

To: KevinCunningham, Tfulmer@mail.dot.state.de.us From: Ned Heite
<ned@heite.org>
Subject: a logical discontinuity
Cc: lwalling@state.de.us, jlmiller@delawareonline.com, dennisCoker Bcc:
X-Attachments:

It's really strange. At the same time the Clarks were accusing me of anti-Native bias, of all kinds of bad professional practice, the following were happening:

1. The archaeological societies of Virginia and Delaware presented me with their annual awards.
2. I was named an honorary member of the Lenape Indian tribe.
3. The Nanticoke-Lenni Lenape tribe of Bridgeton, New Jersey, invited me to speak at a symposium on the history of the postcontact Native communities, which will be attended by members of Lenape groups from all over North America.
4. Native American leaders asked me to consult on a controversy over an Indian site that is threatened with development in New Jersey.

If, indeed, I am an Indian-hater who believes that the only good Indian is a dead Indian, what are these people thinking? They should be ashamed.

Is it possible that my "dead Indian" statement was ripped out of context and distorted, for the sole purpose of discrediting me?

Is it likewise possible that somebody, possibly the same somebody, took some of my other innocent comments and distorted them, for Jay Custer to use in his letter to the state?

Is it possible that our report is in fact an honest recounting of the history of a community I have been studying for nearly twenty years? If so, does that mean that someone is terrified that the truth will be known?

The people of Delaware, and especially the Native American people, deserve the right to read and review for themselves the content of the report. As for the content of my soul, they have plenty of evidence of that, and they (with two exceptions) appear to be satisfied.

I have no objection to a consultant reviewing the report. Better yet, hire a consultant and arrange a public symposium, with all sides represented. Make it an all-day celebration of Native American history and heritage. I will gladly participate. But make the report available first.

It is inconsistent with the First Amendment, fairness, and the state sunshine law, to make the report unavailable to interested citizens, many of whom have expressed a willingness to pay for it. Moreover, good practice dictates that an archaeological report should be placed in the public forum for debate. The archaeological community cannot

evaluate the report until they have had a chance to read and openly discuss it. The recent move to suppress the report flies in the face of this accepted professional review practice.

Back-room maneuvering and suppression is bad for state government, DelDOT, and the Nanticoke people. The report is an honest, straightforward contribution to the culture history of this state, and it should not be suppressed just because two people don't like it.

Hire your consultant, but release the report first. Let's have open discussion.