AN AMERICAN INDIAN RENASCENCE?

NANCY OESTREICH LURIE

American Indian people constitute one of the smallest yet most durable minority groups in the United States.[1] Perhaps their astounding persistence as identifiable enclaves in the larger society rests in the fact that they are distinguished from all other North Americans in two important ways. Unlike all the rest of us, they do not have a tradition of immigration from another land, and they have been set apart from other Americans by a distinct legislative history.

It is true that many tribes[2] have experienced removal from one part of the country to another in the course of frontier expansion and others now occupy but small portions of their original territories. Furthermore, archeological evidence shows migrations and shifts of residence of culturally distinct Indian groups even in prehistoric times. However, their traditions are not "our" traditions derived from old dissatisfactions and flights from earlier homelands for religious, economic, social or political reasons. They did not choose to take on a new cultural and social identity, nor did they, as in the case of the American Negro, have the need forced upon them. Even the nineteenth century removal of certain tribes into western lands was totally unlike the transport of slaves from Africa who were brought as aggregates of individuals having little in common but their fate of captivity. Upon arrival, cargoes of slaves were shortly dispersed to different plantations over a wide region. During removals, Indian families, extended families, bands and tribes remained and were resettled more or less intact, retaining their familiar roles, and with them, the old mutually interdependent responsibilities and leadership.

Even where removals resulted in given tribes becoming split into geographically separated communities, such as the Eastern and Western Cherokee, and where policies of the government purposefully undercut traditional patterns of social organization, economics and religion, Indian communities retrenched with all or an effective segment of familiar personnel, among whom there was the shared knowledge of common custom and historical experience. Although cultural and linguistic variations distinguish tribe from tribe, all American Indian people are characterized by the fact that they were here when the rest of us arrived. They do not share with the rest of us either the historical rejection of earlier national loyal-

ties or expectation of building an improved social order in a new geographical and political setting. It can certainly be argued that Indian "tribes" no longer exist in terms of precise ethnological criteria such as local autonomy and primacy of kinship as an organizational principle. However, the fact of tribal origin of present day communities of Indians remains important in understanding the distinct responses of Indians to an increasingly industrialized and urbanized society in comparison to all other Americans whose origins rest in a peasant and farming tradition. The peasant or yeoman farmer looks to the urban elite as a model and well-spring of innovation for cultural change and feels himself partaking of the same tradition. Generally, Indians look to other Indians for models and successful experiments in selecting from and adapting to the larger tradition while effectively resisting absorption into it. These contrasts between Indians and all other Americans are worth reviewing since this is an issue on which confusion frequently arises, particularly in the present concern of the nation for civil rights.

For many years, of course, American Negroes were prevented from participating actively in the kind of life promoted by the dominant ideology of America, while the viability of their own traditional cultures was effectively extinguished. But the events of the last few years particularly are dramatic evidence that Negroes generally embrace and identify strongly with those concepts cherished as "American."

American Indian people are also involved in a kind of civil rights "movement," which in my opinion, like the Negro movement, has deep roots in the past. Ironically, while Indians enjoy far more general esteem and sympathy than do Negroes, many white Americans, including people active in aiding the Negro cause, either find the Indian movement difficult to comprehend or simply accept as valid. The Indian movement, for example, encounters obstacles in part because interested whites often equate it with the Negro movement and attempt to respond to it in the same fashion. The "fish-in" during the spring of 1964 in the state of Washington in which Marlon Brando, as a white sympathizer, took a well-publicized role, illustrates how confusing this can become. The Indians were not protesting abbrogations of general civil rights to fish in given areas; rather, they were demonstrating for special rights as Indians to fish irrespective of game laws.

Even where prejudice and discrimination of the kind protested by Negroes may be an issue, other matters are involved for Indians. In some of the Plains states particularly there are instances of rather standardized discriminatory practices directed against Indians, but well-dressed and well-educated Indians are able to find acceptance in local white communities in a way even Negro physicians, lawyers or teachers could not hope to achieve in the South or, for that matter, many parts of the North at the present time.

Those who begin to grasp what Indians are really after often feel uncertain or indignant about the moral, ethical and political connotations of the Indian definition of "rights" under the American form of government. Simply put, many Indians want to exercise the right to be Indians, maintaining and protecting their distinct communities and socio-racial identity, even by legal safe-guards if possible, while availing themselves of material and educational advantages enjoyed by the society at large. However, even those non-Indians able to tolerate this definition and sympathetic to it frequently find they cannot offer Indian people their whole-hearted support or sincere assistance because they consider such a goal unfortunately but ultimately unrealistic and impossible to achieve.

If analogies must be sought to understand the position of American Indians in comparison to other minorities, they can be found, up to a point, in those groups which migrated from Europe and settled as communities desiring to maintain the sense of unique identity which was threatened in their former homeland. Usually, however, in such non-Indian groups the integrating force is some distinctive religious commitment -- for example, the Amish, Hutterites, Doukhobors, Hassidic Jews and other sects. Today, many American Indian tribes are divided internally along religious lines, sometimes very bitterly, but as societies they share a sense of common origin and identity apart from differences of opinion in conversion to Christianity, adherence to religions combining Christian and native elements, or allegiance to old beliefs.

The second important consideration which sets Indians apart is that they are our most administered minority, the subjects of special federal legislation and national policies designed exclusively for them. Laws have been made regarding Oriental peoples, and until emancipation, of course, Negro slaves were also subjects of special legislation, but the last hundred years have seen the growing conflict between attempts by states to set up exclusionary and discriminatory legislation and counter-efforts by the federal government to assure protection of civil rights under the laws relating to all citizens. Only people of Japanese descent in the United States briefly shared comparable, though not identical, experiences with American Indians in confinement on special reserves.

Treatment of Indian tribes as "dependent sovereign nations" with whom we entered into treaties until the 1870's and over whose lands federal jurisdiction is still extended in various states is another basic peculiarity of the legal relationship of many Indian groups to the national government. However, even by the 1890's, Indian people were free to leave the reservations as they pleased. Indeed, they have been continually exhorted, encouraged and given material assistance to abandon their reservations and their sense of negotiating with, rather than participating in, the larger society. Moreover, there are many Indian groups on the eastern seaboard who have never been under the federal jurisdiction. Some, such as the Penobscot of

Maine and the Pamunkey of Virginia, but not all, have reservations administered by the local states, legacies of pre-Revolution Indian policies. Other groups, such as the Winnebago of Wisconsin, while always nominally under the federal jurisdiction, were not granted a reservation in their home area where they still live in scattered communities. In recent years they have worked assiduously to establish closer ties with the Indian Bureau, acquire federal trusteeship land and assert their interests as Indians vis a vis the federal government.

Indian people have long had the right to relinquish individual rights as Indians in order to become full citizens, and in 1924 the franchise and full citizenship were extended to Indians under the federal jurisdiction. Indian people pay income, excise and property taxes as required of other citizens; only those residing on federally protected lands do not pay land taxes. In view of the outraged reaction of Indians in the 1950's to the threat of termination of federal jurisdiction over reservations and to attempts to blur distinctions between Indians and other citizens by putting administration of law and order in the hands of local states, I am inclined to feel that the seemingly discriminatory legislation regarding Indians has not forced their distinctive outlook upon them. Instead, where such legislation applies, they have attempted to keep it in effect as a means of expressing and maintaining their outlook.

We are, of course, talking about those people who identify themselves as Indians. The fact is that untold numbers of individual Indians in the past and at present are assimilated into the larger population. In almost any chance gathering of Americans where the people represent more than two generations' residence in the United States one is likely to find a number of persons claiming Indian ancestry who, to all appearances, are "white." They seldom know their tribal affiliation in any detail, but will admit willingly and proudly to their Indian descent. We know that many Negro people "pass" into the dominant white society every year, but success depends upon keeping this fact a secret. The option of assimilation has always been far more open to Indian people than any other racially identified minority in the United States, and even in the "white Anglo-Saxon" tradition, it is more "aristocratic" to claim Pocahontas as an ancestor than a Mayflower or Revolutionary War forebear.[3]

Although remote Indian ancestry is a point of pride in Canada as in the United States, the over-all situation is somewhat different. There, ethnic origins have tended to define social rank as well. Canadians of British origin dominate; French Canadians are immediately below and in some areas compete successfully for first place; other Europeans may merge with the British or form regional groupings in a sort of third position. "Natives" who are members of distinct communities, including both Eskimos and Indians, occupy a sort of special position separate from social ranking. Between the natives and Europeans, particularly in the western

provinces and territories, there are communities of a stabilized Indian-white mixture designated Metis, which form a distinct and lower rank minority group of a type not found in the United States.[4]

In the United States, a person is an Indian or he is white; in either case his genealogy may be from less than 1/4 to 4/4 Indian. A Negro with Indian admixture is a Negro if he grew up in a predominantly Negro or any non-Indian community, although in a number of tribes a known but old Negro admixture is overlooked. A person may be a "legal" Indian, that is, enrolled in a tribe under Indian Bureau jurisdiction. Or, he may be an Indian simply because he accepts this identification on the basis of varying degrees of Indian ancestry and rearing in a community generally considered Indian, whether or not it is recognized by the Indian Bureau. There are some groups of equivocal ancestry largely along the eastern and southern seaboard such as the Lumbee and Haliwa of North Carolina and Houma of Louisiana where Indian identity carries little continuity to any definable tribal tradition, but is preferable to the alternative but less prestigious identity as Negro.

The Indian population of the United States, including people under the federal jurisdiction and self-identified Indians, is less than 750,000. If, however, all the people with any known or recognizable Indian ancestry were identified and considered as Indians as is often the case even with light-skinned American Negroes who are considered Negro although most of their associates are white, it has been variously estimated that we would have an "Indian" population of 5,000,000 to 10,000,000 people. By and large, the assimilated Indians are of 1/4 degree Indian ancestry or less while the people identified by themselves and others as Indian are of 1/4 degree or more of Indian ancestry. However, racial barriers are not an important factor in the way of assimilation into the larger society. If anything, racial considerations tend to operate more strongly against remaining Indian, since many tribes today exclude from their official membership rolls those individuals who are less than "one quarter blood Indian." It should also be pointed out that even fully qualified Indians are not obliged to be enrolled and are free to request that they be dropped from the tribal membership. It then becomes obvious, although exact statistics are lacking, that there are considerably more assimilated than identifiable Indians. Although for the most part people have been brought along the route to assimilation through intermarriages into the white population, some Indian communities, including many tribes under the jurisdiction of the Indian Bureau, have only a minority or virtually no members who are "4/4 Indian."

Whatever losses existing Indian communities may regularly sustain by assimilation, they are not sufficient to eliminate the communities. These have been increasing in population since the period 1900-1910. United States census figures, excluding Alaska, for 1930 and 1960, which most

authorities agree are the most accurate in reporting on Indian population, show an increase from 332,397 to 508,665; a net increase of 176,278, or approximately half the 1930 total. In this thirty year period, only Oklahoma shows a decline in Indian population but even it cannot be accounted for entirely in terms of assimilation. Illinois, which in 1930 had less than 500 Indians, in 1960 had nearly 5,000, and California, which had a little over 19,000 Indians in 1930, had an Indian population of 39,000 by 1960. Chicago and Los Angeles are important relocation centers where many Oklahoma Indians were sent during the 1950's, so that the increases in Illinois and California as well as a few other states represent migration to the cities.[5] Such migration does not mean automatic loss of identity or severing of home ties. Moreover, there has been a drifting home of many relocatees since 1950.[6]

Most white Americans cannot recognize the many American Indians they may pass on the street, but rely on the costuming of TV programs and movies for visual identification of Indian people. Even the "full blood" Indian in mufti can "pass," but he often chooses not to do so. He lets his identity be known to co-workers and takes as a compliment the usual nickname of "Chief." White Americans, for the greater part, have a vague historical knowledge of Indians as the "First Americans," whom we of European ancestry regrettably but probably inevitably treated something less than fairly in building a new nation. I am repeatedly astonished in the course of many years' lecturing to service clubs, women's organizations and other reasonably well informed groups to find that there is a still widespread belief that Indians are "vanishing" and that those few who remain receive monthly support checks from the government. Likewise, the idea is prevalent that Indian reservations -- which are simply lands guaranteed to tribes, usually by treaty, and administered under federal trust, are "concentration camps" where Indian people are confined as "wards of the government." The fact that many reservations are poverty stricken seems to be well known, although everyone seems to know about the few wealthy "Oil Indians" of Oklahoma. The same humorous but largely apocryphal stories of bizarre and childish extravagances of the "Oil Indians" (scarcely anyone knows that it is mainly the Osage tribe which benefits from oil interests) are repeated as gospel whenever one mentions that one works with American Indian people. Despite such persistence of misinformation, however, it should be noted that the general public appears to be increasingly aware of the existence of Indians and puzzled that they really are not vanishing as rapidly as expected. White persons, benevolent in outlook but woefully uninformed, are quick to offer a solution to what they imagine are Indians' problems or THE Indian problem: "Turn the Indians loose." "It is a scandal," they say, "the way we are doing everything for the Negro [in some versions, 'those people overseas'] and neglect [or 'mistreat'] our own First Americans." They are eager to be helpful but when they seek to

bring about their solutions with "expert" assistance they are dismayed to learn that informed non-Indians and Indians themselves do not share their views about the nature of the problems involved or the applicability of their solutions.

The curious fact is, of course, that we have been trying to turn the Indians loose from their identity as Indians for over a century. But with education, relocation in cities and creating individual dissatisfactions with Indian identity, we can't, to use the term of Philleo Nash, Chief Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, seem to "spin off" enough Indian individuals to reverse the trend of expanding Indian communities. If anything, the "spin off" process seems to select out potentially disturbing elements, leaving the more Indian-oriented and like-minded to perpetuate their distinctive communities. It is these communities which distress the average non-Indian citizen as pockets of poverty and rural slums. They also distress the Indian people who live in them and many others who live and work away, but who hope to retire there in later years. They still visit their old homes frequently, often sending their children to stay with grandparents during school vacations to learn tribal ways and language. Such ethnic insularity is somehow "Un-American" to many people, and the hope of change for the better in material standards strikes them as inimical and even contradictory to the expectation of perpetuating Indian community life. Such people may yet be right. The efforts now stemming from the still small cadre of well educated Indian leaders who identify strongly as Indians may finally lead to elimination of Indian communities by improving them economically out of their cultural distinctiveness. The work of such leaders and current policies of the Bureau of Indian Affairs are directed at raising standards of health, housing, education and employment within Indian settlements. However, even if tribal distinctiveness can flourish under prosperity as it has under adversity, the question may be fairly raised whether such a goal can be reached in essentially rural areas. Indian people believe that it can, and there are now enough successful reservation experiments in stock raising, tourist enterprises and small assembly plants to justify optimism.[7] Their primary fear is that the newer programs and those only in the planning stage will not be given sufficient support over a long enough period to succeed.

A review of Indian policy shows that the Indian Bureau long took a militantly assimilationist stand and attempted to stamp out Indian identity. For a brief period after 1934, under John Collier, Sr.'s administration, the Bureau stressed measures of socio-economic betterment in the form of loan funds, improved education and the like while positively glorifying Indian traditions and tribal identity. By the 1950's drastic measures of termination of Indian reservations and stress on assimilation through relocation were again undertaken. The policies and legislation of the 1950's evoked strenuous resistance on the part of Indian people. The decade saw a

gathering momentum in movements toward inter-tribal cooperation to oppose the threat to Indian distinctiveness.

At present, the Bureau appears to be holding a neutral and highly pragmatic position on the question of the perpetuation of Indian identity. Philleo Nash has on many occasions described the work of the Bureau as "directed acculturation," but acculturation, in the sense of culturally shared decisions and choices made by groups of people, is by definition selective and adaptive. It may ultimately lead to assimilation as the differences between the cultures in contact are drastically reduced, but this is not necessarily the outcome. The Bureau recognizes that forcing assimilation has only spun off individuals and that enclaves of Indians still remain and are growing in size. Current work is therefore directed toward elevation of the socio-economic life of communities. At the same time, the Bureau continues to assist those who wish to relocate and through educational and vocational training programs, is making it easier actually to exercise the option, always potentially open to Indian people, of assimilating effectively into the larger society. Plans are now being undertaken with the expectation that present communities will continue to exist and should be materially bettered, but whether they remain identifiably Indian is a question for Indian people themselves to decide. The Bureau is only determined that Indian identity shall not be synonymous with poverty or with what the Bureau and Indian people can agree upon as unnecessary dependency. Congress willing, the Bureau does not see hasty termination of federal jurisdiction as a solution to Indians' problems, nor the reservations system *per se* as evidence of undesirable dependency on the government. However, there is only weak protection of Indian lands until such time as the Indian people involved and the Bureau feel federal jurisdiction should be terminated. As the Kinzua Dam case, which affected the Seneca Indians of New York, so well illustrates, even lands secured by treaties can be appropriated by unilateral action on the part of the United States government. This instance as well as the equally ineffectual efforts to protest the termination of the Menomini Reservation in Wisconsin and the Klamath Reservation in Oregon typify the difficulties American Indians encounter in gaining widespread and organized sympathy from non-Indians for what they conceive of as their rights.

Although the Menomini, Klamath, Seneca and others lost their cases, the dead-center immobility of relations between Indians and whites seemed to have been finally shaken during the 1950's by the intensity of the crises posed in the policies set in motion during those years. I feel that the current policies of the Indian Bureau, beginning about 1961, were stimulated by this change as much as by the obvious lack of success of earlier policies, and may have been deemed feasible because Indian people were taking a more positive and clearly enunciated stand in their own behalf. Indian tribes seemed to be doing more than simply digging in their heels to resist

the Bureau and Congress. They began efforts to draw the opposition toward them to enable them to go in their chosen direction.

It is difficult to characterize this situation briefly for purposes of opening discussion, and I finally settled on the term "renascence." I was not entirely satisfied with it initially and I am increasingly convinced it is not appropriate. Perhaps I should have used the metaphor of a tug-of-war. But if we are not observing something re-born, we are not watching a game either. There are important political, social, scientific and philosophical implications involved. As early as 1961, Alexander Lesser observed, in regard to Indian resistance to termination and forced assimilation:

> In a world which may be moving toward greater internationalism, in which we hope that peoples, however diverse, will choose the way of democracy, we cannot avoid the responsibility for a democratic resolution of the American Indian situation. Our attitude toward the Indians, the stubbornest non-conformists among us, may be the touchstone of our tolerance of diversity anywhere.[8]

In seeking to explore the contemporary Indian scene in terms of my impressions of a kind of movement taking place, I circulated a statement and a questionnaire regarding it. I titled it, "An American Indian Renascence?" and sent it to some eighty people familiar with Indian affairs, including anthropologists, government personnel, church workers and individual Indians. In some cases, a given person filled several of the above roles. The letters were sent out on July 20, 1964, with the request that replies be made by September 25, 1964. Thirty-one people replied. Of these, nineteen filled out the questionnaire; a number of those who did also volunteered to write papers. Five wrote separate extended commentaries, seven people wrote to express interest in the project; three preferred to write papers and therein set forth views evoked by the questionnaire, while four felt that their own data were not sufficiently recent or complete to permit comment. At the time the letters were mailed, many anthropologists were preparing to attend the several scholarly conferences held in Europe during the summer of 1964 -- some had already left -- while others were engaged in summer field research. Even with the late September deadline and the usual flexibility regarding such deadlines, I knew that many people would be returning to teaching and administrative duties after a busy summer and might not be able to take the time to read the statement and answer the questionnaire. In view of all these circumstances, the fact that better than 25% return was obtained far exceeded my hopes. Furthermore, at scholarly gatherings held during the fall and winter of 1964, a number of colleagues took the time to explain personally that for various reasons they hadn't been able to fill out the questionnaire but considered the project both timely and valuable and asked to be kept informed of developments. Indian friends also expressed similar views.

Following upon an explanation of purpose and the mechanics of questionnaire and deadlines, the statement read:

> When I was invited to put together a special issue [of the Midcontinent American Studies Journal] I at first thought of something similar to the May, 1957 Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, bringing it up to date. You may recall that the issue bore the title, "American Indians and American Life," and dealt with then current facts on health, population, education, welfare, legal questions and the like. However, on further thought, it seemed that at least a decade ought to elapse between such assessments. I believe that a topic of special and timely interest is what I have tentatively designated a renascence among American Indian people. I am not irrevocably committed to this term if you do not happen to care for it and would like to suggest another. But I do believe that there is a real and discernible social movement on the part of Indian people at the present time, whatever it may be called. While the characteristics of the movement are certainly not new, what is new is the gathering momentum throughout the country to make a body of Indian opinion explicit and widely known. I would date the publicized and formalized expression of ideas from about 1960. Perhaps it was partly a response to the unpopular federal policies and legislation of the 1950's.
>
> My own opinion that there is a general movement in terms of agreement upon and publicizing of Indian goals derives from several sources: the response to the American Indian Chicago Conference of 1961 and the form taken by the "Declaration of Indian Purpose" which resulted from the Conference; the formation at the Conference of the National Indian Youth Council which brought together relatively younger Indian people who considered the "Declaration" correct but too mildly stated and in any case requiring organization and action to achieve Indian purposes; the example of increased tribal consciousness and action for group welfare of Wisconsin tribes, particularly the Wisconsin Winnebago with whom I have worked closely over a period of twenty years and so can note marked changes since about 1960; activities of other Indian groups in the Midwest such as the formation of the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council; and finally the consistency and increased articulateness of Indian participants in various recent conferences dealing with Indian affairs. I have

the impression that what I have been observing in the Midwest is paralleled in other parts of the country I would like to get expressions of opinion on the matter from Indian people, anthropologists, and others concerned with Indian affairs in local and federal governmental vantage positions or private organizations and agencies. The following are characteristics of the movement which I discern and about which I would appreciate your opinions, pro or con, and other thoughts on the matter.

I. I use the term renascence, rebirth, rather than revitalization or nativism, because leadership is diffuse, emphasis and action vary from place to place, and the common characteristic seems to be a heightened desire for Indian identity coupled with vocalized insistence on recognition of the right of Indian groups to persist as distinctive social entities.

II. Although differing from place to place in content, two basic objectives seem to be stressed: improvement of material standards of living and general welfare of Indian groups by means of increased formal education of Indians in professions and vocations to better serve Indian communities; emphasis on Indian identity in terms of reactivating or encouraging perpetuation of tribal languages, customs, and tribal residential communities.

III. I am not sure to what extent the rising Negro militancy and articulateness of the last decade have contributed to the Indian movement. It is possible that the widespread national concern for the Negro has contributed a sense of need on the part of Indians to make their position clear to the larger society. However, the following points seem to have pertinence.

A. Many well-intentioned but uninformed Whites tend to equate Negro and Indian problems in terms of poverty, discrimination, segregation, etc. and assume the goals of Indian people parallel those of the Negro people.

B. Certain not-so-well-intentioned Whites sympathize with and accept Indians but not Negroes and try to deflect interest away from the Negro by arguing we ought to consider "First Americans first," and would readily grant Indians the goals sought by Negroes.

C. Indian people as individuals or groups, tribal and intertribal, have generally reacted against this equating of their problems with those of the Negro. It is my impression that Indian people are sometimes more drawn to White racist demagogues in seeking a sympathetic hearing as represented in b. above than they are to educable Whites represented in a. above simply because the second type of White for his own reasons distinguishes Indians from Negroes as "superior."

1. The reason lies in part in simple racism borrowed by Indians from certain segments of the White population.
2. In some cases Indian racism takes a distinctive form in arguing against assimilation with non-Indians and in asking for White acceptance of Indian "segregation" as desired by Indians.
3. In some cases the arguments are cultural rather than racist, that America may have much to gain in the long run by permitting model groups such as Indian communities to pursue their own values which Indians conceive of as less materialistic, competitive, prosaic, ulcer-producing and mass-cultural-monotonous than those of the society at large. However, even such philosophical arguments devoid of racist overtones come as a shock and surprise to well-intentioned Whites who in concern for minorities' welfare generally have expected that Indians' goals are those of assimilation, loss of Indian identity, and acquisition of middle class values along with increased acquisition of middle-class creature comforts. At a recent conference on Indian affairs held at Eau Claire, Wisconsin, when a number of Indian speakers voiced their views, some heretofore sympathetic if not informed Whites dubbed the gathering a meeting of the "Red Muslims"!
4. Many Indians feel that they simply do not have the same problems as the Negro or at least not in the same degree in regard to prejudice, discrimination, abrogation of civil rights and the like. They see their problems as stemming from their special historical status as Indians

and that their means of bringing their problems and needs to the attention of the public should also be distinctive. By way of illustration, at the same conference noted above, an Ojibwa observed at a workshop discussion that it is good that Indian problems are being discussed and solutions sought but went on to say, "And I hope I never see the day that Indian people feel they must throw themselves in the path of bull-dozers. You could get run over!" Indian reactions were also heated and equivocal in regard to the recent Indian "Fish-in" involving Marlon Brando.

IV. Indian distinctiveness is stressed culturally and historically: emphasis on treaties rather than judicial recourse in obtaining perceived rights of Indians; ineffable attachment to land; attitude that all other Americans are "immigrants" and that Indians as "First Americans" deserve special consideration; or that it isn't really special consideration but that the nation as a whole permits and at times even protects cultural pluralism of other ethnic minorities such as Jews, Amish, etc. and it is only that Whites find it hard to accept the distinctive criteria of Indian ethnicity; and, the nation still "owes" the Indians something for taking their land.

V. Stress on tribal identity as inseparable from Indian identity. Many Indian people dislike the anthropologists' term "Pan-Indianism," arguing that pow-wows, the Peyote or Native American Church, etc. are cases of mutual borrowing and enrichment of different tribes' own cultures. In terms of legal and political action, they recognize a need for tribes to pull together in helping one another to achieve the different tribes' goals and to oppose by concerted action measures threatening to all tribes' distinctiveness. The National Congress of American Indians and other inter-tribal organizations which may not even be in sympathy with the NCAI have always tended to pattern action on recognition of tribal distinctiveness and cooperation between tribes as tribes rather than generalized "Indians" although objectives may have general Indian significance.

It is my impression that the more romantic, antiquarian, mystical and less tribally oriented expressions of the movement derive from individuals of more White

than Indian descent or early conditioning who have chosen in later life to be Indians or from those groups which have maintained a social continuity with their past, sometimes imposed from the outside by racial considerations, but retain little cultural distinctiveness from their own tribal origins.

VI. The movement is recognized and viewed with distaste in whole or part by different types of Indian people. To date, my observations relate to individuals rather than tribal groups.

A. Those who have chosen the path of assimilation but proudly admit to their Indian origin, taking pride in having beaten the White man at his own competitive, economic game in terms of middle-class criteria of success, status symbols, etc. They are perturbed and distressed that they are rejected as models for other Indian people to emulate. I am uninformed about Indian people who have rejected their identity completely; they do not show up at Indian gatherings or conferences on Indian affairs. It would be interesting to know if such people are aware of what other Indian people are doing at present and what they think about it.

B. Those who are in fundamental agreement with the movement in terms of respect for continuation of Indian identity and improvement of material welfare, but who deplore the racist overtones.

C. Those like 2. above who are in agreement but deplore the participation of "recent" Indians whose romanticism they consider pseudo-ethnicity and comparable to Boy Scouts who dress up as Indians without understanding what they consider the real sense of being an Indian. In this same connection I have detected distaste for publicists of the movement who gain personal recognition as somehow "un-Indian" in their seeking of ego-fulfillment.

D. Those active in the movement who resent their hard work being equated with glory-seeking or personal aggrandizement on the part of Indians otherwise sympathetic to the objectives of the movement.

Four questions were posed concerning the statement:

I. Do you agree with the foregoing statement regarding what I have called an American Indian Renascence? If you agree please indicate your reasons briefly.

II. Do you disagree in whole or in part? Please indicate your reasons briefly.

III. Do you have further comments you feel are pertinent to the issue?

IV. Would you like to submit an article for inclusion in the American Indian issue of the Midcontinent American Studies Journal? If so, please indicate the subject briefly.

Because the responses varied in format from letters going through my entire statement point for point to simple yes-no answers on the questionnaire, a precise statistical breakdown of replies to the first three questions cannot be made. However, certain generalizations are clearly evident which, though not adequate unto themselves, suggest a framework which would lend itself to more concise testing by means of coordinated studies among different Indian groups. I shall only attempt to discuss disagreements and striking expansions on my statement.

While all but six people took immediate exception to my statement -- often with heavy underlining and bristling exclamation marks -- it turned out that disagreement centered in connotations attaching to the term "renascence" or the emphasis given certain points. Everyone agreed that something is going on but differed in opinions as to content and significance. The outstanding corrective of my term was that "re-birth" signified something revived, whereas Indian cultures did not die out to become recently re-established, but have simply changed through time, as cultures do, and that current developments represent a logical point in a historical trend of adaptations and adjustments to changing circumstances. On this there was general agreement. However, some respondents felt that the current situation is marked by new experiments and revolutionary departures from familiar adaptations, while others felt that no more than a cumulative effect is involved, particularly the presence of more educated and vocal Indians, which makes current efforts appear more revolutionary than they really are.

I have begun to appreciate that a major consideration in what I called a renascence does not derive from within the Indian social setting alone, but consists of the increasing visibility of Indians as a distinct feature in the total social landscape of the United States. Whether vocal about themselves or not, they can no longer be ignored or disregarded by the public at large. Anthropologists and others familiar with the course of Indian affairs have long abandoned the simplistic view of acculturation as the breakdown of traditional culture followed by a period of transitional culture when old elements are gradually replaced by borrowed ones and culminating inevitably in the total assimilation of Indians into the dominant society. In recent years the facts of continuity of Indian identity -- despite cultural changes and adaptations -- and actual population increase are becoming more widely

known to the general American public. The official policies of the 1950's, which aimed at rapid termination of reservations and dispersal of Indian people throughout the population by means of relocation in cities far distant from reservation areas, may eventually be understood as an almost frantic attempt to fulfill forcefully an entrenched social prophecy when it was becoming ever more evident that the prophecy was not fulfilling itself. Whatever other stubborn ethnic groups such as the Hutterites might do in regard to assimilation was a matter for sociologists, but Indians under the federal jurisdiction could at least be dealt with by law. There were two compelling but specious arguments to justify the policies of the 1950's: Indian administration cost the taxpayers money; analogies could be made to Negro segregation to win general approval of right minded citizens to "free" the Indians.

In regard to the first argument, it was soon apparent that termination of such groups as Menomini and Klamath resulted in economic hardships for the Indians involved. The costs of study and administration were simply shifted to the local states. The second argument has already been shown to be untenable.

If my sample of responses is a fair indication of information on current events in the Indian world, we find that there are many different kinds of action promoted and promulgated in various ways, but the appearance of a kind of unified movement rests in the fact that when goals are made explicit, they are expressed in much the same form. It is worth noting that no one disagreed, and a majority added positive agreement, with my view that education is seen generally by Indian people as the key to opening a brighter future for them. Furthermore, there was general agreement that goals of material improvement by means of education are emphatically coupled with expressions of the importance of retaining Indian identity, whether generalized Indian or specifically tribal in content. Education in itself has been the traditional route to social betterment, and often, by definition, assimilation into the larger society. As such it has always been supported and promoted by the government, philanthropic agencies, missionaries and others dealing with American Indian people. That younger Indians particularly are taking up the cry as if they had personally discovered the benefits of education for the first time must strike "old Indian hands" as ironical. However, when Indian people stress the importance of education they stress that it is not necessarily synonymous with assimilation but can make Indian life better.

It is in the matter of what constitutes Indian identity that complexity and cross-purposes occur within the movement and result in different assessments by participants and observers. The questionnaire responses and contributed papers indicated that the greatest weaknesses in my statement lay in confusing the types or levels of activity and publicizing of the movement or aggregate of movements, and in not taking regional differ-

ences into account. These levels are not mutually exclusive; given persons and groups sometimes operate on several levels, and people with different preferences for action sometimes work together. Taking all the responses together, I find that four levels are involved. Most people, however, contrasted only two levels, and none discussed all four. Thus, my delineation of four levels may distort the intent of given respondents' comments, so let me make clear that when I cite examples from each of the levels, the respondents involved may or may not agree with the data regarding the other levels or the way their data are compared to them. I feel that my synthesis is valid in terms of all the information volunteered to me. Arguments could arise among the respondents, since, as shall be shown, there were differences of opinion on given topics.

The terms used for the different levels are sometimes the same, but the content of questionnaire responses and contributed papers shows the nature of the differences perceived. Thus, the first level which I will accept as "nationalism" for purposes of discussion was also designated as "supra-tribal," "generalized Indian" and "pan-Indian." The second level, which seems best described as "inter-tribal" or "pan-Indian," was also referred to as "tribal federalism" and "generalized Indian." It is not sharply distinguished from the first, although differences in emphasis are apparent. The third level I shall call "tribal," but respondents used such terms as "local community," "parochial" or "reservation," while the fourth level was variously discussed as "country Indians," "grass-roots Indians," "real Indians" and "full-bloods."

Most respondents seem to feel that the majority of Indians are of the third and fourth types, and that while the fourth type includes the greatest numbers and the real hard core resisters, its members are least heard from. They just go on as always, being particular kinds of Indians, borrowing selectively and retaining their identity without feeling a need to verbalize or perhaps even introspect very much about who they are and where they are going. Such people are often quite isolated from other tribes and sometimes even quite estranged from their own more inter-tribally oriented members.

At the tribal level we find a variety of forms. Usually, there is an acculturated elite. This is sometimes the power faction which determines tribal policies; in other cases, it is split into factions vying for and alternating in holding power. Or it is sometimes a faction which has little power in its own group, but identifies with inter-tribal or nationalist efforts while the tribe as a whole is parochial in orientation. The important point is that there are tribes which operate primarily in regard to their own communities and include people who are vocal and command attention and commitment to the goal of Indian identity-education in purely local terms. These tribes have little to do with other Indians on an inter-tribal or nationalist level, although they may look to other tribes as models and examples. It

is the similarity of structure in leadership and interaction with country Indians on the one hand and relationships to the Indian Bureau and other outside agencies on the other that gives an appearance of a unified movement. Actually, these are largely independent replications of similar situations.

At the inter-tribal level tribes are jealous of their identity and retain distinctive traits, but interact with other tribes for particular purposes of a social, religious or political nature. Such interaction is often widespread in attendance at pow-wows and meetings of Indian rights groups far from home. The respondents agreed that many Indian people who are involved in inter-tribal activities resent the term "pan-Indian." As one anthropologist put it, "They fear the entity-dissolving implications." However, a generalized Indian identity which derives most of its external symbols of song, dance, costume and ritual from the Plains area is indeed developing and spreading, although to date tribal identity takes precedence in many cases. Three respondents noted that in the Plains and East, exclusive of the Iroquois, Cherokee and Seminole, identity is more likely to be general or pan-Indian. One person would include the Midwest, but the others felt that both the Southwest and Midwest are typified by strong tribal identifications. The curious fact is that in some groups, pan-Indian traits may be borrowed in order to symbolize identity in local tribal terms, while in other cases they may reflect commitment to a general Indian identity. One of the questionnaire respondents dwelt on the presence of organizations, often including interested and active whites, seeking to be the spokesmen for THE American Indian. This person felt that no one organization is able to do so and should not attempt to do so because of the heterogeneity of Indian cultures, types of leadership and gradations between tribal and general Indian orientation.

Finally, despite the suspicion in which even inter-tribal organizations are held because of their pan-Indian tendencies, although they frequently spell out the need to respect tribal integrity, there is a genuine voice of nationalism which admits to supra-tribal objectives. The National Indian Youth Council generally falls into this category, although individuals with such sentiments have long been found in the conventionally organized inter-tribal organizations such as the National Congress of the American Indians, the American Indian Defense League and various regional and urban inter-tribal councils and clubs. Although only the last paragraph of Section V in my statement was devoted explicitly to overtly supra-tribal expressions, several respondents criticized me for giving it more attention than it merits. On the other hand, two Indian people suggested that the term "nationalism" was entirely acceptable in describing what they considered a new and creative force to pull Indians together as a power bloc. They do not feel that tribal identity should be abandoned, but rather that Indian people would be better off if they thought of themselves first as <u>Indians</u> and then

as members of given tribes. They feel that the present primary emphasis on tribal identity results in obstructing organized inter-tribal efforts to cooperate in actions of interest to all Indians, such as opposing undesirable legislation. A number of other respondents recognized the presence of such conscious nationalism, but feared or disparaged it because it involved more noise than direction, because it lacked clear-cut objectives or because it played upon a generalized shared hostility toward the larger society rather than positive features of a shared Indian identity.

Further study is clearly indicated in order to understand what regional and other factors are at work in explaining the numerical strength, composition and inter-relationships of the levels of activity if we are to attempt any predictions as to the future of the American Indians. I am reluctant to view the levels as a continuum moving from grass-roots or country Indians to Indian nationalism. I get the impression that the nationalists encountered by many of my respondents are simply part of the spin-off process. They have come to know the larger society and find it wanting. They are unlike those individuals who are successfully and contentedly assimilated in their work, friendships, class standing and, frequently, marriage. Some of the latter make capital of their Indian ancestry for purely personal reasons consistent with the American ideal of the "poor immigrant boy who made good" -- a role traditionally exploited by politicians and "self-made men" of the business world. Those nationalists who still have strong ties of culture and kinship to distinctive tribal traditions have the option of returning to, or at times operating most effectively in, inter-tribal and tribal efforts, and, in fact, do so. The questionnaire aside, young people with whom I have spoken frequently express their annoyance with the hide-bound leadership of the older members of their tribes and feel frustrated in their sincere efforts to be helpful. But the complaints of youth vary from tribe to tribe. In some cases a highly acculturated elite in a position of leadership is believed to have sold out to the crass values of the white man and middle-class mediocrity, thereby repressing the creative and adaptive continuity of the traditions of the people. In other cases, power resides in people whom the young believe to be incapable of adjusting to the demands of the twentieth century. Their intransigence likewise threatens the continuity of Indian tradition because, if it cannot bend to a changing world, it can only break apart.

On all levels, but particularly in inter-tribal and supra-tribal activities, one finds helpful whites who recognize and usually accept as a good thing the need to respect Indian identity in promoting socio-economic programs in behalf of Indian people. On the tribal and country Indian level, local whites such as social workers, teachers, missionaries and employers are more apt to expect that their concern and help will lead Indians to identify with their own social class and to assimilate into it. Certainly there are exceptions to this situation, but it raises a point for further explora-

tion. To what extent do these whites with whom country Indians and local tribal leaders most frequently interact serve to reinforce resistance to assimilation? These friendly whites share much of the outlook and many of the habits of whites who are unconcerned about their Indian neighbors or downright hostile toward them. At this level the local ethnic content of Indian tribal identity is likely to be most extensive, intensive and meaningful to existence. It underlies daily interpersonal relationships, expectations, decisions and behaviors. It is thus the most sensitive to overt and implied threats of destructive changes. The cultural gap between Indian and white people is also greater than it is between more sophisticated inter-tribal and supra-tribal leaders who can meet the white world on its own terms and encounter whites who respect and do not threaten their often close identification with those less able to operate beyond the tribal community. Inter-tribal and supra-tribal leaders recognize that material changes which would improve and not destroy community life are possible at the grass-roots and tribal level. However, they are suspect among their own tribesmen unless they are exceedingly skillful in keeping their home fences mended, because they interact easily with whites, often enjoy standards of living comparable to whites and hob-nob with Indians from different tribes who are both overtly assimilationist and overtly nationalist. Such leaders operate in the face of obstacles posed by friendly but assimilation-oriented whites and their own people who tend to think that all whites are assimilation-oriented and to be avoided. Some highly vocal if not representative nationalist leaders often recognize the social insularity of grass-roots Indians and consider it somehow necessary to Indian identity. In the face of the current civil rights movement in regard to the Negro they often alienate potential white sympathy by talking of Indian "segregation" as a desirable goal. For outsiders, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish their arguments from those of Indian leaders who seek legal safe-guards to Indian lands, promote land acquisition programs and oppose termination. Land is the primary resource for effective community development. Such leaders feel it can articulate community economic life into the broader socio-economic system and still allow a healthy localism which gives vitality, meaning and distinction to a variety of communities throughout the United States, non-Indian as well as Indian.

Of the ten respondents who took explicit notice of the general civil rights question or specifically the matter of Negro militancy, all agreed that Indian and Negro problems are decidedly different and that Indian people almost universally resent equating of Negro and Indian problems. One respondent in the South noted that Negroes as well as whites are prone to make this comparison while Indians reject it. It should be noted that Indian people are frequently outspoken on a very sensitive point in the integration crisis, and they shock liberal white sympathizers with the frank opinion, "I don't want my child to marry a white person." The responses divided

evenly as to the catalytic effect of the Negro movement on the Indian movement. Respondents speaking for Alaska and Canada felt that current Negro strivings have little or no influence in those areas, but that there is, perhaps in less well developed form, evidence of Indian movements of an intertribal nature found throughout the United States as well as opposition to unpopular government policies and an increase in tribal efforts at self-improvement.

One anthropologist observed that more than a racist deflection of sympathy from the Negro issue may be involved in the concern of certain whites for the "First Americans." Some whites have much to gain through the tourist industry in fostering the distinctiveness of local Indian communities while catering to Indian good will as a matter of good business. Since I sent out the questionnaires I have had the opportunity to see the salutary effect of new super highways on Indian-white relations in a number of Wisconsin towns where tourists once stopped at service stations and restaurants. An Indian friend observed with a smile, "We're their only natural resource to pull the tourists off the highway."

In reviewing the questionnaires, I was surprised that only one respondent commented on a point which I thought would be much more frequently mentioned -- the ubiquity of energetic and outspoken women at all four levels. Perhaps the fact that women have weathered acculturational storms more effectively in psychological terms than men is now so much taken for granted that no one bothers to reexamine the idea. In my opinion, there is more involved than that women's roles were less shattered than those of men. Granted that families still had to be reared and households managed through all the upheavals of removal, undercutting of local leadership, loss of game and termination of warfare which affected men's roles, girls received and continue to receive the kind of education which qualifies them to meet the larger society on its own terms and deal with it. At the high school level the acquisition of clerical skills, such as typing, shorthand and bookkeeping, introduces them to the managerial side of the business world, whereas boys' training in manual arts places them on the side of labor. Likewise, training for girls beyond high school frequently involves nursing and teaching, vocations rising in status recognition. Until very lately a great number of boys who sought higher education were supported and guided by missionaries who encouraged them to go into the clergy, a career carrying considerably less prestige than it did formerly. Advanced vocational training for boys comparable to training as practical nurses or stenographers for girls has also placed them in the production end of the labor market and isolated them from opportunities to learn or at least observe administrative skills and higher organizational techniques.

Finally, two respondents made a pointed suggestion in regard to the American Indian Chicago Conference coordinated by Sol Tax and similar gatherings of a local nature patterned after it which I mentioned in my

statement. They observed that people such as Tax and even I may be contributing more than we realize to the stir and turmoil by providing public platforms contributing to the development of an actual movement. It is too early to attempt predictions of future effects, but I think it is worth noting that a surprisingly large number of younger Indian people who are deeply committed to the idea of Indian identity are seeking degrees in anthropology! One person felt that even this publication will have an impact and influence on Indian thinking and further action.

The contributed papers which follow represent a remarkably accurate reflection of the major trends revealed in responses to the questionnaire. In some cases the writers had already devoted thought to certain aspects of the situation and simply volunteered papers (or somewhat revised versions of them) which they had already prepared but had not yet published. In other instances, the questionnaire served to stimulate the actual setting forth on paper of ideas and observations which the writers had been mulling over. Thus, Shirley Witt presents us with an excellent summary of the history of Indian administration and the reactions to that administration which have resulted in nationalistic philosophies. The origin and spread of a generalized pan-Indian identity is detailed by Robert K. Thomas, who distinguishes this trend from organized and consciously-held sentiments of Indian nationalism. Carol Rachlin shows that in Central and Eastern Oklahoma, despite inter-tribal activities for social, political or religious purposes, strong tribal allegiances and distinctive practices continue.

Four of the papers show the varying interplay of tribal and inter-tribal orientations within and between tribes. The Kansas Potawatomi described by James Clifton comprise one community of a once large tribe and are an excellent example of a group which has managed to perpetuate a conservative tradition while adapting it to changing circumstances. By both "spin off" and self isolation, this group sees itself first as Potawatomi, yet avails itself of inter-tribal or general Indian contacts and benefits in a highly selective manner. The Eastern Cherokee discussed by Harriet Kupferer are likewise a segment of a once larger tribal entity. Compared to the Potawatomi their culture contains many more elements, borrowed from white and pan-Indian sources, than native traits, and the population itself is more heterogeneous in racial terms and acculturational levels, but the orientation is primarily tribal rather than inter-tribal or nationalistic. The presence of a real schism between segments of the Nez Perce population is detailed by Deward Walker in terms of a series of operationally defined "renascences" gradually superceded by greater and more frequent declines in distinctively Nez Perce or even general Indian identification. The result today is a factional dispute between those who have a vested interest in at least continuing a general Indian identity and those who would prefer to divide the tribal patrimony and go their separate ways as assimilated Indians. Ann Fischer's account of the Houma of Louisiana illustrates the case of

people outside the federal jurisdiction who have lost almost all recollection of any distinctive tribal language or culture. The external features or symbols of their Indian identity are not derived from Pan-Indian sources to any great extent. The Houma are aware of and interested in general Indian or inter-tribal activities, but their social and economic isolation precludes active participation in such endeavors as a means of obtaining assistance in working through their own problems of law suits involving land. Although their questionable racial heritage raises obstacles to assimilation into the white population, Fischer's data reveal that they would be better off than they are in economic and educational terms had they chosen to identify as Negroes.

In all of the papers there is a common thread of concern about education as this relates to attempts to improve the material side of Indian life. Rosalie and Murray Wax provide us with a most perceptive analysis of the different meanings of education as viewed "from above" by outsiders engaged in the business of education and as viewed "from below" by those seeking education or having it foisted upon them. Of special interest is the discussion of the selective and adaptive response to education now evident even among the "country Indians" on the Pine Ridge Sioux Reservation as something useful and not threatening to Indian identity. The school can become part of Indian culture just as the automobile and manufactured clothing have become part of Indian culture along with those parts deriving from tribal sources, such as the give-away ceremony in commemoration of important events in an individual's life, and those parts relating to pan-Indian developments, such as the inter-tribal pow-wow.

That Indian people are no longer to be considered simply the special concern of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or of interest only to themselves until they fade away is strikingly evident in the study by Henry Dobyns. Dobyns concentrates on the articulation of Indian communities into the larger socio-economic system and their effective control over their own destinies within the larger system by means of recourse to lawyers sympathetic to their peculiar interests as Indians. Anthropologists and other professionals in the social sciences have also been engaged in the role of liaison people between tribes and the dominant society in helping to realize goals decided upon by tribes. But the involvement of the legal profession is of particular significance. It means that members of a powerful, highly articulate and notoriously realistic segment of the society at large are able to accept continuation of Indian communities as a fact of American life. Perhaps in the last accounting, the renascence is the change in the non-Indian world in regard to the Indian world rather than the reverse, as I first perceived it. [10]

University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee

Footnotes:

[1] John Provinse and others, "The American Indian in Transition" (a Wenner-Gren Foundation Supper Conference), American Anthropologist, LVI, 3 (June, 1954), 387-394.

[2] I recognize that my use of the term "tribe" is distressingly inexact. Ethnologically, American Indians were organized in different places as simple bands, "true" tribes, chiefdoms and village communities moving toward even greater complexity. Legally, Indian enclaves are categorized as tribes, bands and statutory groups. They may or may not occupy reservations. In some places inter-tribal organization was thrust upon tribes because several once distinct tribes were placed on the same reservation and may now have one over-all "tribal council" drawing membership from the component tribes. In other cases, a single tribe or chiefdom has been divided into many geographically separated components which today are virtually autonomous. For example, the modern Potawatomi include the Kansas Prairie Band, Oklahoma Citizens Band, Forest County (Wisconsin) Band, Hannahville Community of Upper Michigan, the Pokagan Band of lower Michigan (occupying a reservation under state jurisdiction) and the Potawatomi Indians of Michigan and Indiana (incorporated by their own efforts only under a state charter). Thus, I use the term "tribe" to refer to any group which, as one or more communities or neighborhoods, occupies a geographically definable area and considers itself in terms of a given name, used by outsiders to refer to them and to distinguish themselves from other Indians.

[3] The distinction between Indians and Negroes is pointedly illustrated in a joke Indian people tell: a little Indian boy and a little Negro boy were arguing about the relative superiority of their races. The little Negro boy mentioned a great many famous Negroes in sports, politics and the theater and challenged the Indian boy to name as many famous Indians in these fields. The Indian boy merely replied, "Did you ever hear of anyone playing cowboys and Niggers?"

[4] The Turtle Mountain Chippewa comprise communities of Indian and metis in North Dakota, and many tribes distinguish "fullbloods" and "mixed bloods" as living in different reservation neighborhoods with different standards of living, but legally, all are Indians.

[5] J. Nixon Hadley, "Increases in American Indian Population, 1930-1960," 5 pp. mimeographed, prepared for American Indian Chicago Conference, University of Chicago, June 13-20, 1961.

[6] Cf. Joan Ablon, "Relocated Indians in the San Francisco Bay Area," Human Organization, XXIV, 4 (Winter, 1964), 296-304; and Harry W. Martin, "Adjustment Among American Indians in an Urban Environment," Ibid., 290-295.

[7] Alexander Lesser, "Education and the Future of Tribalism in the United States: The Case of the American Indian," The Social Service Review, XXXV, 2 (June, 1961), 1-9, quotation on p. 9.

[8] Fred Voget, ed., "American Indians and their Economic Development" (Special issue of sixteen articles), Human Organization, XX, 4 (Winter, 1961-62).

[9] A most striking case is that of the Wisconsin Winnebago who applied successfully to the Social Security Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a grant to do a self-study as a basis for community development along the lines of self-help operations. The first results presented in 1963 were so promising that S.S.A., H.E.W. volunteered further funds to continue the work in terms of actual program planning. The Wisconsin Winnebago have no tribal funds, so entirely on their own initiative they sought a grant in order to carry out their own research as well as engage the services of resource people to advise them, but not manage for them.

[10] I would like to express my thanks to all the contributors to this collection of papers. Many of them also filled out the questionnaire in detail. In writing my paper I have drawn upon their responses along with those of the following people to whom I also wish to express my appreciation for their helpfulness. In addition to thus acknowledging my debt to all the respondents, I think the list may be of interest and value to readers in appraising the cross-section of opinion I was able to sample.

Joan Ablon - familiar with a number of reservation Indian groups and a specialist in studies of urban Indians; currently a Research Anthropologist, School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley Campus.

Niki Barnett - a free lance journalist interested in Indian affairs who has worked in the Indian section of the Wisconsin Governor's Commission on Human Rights and for the Foundation for American Indian Culture, Bismarck, North Dakota.

William Fenton - an anthropologist widely known for his Iroquoian studies, the author of Indian and White Relations to 1830 (Chapel Hill, 1957) and currently Assistant Commissioner, New York State Museum and Science Service, Albany, New York.

Stephen E. Feraca - Tribal Relations Officer, Bureau of Indian Affairs, who has had anthropological training and extensive administrative experience in a variety of Indian groups.

Thomas Gladwin - an anthropologist long familiar with Indian affairs, particularly in the Southwest, currently a Social Science Consultant, National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, Maryland.

Sister M. Inez Hilger - an anthropologist who is well known for her studies of the Ojibwa, currently on the faculty of the College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph, Minnesota.

John J. Honigmann - a professor of anthropology, University of North Carolina, who has done many years of field work in northern Canada and has published extensively on the northern Athabascan speaking people.

Margaret Lantis - an anthropologist who is an authority on Eskimo culture, particularly in Alaska, and whose interests include the study of child care and training, health and community development.

Gordon MacGregor - an anthropologist now employed as a Special Assistant, Bureau of Indian Affairs, who has done research among many Indian groups and is well known for his studies of Plains groups, particularly the Sioux.

Elizabeth Rosenthal - an anthropologist who as the child of missionaries grew up among Sioux Indians and is currently associated in the Indian work of the National Council of the Episcopal Church.

Paul Schulze III - Chicago business executive who has long been a student of Indian culture and history and is active in work promoting Indian welfare.

William Sturtevant - an anthropologist with the Bureau of American Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution, who has done extensive research among American Indian groups, particularly the Iroquois and Seminole.

Melvin Thom - President, National Indian Youth Council; active in programs to aid Indian people.

Anthony Wallace - Professor of Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, who has worked among eastern tribes in the United States and is well known for his studies of nativistic movements.