of museum narratives that tell the story the way they see it. I agree with his statement that "the museum and casino together offer a prime site for understanding the revitalized formation of a national community and how public spaces of representation—both formal and vernacular—are mobilized to support the parameters of community as an inclusive and exclusive construct." He states this is a significant shift into the public terrain for Native people.

This is a positive book, influenced in part by the time the author spent working at the MPMRC as an intern, a grants proposal writer, and as a researcher, writer, and photographer for the museum's exhibition designers. De Uriarte nevertheless does point out areas of conflict and gives brief overviews of those arguments.

The book would have been stronger had de Uriarte broadened his scope to examine how other tribes present themselves and what that means. The public terrain is a key battlefield for articulating the tribal vision. However, he never defines the "public terrain," which can extend to tribal advertising, media reporting, and media coverage, not just the casino or the museum. The conclusion is that the museum and casino comprise part of that view but certainly not all of it.

However, he does make a strong enough argument to support his assertion that the success of Indian gaming provides a highly visible example of Native American survival and persistence. Very few tribes have succeeded like the Mashantucket Pequot. Indian gaming has brought success to tribes with the right set of circumstances, including location near a major population center, culture, leadership, the state they reside in, and timing. Success is due to both internal tribal factors and external public factors. The Mashantucket Pequot's success was due to the tribes' extraordinary leadership under Skip Hayward and the positive response the tribe received from the state of Connecticut. Effective tribal leadership causes ideas to gel faster, pushes the tribe forward at a comfortable rate, and keeps the tribe united in its efforts. Foxwoods Casino is ideally located for success as well. The casino is off a major highway with a large non-Native population nearby. The Mashantucket Pequot have the tribal, political, cultural, and economic support of those outside the reservation to ensure their success.

Bodinger de Uriarte demonstrates that MPMRC and Foxwoods Casino project the identity that the Mashantucket Pequot tribe wants. However, the tribe's power is being challenged from within and outside the reservation. Given that fact, does the museum provide balance to this cultural challenge? De Uriarte clearly describes how one tribe performs its "Indianness" to millions of visitors every year. It has taken back the power to represent itself. He is correct in his conclusion that the tribes tell a different history in a different kind of space. However, the impact of sudden wealth has had both positive and deeply negative consequences for the tribe. Despite their efforts to the contrary, the Mashantucket Pequot will have to continue to strive toward the goal of controlling their image, identity, and cultural agency to make that argument real in their own eyes as well as in the eyes of the public.

Sioux Harvey

www.LegacyHistory.com