

APPENDIX A

DELANEY CUMMINGS WORKSHOP 1 RESPONSE

Dear Owner of the Contraband Key:

Thank you very much letting me, my classmates, and my professors examine your key at the National Museum of American History on Wednesday. Your key was one of many objects we examined, but it stood out to me amongst all of the other artifacts. I appreciate your key because it probably has an interesting story behind it. I can imagine that since you were in a hospital for people who identify as neurodiverse, most people probably did not encourage or welcome you to tell your personal story. I would love to hear your story though because the stories of those who were always told to be quiet are in my opinion the most important stories to be told.

I have a few questions for you. Do you mind answering them? Please understand that I am asking these questions to become more educated and to learn more about you and your key, and never to judge you or make fun. Was this key for your hospital room, or another room in the hospital? Did you decorate the key because you wanted to hide what it really meant, or did you decorate it for another reason? If so, what was the reason? How long did you live in the hospital? Can I ask why you were sent there, and who exactly sent you there? What were the conditions like? Did you ever leave the hospital? Did you get to take this key with you when you left? What did you do with your key after you were in the hospital? Where did you go after the hospital? Do you think hospitals like the one you stayed in will improve in the future? I appreciate the time you take to answer my questions.

Sincerely,

Delaney

APPENDIX B

ANTHROPOLOGY SAMPLING REVIEW COMMITTEE POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

Updated June 1, 2018

ADDITIONAL PROCEDURES FOR DNA/RNA SAMPLING REQUESTS

Unless otherwise specified by the Sampling Review Committee, all researchers requesting to sample objects to analyze nucleic acids (DNA, RNA, epigenetic data, etc.) must adhere to the following standard procedures for data availability. If compliance with these procedures is problematic, researchers must provide detailed justification for special data handling with supporting information as appropriate, and should provide an alternative strategy for data management and long-term curation in the Data Management Plan (see below).

1. All raw data from high-throughput sequencing experiments must be deposited to the NCBI Sequence Read Archive (SRA) or EBI European Nucleotide Archive (ENA). Uploaded files must be complete raw reads: fastq files or equivalent un-modified base call files from sequencing platforms. Default adapter trimming during base calling (or platform-specific equivalent) is the only allowable modification to uploaded reads. We encourage release of any other data types such as read alignments and variant call summaries that would be useful to researchers, but complete raw reads must be made available in all cases. Read metadata should include SI accession numbers, and researchers should provide nucleotide archive accession details to collections staff to be linked to the SI anthropology collections database. It is advised to consult with collections staff at the time of data archiving.
2. Sanger-sequenced fragments must be deposited in GenBank.
3. Data deposition should happen at the time of publication, including to preprint servers. However, data must be released within 3 years after the sampling date regardless of publication status. Data can be restricted under Ft. Lauderdale and Toronto Agreement guidelines to reserve the first right to publish for an additional 1 year. Extensions to these deadlines may be requested from the Sampling Review Committee but are not guaranteed, and researchers should present a clear plan for timely data analysis and release in the Data Management Plan (see below). The requirement to report results and progress to the Department of Anthropology within 1 year after sampling also applies to DNA/RNA requests, in addition to the 3 year data deposition requirement.
4. If SI Anthropology collections are analyzed in publications along with non-SI samples, modern or ancient, ALL of them are subject to the data release requirements in 1 and 2 above (the non-SI samples are not under the 3-year limit). This is necessary for full replicability of studies for which SI collections were destructively sampled.
5. Raw data must be backed up at all times until stable archiving on SRA or ENA to ensure that data generated from destructive sampling are safe from accidental loss. Backup should be either on a stable commercial platform (e.g. Amazon AWS, Dropbox, Google Cloud Storage) or on a physical backup in a separate location from primary data storage. For example, a redundant server in the same room is not sufficient, but a second-site server or external hard drive that is regularly checked for data integrity are sufficient. Institutional IT and high-performance computing departments can usually help provide options for data backup if needed.
6. In addition to the sampling request form and project proposal, requestors must submit a brief (<300 word) data management plan outlining the specific strategy and timeline of data collection, backup, and release. Please include the intended data repository as well as the intended data backup mechanism including type (commercial cloud storage or physical redundant storage).
7. As with all sampling requests, the Sampling Review Committee will consider nucleic acid sampling requests strictly in context of ethical requirements. These may include consultation with and approval from descendant communities and institutional review boards, when applicable. Researchers should provide supporting documents as appropriate.

APPENDIX C

DAVID GASSET'S EXCERPTS FROM FINAL PAPER

I was flipping through a folder in the National Anthropological Archives when I came upon two photographs of an Osage young man, Charles McDougan, who is part of a series of anthropometric photographs taken for racial science. Frank Mic̣ka created them to record measurements and details of his subjects to help in the creation of plaster busts of their heads and shoulders for Curator, Aleš Hrdlička, of the United States National Museum (USNM) to exhibit at the Panama-California Exposition. All of these photographs are exactly posed, one with the subject straight-on and one in profile, devoid of unnecessary movement or even expression. They were meant to be purely physical, objective descriptions of their subjects, mimetic representations of bodies.

In one photograph, McDougan stares directly at me, while in the other he faces sideways, but in either one, the ghost of a smile haunts his face—a hint of tightness in his right cheek and the merest narrowing of twinkling eyes. It is an arresting look given the folder in which it resides. This enigmatic portrait of Charles McDougan's smile, however, is something else. It is a unique and individual act, a performance of his personality that continues to leave traces to his identity outside of a measured body and acts as a potential symbol of his agency in a colonial situation. It is a smile that I, as a Biracial man, can recognize.

Growing up Biracial, I have become accustomed to ascribing to multiple and even hybrid identities as I shift between various contexts and scenarios. More off-putting, however, are these moments when my identity is chosen for me. Suddenly, my identity is frozen around some trait that someone else has decided is all-important and all-encompassing, almost always my "Black" traits chosen by the largely White circles I've grown up in. It is always uncomfortable and always disempowering, as I rarely feel I have the social capital to refuse or perhaps that my refusal would eliminate me from that group. So, I play along. That smile, however, has become my way of pushing back, of positioning myself as the only one who truly knows everyone's hidden motivations or biases and so regaining some of my social power, my agency. Through that smile I negotiate, as best as I can, my own agency in the fraught realm of racial power relations.

Of course, everything from our personal histories to the exact power relations involved, our races, our relationships to photography, and the myriad other changes that come from such a large gap in time and space differ. Some things, however, do resonate across them. Both Charles and I had our photographs taken in situations of unequal power relations and both of us performed some small act that although seemingly irrelevant departs from the norm of that situation; the rest of the subjects in the anthropometric series maintain the expressionless pose

As an act of genre subversion, then, we can think of Charles' smile as part of his bodypolitics. His smile is only one example of a vast variety of bodily performances that enact his relationship with not just the physical but also social worlds around him. It directly negotiates

his experience of and response to the material, intellectual, and emotional components of colonialism. In this way, Charles' smile functions as a decolonizing technology, helping him to negotiate the oppressive dynamics of a colonial system. Its power, however, comes not from the fact that it was a carefully thought-out mental construct but rather that it was a lived, sensory performance, an affective experience. This does not diminish its status as an act of agency, though, but rather enhances it. In line with body-politics, epistemic disobedience, and the logics of ghostly matters, we have to recognize these everyday slight actions as the significant components of the lives of colonial subjects and as such performances of their agency. Although hidden behind the grand, recorded gestures of either resistance or cooperation, these emotional and affective bodily cues are the true signs of the complex negotiations of an always complicated past social world.