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ABSTRACT:

THE INDIGENOUS DIASPORA IN ACADEMICS AND THE IMPACT OF THE RED POWER MOVEMENT ON INCLUSION OF AMERICAN INDIAN SCHOLARSHIP

by

Sara C. Sutler-Cohen

This thesis investigates the degree to which American Indians are left out of the academic discourse around race analysis. Further, it investigates the way in which, since the 1960s' Red Power Movement, the gates of the Ivory Tower have opened for Indigenous scholars. Henceforth, scholarship from Native people continues to flourish, as does the Native student body.

This work contributes to our general understanding of race and ethnic relations by utilizing theoretical tools with which we are already equipped. I draw from theories of race and ethnic studies, social construction, and social history. I also bring in work by Indian scholars from American Studies, philosophy, psychology, history, and the work of White scholars on the issues of American Indians. It is my goal to promote the study of Indigenous issues within the realm of sociology, and to do this with all of the intellectual integrity possible.
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INTRODUCTION

We are statistics that everyone heard about, the unemployed, uneducated, alcoholics, welfare recipients. We have been the study of many Congressional studies and investigations, all types of studies, but we as statistics still remain – our situation has remained the same for a century. So we have grouped together behind our religious beliefs, our respect for human rights, our beliefs that we are entitled to human rights as well as everybody else. Our functions have been to educate our own people and to try and educate the White American as to the fact that we exist yet today. I mean when you look at AIM, [this is] who we are. We are the descendants of Geronimo, Crazy Horse. We are the indigenous people. We are concerned about what is happening to our people now, because, you know, we don’t like to be a statistic...To respect the Creator we must show respect, we must respect ourselves. Too many times we have seen our people in a condition where we don’t see...even selfrespect.

— John Trudell

The purpose of this thesis is to look critically at the framing of the study of race relations in academics and to note the absence of American Indian issues. The crux of this analysis lies at understanding how anti-racist discourse developed out of the intersection between activism and academics. The academic context I am concerned with is the study of race and ethnicity in the social sciences. Traditionally, the academy has been responsible for teaching students about race, while activism is designed to fight racism. Native peoples’ activism since the development of the Red Power Movement of the 1960s, has provided the thrust for Native scholarship in colleges and universities. I am interested in the intersection of the two, in order to look closely at how activism and academics can have a working relationship in the academy.

Although the study of race relations in the social sciences has broadened over the years to include academic/activist voices of both Whites and myriad
people of color, the overwhelming focus remains on a Black/White dichotomy. Patricia Hill Collins (1990) writes, “This emphasis on quantification and categorization occurs in conjunction with the belief that either/or categories must be ranked. The search for certainty of this sort requires that one side of a dichotomy be privileged while its other is denigrated” (pg. 225). As a result of categorization of race as Black and White, there is an omission of most other groups of people of color, particularly American Indians, who are arguably one of the most distressed groups of people in North America.

As will be noted further in this work, even with all the strides in scholarly work in the discipline, American Indians still remain, at best, on the outskirts of a social analysis of race and ethnic relations. The irony of this is a painful one, and I argue that the inclusion of American Indian voices can deepen sociological analyses of race and ethnicity.

Over the years, the exercise of white privilege in academics has contributed to the lack of inclusion of American Indian issues in college level courses dealing with race. In exercising white privilege, White scholars make an active choice on how, when, or why they look at American Indian social, political, and cultural issues.

The study of American Indian issues is so often relegated to anthropology (a primarily “bone-centered” analysis), where what remains (pun intended) about American Indians is a flawed interpretation of assumed physical and cultural
“differences” from the dominant culture. Further, Indians are almost always portrayed in the past tense, contributing to what has been called the “Vanishing Indian Concept.”¹ Because of the emphasis on a Black/White (B/W) binary, what is taught about Indians is their status as historical markers of the past, not the current conditions of tribal governments, Indian-White relations, reservation life, or their role in politics. Native people remain an 18th Century stereotype, which is further perpetuated in popular culture via movies, television, and children’s books, among other forms of text.

Alternative visions of Native people are provided by activists and scholars, particularly those who are located in Native American studies departments, however, the academy has not made much room for NAS. Along with ethnic studies departments in campuses across the US, they may face impending closure (Deloria, 1999).

In My Own Words

It is important here that I speak briefly about why it is that I am doing this research in particular. Though some may disagree, when looking at issues of race relations, it is important that a researcher racially self-identify. By self-identifying in this way, I come clean with the reader and am able to better explain what informs my writing. Ethnically, I am Irish, Tsalagi, Polish Jew, and Romany/Gypsy. However, although this mixture is within me, I grew up
racialized as White. That is to say, my ancestors “passed” some generations back and made the choice, for survival, to identify as White.

I grew up in the East Bay Area, California, but also spent some years in New York City, Marin County, and San Francisco. I spent the bulk of my childhood in both Berkeley and Oakland. My mother is an artist, and my father is a musician, and I grew up in the 70s and 80s with an intense musical influence. I also have two brothers, whose Japanese father left the family when they were very young, about five years before I was born. My father’s family is from Bialystok, a once-small border town between former Russia and Poland. My dad was born in 1942, in Flatbush, Brooklyn and is a second generation (non-practicing) Jewish American.

Growing up my brothers and I knew nothing of our ethnic background. The extent to which we were in touch with our ancestry came out through, of all things, food. At Christmas we would have an array of food reflecting our heritage (sans Tsalagi blood): sushi, boiled potatoes, and matzo ball soup, often accompanying our turkey and stuffing. Racial identity for me has typically been experienced through events in my childhood. Up until I was ten, my skin was very dark, and it was not unusual for strangers to ask my mother whose kid I was. It only served to make me feel terribly isolated, as I obviously did not look Japanese, like my brothers, or even Jewish, like my dad. It was my classmates who usually pointed out to me that I was a “dirty Indian.” When I brought that
home to my family my mom would shake her head and walk away. It simply was not discussed.

These days, I often say I am “oppressed on all sides” when I discuss my racial and ethnic background with friends. I use this phrase tongue in cheek to somehow cover up the madness and sorrow that goes with that fact. It was beyond frustrating to understand that all of my ancestors had been victims of genocide, all in the name of a White God, and who in later generations all made the choice to fully assimilate into White culture so deeply that there is now very little connection to our ethnic and spiritual culture.

By ten or eleven, my skin went pale, and I admit that I loved it. I did not get hassled in school anymore, nobody circled me and chanted the ever-popular “Indian war cry” and I didn’t have to ask my mother about why I got teased like that anymore. It just amazes me what white skin affords us in this culture. I now make an active choice to identify myself racially so that I may somehow confront that White power structure and learn to walk a different road, even if it means giving up some of that unearned privilege.

This work is informed by my life’s experience. Because I never learned about my ethnic backgrounds, I became self-motivated to search out answers on my own. As a teenager in the 1980s, I became interested in the American Indian Movement (AIM), though wrought with self-doubt and tremendous insecurities,
I chose to only read about Indians from afar, taking pride in the link I knew was there, but also keeping it to myself.

It was not until I became a mother at twenty-four that I developed a sense of urgency in having some real contact with my people. It is necessary for Indian survival that those of us cloaked by Whiteness come forward and be proud of who we are, and that means more than going to a powwow a couple of times a year. What it means for me and my son is that we involve ourselves in our Indian community, even if our people are not from this part of the country. By becoming involved, we must fight for the rights of all Indian people, and to that end, I hope that this scholarly effort on my part will contribute to an enclave of much needed voices to mobilize future action in an area that needs it: the academy.

It is my hope that this thesis will continue the push for inclusion of American Indian political and cultural issues into the realms of all academic disciplines. It is of vital importance to the recognition and inclusion of American Indian realities in the classroom. I believe that as scholars concerned with race relations in the US, we have the tools to incorporate Indian histories, issues, and struggles into our work. Additionally, it is also our responsibility, as teachers of sociology, to invite activism into the classroom as a push for social change.
Some examples of how popular culture has been helpful in portraying Indians as “Vanishing” are, "...photographic images taken of Sitting Bull following his surrender, nineteenth-century advertising, Native images in early cinema up to 'Dances With Wolves,' representations of Indians in southern history, Florida Seminoles on display for tourists, the national monument at the Battlefield of Little Bighorn, how news frames Native conflicts, sexual images of the Native male, cultural heritage in 'Northern Exposure,' and Indian imagery in 'Dr. Quinn, Medicine Woman' (Hirschfelder, Molin, and Wakin, 1999, p. 263)."
METHODOLOGY

This work is a secondary analysis and is divided into the following sections: Literature Review, Indigenous Activism Post-Relocation, and Indian Realities, Graduated Activism, and Praxis: A Working Pedagogical Practice. Each section is designed to accomplish specific tasks. Utilizing several theorists, American Indians, other writers of color, as well as Whites, I will explore the literature in race studies and demonstrate the way in which American Indian people are left out. I argue that this is part of a larger racial project to erase Indians, contributing to the cultural genocide of a people.

American Indians are symbolically annihilated in academics (I use this language to note the effect of excluding Indians), and their absence in academics ensures their "absense" in what many non-Indian people conceive of as real life. Indians do not become part of the conversation about race and racism hence, they remain marginal. We see the exclusion of American Indians in academics in the lack of theory, research, and lack of funding for further research that would enable useful (read: contemporary) study of social, political, and cultural issues.

In this work, I explore some of the dominant theories in the study of race-relations: the power-conflict model which came out of activist-academic work in the 1960s, internal colonialism, and the development of the study of racial formation (which has elicited significant use in the past fifteen years).
will also examine feminist standpoint theory as well as coalition building and transcommunality, following some elaboration by scholars of color, as it relates to Indian pedagogical activism.

The first two theoretical models (power-conflict and internal colonialism) provided a continued counter-narrative to biological determinism and the assimilation model. However, like the scholars adhering to the assimilation model before them, power/conflict theorists continue to emphasize the Black/White dichotomy in their study of race. This academic emphasis frames the way in which the general public thinks about race relations in the United States.

Various forms of power conflict models, and further elaborations of the internal colonial models, are continuing to be elaborated by scholars of color. Since these models predominate in contemporary sociological analysis, the way these models generally ignore Indian people will be my primary theoretical focus, and is relevant to American Indian scholarship.

In an era where college and university campuses are witnessing the abolishment of affirmative action, *The Bell Curve* is published (and used in classrooms) without peer review, and ethnic studies departments are facing closure, it is no wonder that scholars of color are writing with a fury. Articles, books, and critiques dealing with Indigenous knowledge and discourse are produced by Indian writers such as Vine Deloria, Jr. (1969-1999) and Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (1996) and others who produce works that locate them as part of the
(often excluded) indigenous voices in the Ivory Tower. By providing that voice, by keeping it strong, Indian scholars are forcing an inclusion of Indian political and cultural issues in critical race and ethnic studies.

American Indian scholarship and activism is pushing academic theorizing and forcing a grappling with new ideas. These ideas may also elicit new approaches to the study of race and ethnic relations. I argue that both are interchangeable, with the Indian academic often being an activist simply because of his or her taking up space in the Ivory Tower.

Regardless, however, of the presence of academic and activist voices of American Indians (both full and mixed blood, reservation and non-reservation based, enrolled and non-enrolled tribal members), we remain on the periphery of study. Indian political and cultural issues are more often than not found only in an ethnic studies or Native American studies course, and it is a rare instance that a full section of a sociology course deals with present struggles in Indian Country.

What has been clear to me throughout my research is that as scholars we have very rigid (and clear) boundaries within which we are allowed to operate. Yet, often over-developed solutions do not always fit the problem. American Indian Movement activist Russel Means (1980) writes,

...I detest writing. The process itself epitomizes the European concept of ‘legitimate’ thinking; what is written has an importance that is denied the spoken. My culture, the Lakota culture, has an oral tradition, so I ordinarily reject writing. It is one of the white world’s ways of destroying the cultures of non-European peoples, the imposing of an abstraction over the spoken relationship of a people (P. 32).
On a related note, Edna Bonacich (1989), in a footnote to her article, "Inequality in America: The Failure of the American System for People of Color," writes, "...the western style of academic writing is very much part of the 'white man's' civilization.... I am seeking a more integrated world view and want my method of communication to match the content" (12:96). I, too, am seeking an alternative worldview with which to include American Indians in race studies that is inclusive and sociological, rather than peripheral and anthropological.

In addition to exploring where Indian presence has been erased, I also explore where American Indian scholarship has made inroads. With the rise of Indian activism in the past three decades, many activist-scholars are bringing their activism into the classroom. To reiterate, it seems clear to me that the sheer presence of Indian scholars is activist work. Colleges and universities are set up for learning about Indians in historical and anthropological contexts, and having a presence of Indian scholars in the academy contradicts that framing. So, it’s not just the fact of their presence – it is that they were activists and bring their activist framing into what they do.

I am interested in looking at the work of these academically located Indian activists. I will focus on Vine Deloria, Jr., and Elizabeth Cook-Lynn. These educators are pushing the envelope, as it were, of Indians in higher education because of their activist approach to academics.
My work explicates the development of theoretical analyses around Native issues and attempts to be reflexive as opposed to being an outsider, looking in.

Definitions and Explanations

I should like to address definitions briefly here. On the issue of what language to use when speaking of indigenous people in North America, I have chosen American Indian, Indian, or Native, all of which I use interchangeably. Native American tends to be a more academically used definition, and since this is the very paradigm I am confronting, it seems natural for me to utilize a different "category." Ideally, of course, I would be tribe/nation specific, and I will be throughout my paper when possible, however, it is not something I will be able to do consistently because so many issues in Indian Country affect so many Indian people. Regardless of the fact that there is no "one" group of Native people (not to mention people like myself who are mixed-raced), the terms I have chosen will have to suffice. I have chosen to use them because it is the most widely used (and non-offensive) terminology that I know of among Indian people.

On the issue of terminology, I want to outline definitions I will be using for race, racism, and ethnicity throughout this work. Race, as a biological category, is a fiction (Eichstedt, 1999). Rooted in biological studies of head circumference, muscular abilities, and gross assumptions about people who were
not from "Aryan" stock, the category of race was developed and is used today as a method of categorizing people according to their skin color and/or country of origin. Many scholars, such as historian Audrey Smedley (1999), are pushing for an attempt to do away with the concept of "race" because of its fictional status. Sociologist Martin Marger (1997) writes, "As a result of its confusing usage and its questionable scientific validity, many sociologists and anthropologists have dispensed entirely with the term race and instead use *ethnic group* to describe those groups commonly defined as racial" (pg. 26). However, what then gets left out is what has come out of the use of that racial terminology, which is the formation of racism as a system of oppression. If we do away with the use of "race" as a descriptive term, might we also forgo a necessary and deep analysis of racism?

I am making an active choice to use "race" in my thesis not to reify a "false" category, but because race has real consequences in the world: racism. Race is a myth but there are rules we abide by (for example, as children, we "know" who we are supposed to play with), and it is a fiction, but there are unspoken truths about it (if a person's race is not identified in the media, we can assume that person is White).

I use the definition of racism that Humboldt State University assistant professor of sociology, Jennifer Eichstedt uses in her introduction to race and ethnicity classes for undergraduates. Her definitions are clear and concise, and I find them useful. On racism she writes:
Racism is the systematic oppression of people based on the color of their skin or the racial group to which they have been assigned. ‘Systematic racial oppression,’ or ‘racism,’ goes beyond mistreatment based upon race. For mistreatment to be oppression, it must have three component
1) It must be part of the national consciousness of the dominant culture.
2) It is reinforced through the institutions of society.
3) There is an imbalance of social and economic power (Eichstedt, 1998).

On the definition of race, Ronald Takaki (1993) notes further that,

“Race...has been a social construction that has historically set apart racial minorities from European immigrant groups. (R)ace in America has not been the same as ethnicity” (pg. 10).

Michael Omi and Howard Winant (1986; 1994) define ethnicity as follows: “(E)thnicity (has been) understood as the the result of a group formation process based on culture and descent. ‘Culture’ in this formulation include(s) such diverse factors as religion, language, ‘customs,’ nationality, and political identification” (pg. 15). I use ethnicity to describe the cultural identification people adhere to, as something that “we” are.

To wit, I am an east-coast-roots-second-generation-Californian-Jew, which places me in a very particular tradition of being a cultural Jew, of which the details here are not of particular relevance. If I include my Tsalagi blood, which complicates my ethnicity, I am then multiethnic (particularly if I include the Irish and the Gypsy ancestry). Henceforth, race gets applied from the outside, ethnicity from the inside, from a personal identity construct that
outstretches its arms to become part of a group identity, or in some cases, identities.

In the following section, the Literature Review, I investigate the way in which race analysis has developed over the past thirty years (on par with the period of Indigenous activism I note throughout this work). This review is further broken up into four subsections, “Race Analysis is Black and White,” “Racial Formation: Race Analysis is Still Black and White,” “Race, Class, & Gender Intersections, Coalition Building, and Transcommunality,” and “In the Final Analysis.” Each part explores different waves of the study of race and ethnic relations. The definitions I have outlined above refer to the language I use throughout this thesis, unless otherwise noted.
LITERATURE REVIEW

This section looks at a general history of the study of race and ethnicity in the social sciences during the past thirty years. Due to the confines of this work, I will clearly not be able to take an in-depth look at that history, rather, I will focus on some of the more widely used theories in the field of race and ethnicity during the time of the resurgence of Indian political activism.

I investigate the way in which Indian people are symbolically annihilated via an academic content and pedagogy rooted in Western worldview. My argument, that there is a lack of recognized Indian scholarship in the social scientific perspective on race and ethnic studies as well as a severe lack of inclusion of Indian social, political, and cultural issues, focuses on three main points.

First, I believe that race has, and continues to be, largely constructed in a Black/White dichotomy, and that, despite the strides radical academics have made in the past thirty years, we have yet to expand the way in which we think about race on a pedagogical level.

My second point is that there are writers, however few, who have been challenging this dichotomy. This includes, aside from Indian scholars, about which a chapter of this thesis is dedicated, Elizabeth Martinez, Ronald Takaki, John Brown Childs, and others.
Third, the concepts of racial formation (Omi and Winant, 1986; 1994) are extremely useful for pushing us forward. While Omi and Winant’s own analysis is bi-polar, we can use racial formation concepts to understand the ways this Black/White dichotomy works to marginalize additional “others.” However, to do this we must move beyond the limitations of a dichotomous analysis of race in Omi and Winant’s own work. Omi and Winant’s theory continues in the tradition of looking at racism through a Black and White lens.

For this work, the importance of looking at the past thirty years of the study of race in social science lies in the history of US government and tribal relations. As will be noted further in this work, the “relocation” years (roughly between the mid-1950s through 1970s) had a profound effect on the Indian community at large. Relocation forged a new identity to accommodate drastic changes in the family structures of Indian people. Indian youths from the ‘50s who were forced off their homelands to live with their now-nuclear families grew up to become Urban Warriors, fighting against new types of poverty, and violence perpetrated by city cops. In this era, hundreds of Indians from several tribes around the US and parts of Canada mobilized for a radical return to Indian sovereignty (NARP, 1972).

Despite this action, however, the study of race and ethnicity in the social sciences that came out of this era of vast social change remained on this Black/White paradigm. As a result much interracial and intercommunal activism was ignored, including American Indian issues, but also relationships
among coalition-building groups such as the Black Panthers and gay rights activists (Davis, 1998), which only served to perpetuate a marginalized structure with which to confront the problems of race relations in the US.

**Race Analysis is Black and White**

The Power-Conflict theories of the ‘60s, ‘70s, and ‘80s, and the development of Internal Colonialism is an excellent place to develop a critical analysis of the field because it is here where we see a movement away from both biologistic notions of race and the assimilation model, which were used widely up through the 1960s.

The most popular definition of Internal Colonialism comes out of the work of Robert Blauner (1972), who writes, although in a limited and historical way, of the American Indian experience as a colonized people. It is not until the 1980s and 1990s that internal colonialism as a model is applied to American Indians by American Indians. Whether that scholarship is utilized in the classroom is a question that should be investigated in further study. Blauner defines internal colonialism as follows:

[That which] typically refers to the establishment of domination over a geographically external political unit, most often inhabited by people of a different race and culture, where this domination is political and economic and the colony exists subordinated to and dependent upon the mother country. Typically, the colonizers exploit the land, and raw materials, the labor, and other resources of the colonized nation; a formal recognition is given to the difference in power, autonomy, and political status, and various agencies are set up to maintain this subordination (pg. 83).
Since Blauner's definition of internal colonialism, several social scientists have taken it up and applied it to different groups of people (Ward Churchill [1997], for example, applies it to Indigenous people, and Mario Barrera [1979] employs it to look at Chicano/as). Henceforth, internal colonialism is a useful way in which to include American Indians into race analysis.

While the theories that are most important to this analysis are Power Conflict and Internal Colonial models (including Racial Formation), I will provide a brief background of sociological theory prior to the 1960s. Before the development of Internal Colonialism, there was a rejection of biological determinism theories as early as 1903 at the Chicago School. W.E.B. DuBois's seminal work in the sociology of race relations (The Souls of Black Folk [1903]) planted a seed for future generations of scholars. DuBois' writing smacked of cultural nationalism as he was organizing the Pan-African movement of the early to mid-1900s (Omi and Winant, 1994). Most notably in terms of the development of the study of race in sociology was the way in which DuBois vehemently rejected the biological deterministic theories of the day. It is important to note, however, that DuBois' rejection of biologistic notions of race was a rejection of race analysis in the academy as well.

It was not until the beginning of the 20th century that scholars began to regard race from a sociological perspective (Omi and Winant, 1986; 1994). At the turn of the 20th century, Max Weber also rejected biological determinism,
and DuBois, with his Pan African Movement, discussed race as part of a problem of the sociopolitical climate of the day. As a side note to understanding his lack of recognition, DuBois was excluded from the annual conferences of the American Sociological Association because he was too poor to participate and could not afford to stay in the same hotel as his White colleagues (Henslin, 2000).

By the 1920s, Chicago sociologist Robert Park was using ecological language to explain race relations in the urban center. He believed that the positive progression of race relations in the United States was inevitable, and used an ecological model of the inner city of Chicago to demonstrate this.

He later developed a race-relations ‘cycle’, which had four stages leading to the assimilation of European immigrants: contact, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation (Eichstedt, 1998). Prior to assimilating into White culture in the US, each European immigrant group underwent exploitative racism in American cities, including the Irish, Jews, and Italians.

Over time, Park argued that all groups eventually assimilated and that assimilation was the key to healthier race relations in the United States. The argument put forth by Park was that assimilation was inevitable by virtue of his four stages, or cycles, as previously mentioned. Contact, according to Park, does not necessarily have to be voluntary or involuntary, positive or negative (as it has historically been both). The second stage, competition, Park refers to as a normal period of social evolution, with groups competing for the better things in
life. *Accommodation*, the third stage, entails the minority group accommodating to the dominant group, which already presents an uneasy state of equilibrium when the immigrant or minority group begins to give up pieces of their culture such as language or religion. The final stage, *assimilation*, is where people become fully integrated into the dominant culture. One of the most successful ways in which this has been done in the United States is through intermarriage, where we see people marrying out of their culture, and into the dominant, or White, culture.

While the assimilation model was developed by Park in the 1920s, its popularity remained strong during the 1950s and 1960s when immigrants were assimilating at a faster pace than Latino/as and Blacks in the US. The 1950s, when the assimilation model was being applied vigorously to a variety of groups, was also a very important time in Indian history. However, assimilationist theorists did not look at Indians, who were, at the time, dealing with the beginnings of the "relocation" years, the specifics of which are elaborated on further.

With the coming of the politically charged era of the 1960s, scholars shifted their focus to challenge institutionalized oppression. Out of this focus came elaborations on earlier power-conflict theories, which stressed that what causes inequality is external to, or outside of, the subordinate group. The idea is that *structural* causes of inequality must be addressed in order to better understand and challenge those inequalities. An example would be to alter...
structures so they do not replicate racism — and to set up clear guidelines that operate at a structural and institutional level. At the most basic level, Power-Conflict theorists argue that the general pattern or problem of a specific marginalized group is one of exclusion and exploitation, which is embodied in existing social, economic, and political structures.

Interesting to note here, is the way in which scholars in the early 1970s critiqued assimilation models, and thereby began to use the Internal Colonial model. Robert Blauner (1972) offered a provocative analysis of Park’s model, noting the way in which Indians are left out. To wit,

In recent years third world nationalists have pointed out the ideological repressiveness implicit in the assumption that the cultural traditions of people of color are either nonexistent or less valuable than those of the dominant society. They have noted how social scientists have tended to ignore or distort the experiences and values of such groups as Indians and Mexicans, who have long histories of resistance to assimilation (pg. 7).

What happened to analyses such as this one, which called for inclusion of American Indian people, and critiqued those theories in which they were/are left out? It seems as though, for sociology, such calls were virtually ignored, at least until sociologist Stephen Cornell (1988) wrote *The Return of the Native; American Indian Political Resurgence*. Prior to this, Native people were largely absent from the sociological race relations literature.

At the same time, conflict theories provide same analysis of dominant groups. For instance, Henslin (2000) argues that conflict theorists see the
"dominant group (as) almost always consider(ing) its privileged position to be
due to its own innate superiority" (pg. 262). There are six major themes to
Power-Conflict analysis within which to operate (although there are several sub-
themes as well). First, there is a central concern for racial and ethnic
inequalities in economics, power and resources (Eichstedt, 1998). Power
conflict theorists who emphasize this theme look at the ways in which scarce
resources are distributed in society, who ends up in positions of power, and why.
Such analysis also looks critically at institutional discrimination.

The focus on institutional discrimination, as a term, was popularized by
Black Panther Party members Stokley Charmichael and Charles V. Hamilton in
the 1960s (Omi and Winant, 1986; 1994). A simple definition of institutional
discrimination (Ferrante, 1998), is as follows: "The established and customary
way of doing things in society – the unchallenged rules, policies, and day-to-day
practices that impede or limit minority members' achievements and keep them
in a subordinate and disadvantaged position" (pg. 317). A concrete example of
institutional discrimination is provided by Patricia Hill Collins (1990) who
writes,
Many Black women turn to the informal labor market and to government transfer payments to avoid being called out of their names and asked out of their clothes. In 1980 approximately one-half of all Black women age 16 and over were not in the formal labor force. School attendance, child care responsibilities, retirement, and poor health are all factors affecting nonworking women (McGhee, 1984). A considerable proportion supported themselves through varying combinations of low-wage jobs and government transfer payments such as Social Security and Aid to Families with Dependent Children, payments that reduced their dependence on the informal economy (pg. 63).

Institutionalized discrimination has been highlighted over the past few decades by conflict theorists who study racial and ethnic minorities. However, most of this work focuses on Blacks, Latina/os, Asian Americans, gays and lesbians, and women (single and/or teenage mothers, most notably). I have, in my research, yet to see the Power-Conflict theme as listed above, be applied in a substantial way to American Indians.

A second theme of Power-Conflict theory emphasizes the interrelationships of racial inequality, class and economic inequality, and the subordination of women (Eichstedt, 1998). For example, this theme might investigate the way in which systems of racism, classism, and sexism intersect and cross-cut each other.

Another major characteristic of Power-Conflict theory looks at the role of government in legalizing exploitation and segregation and in defining race and ethnic relations (Eichstedt, 1998). This characteristic looks at the way in which power is consolidated and how the government and legal system works to mask racial oppression. A contemporary example of this is the political
imprisonment of Leonard Peltier or Mumia Abu-Jamal, both of whom have endless evidence to their defense, yet remain incarcerated seemingly without a chance at any sort of future freedom. Fourth, there is an emphasis on the role of coercion, segregation, and institutionalized discrimination in keeping groups at the bottom rungs of society (Eichstedt, 1998).

Next, Power-Conflict theories address the forced character of much cultural and economic adaptation, in other words, this theme addresses the fact that many groups do not choose to live where they are living (Eichstedt, 1998). An example of the focus is found in Loic Wacquant’s (1990) attempt to explain the dynamics of economic deprivation in the inner city. His definition of the “hyper ghetto” was one which described people living in a state of terror and hopelessness. In terms of theoretical explanation, Wacquant (1990) argued that structural forces shaped that particular community and forced the ghetto community to increase the percentage of negative aspects such as violence, drugs, and unemployment.

Additionally, he notes that ghettos like the Shaw do not just “happen” and contrary to public opinion, people do not necessarily have the choice to come and go as they choose. Hyper-ghettoization, according to Wacquant’s analysis, is caused by economic and political roots such as corporate disinvestments, racial segmentation, housing discrimination, and migration by wealthier minorities into the suburbs (Wacquant, 1990).
Finally, many Power-Conflict theories focus on, or at least recognize resistance to domination on the part of oppressed groups (Eichstedt, 1998). Omi and Winant (1986; 1994) illustrate this aspect with their explanation of the rise of Black Nationalism in the mid-1960s, the crux of which lies at a theoretical convergence. According to the authors, nationalism is “a resultant of disparate currents. Nationalist currents have always existed in the US – in the form of minority-based political movements – responding to perceived failures of racial accommodation and integration. Nation-based approaches to race also have a long theoretical tradition, which analyzes in diverse ways the realities of racial separation and white supremacy” (pg. 36).

An excellent example of the way in which this Power-Conflict theme has been used by writers is out of their firsthand experience in the Black Power movement (specifically, Angela Davis, Stokely Charmichael, and Charles V. Hamilton). Omi and Winant (1986;1994) discuss the period of social change during the 1960s and 1970s as “The Great Transformation.” During this time, they state, the political climate was confronted with the emergence of “New Social Movements”, led by the Black Power Movement.

According to Omi and Winant (1986; 1994), “The black movement redefined the meaning of racial identity, and consequently of race itself (italics in original)” (pg. 98). What is usually left out of popular analyses of the Black Power movement are those which elicit the intersections of race, class, and gender. Angela Davis, Elizabeth Martinez, and Patricia Hill Collins write in this
vein, offering critiques of studies of institutional discrimination that omit the experiences of women of color, poor White women, and lesbians. So perhaps it is not surprising that many alliances among people of color are left out. To wit, in a 1970 edition of a Black Panther Party newspaper, “Huey Newton wrote an article urging an end to verbal gay bashing, urging an examination of black male sexuality, and calling for an alliance with the developing gay liberation movement” (Davis, 1998, pg. 292).

The themes of the Power Conflict and Internal Colonial models are marked by important guideposts for what should be considered. However, while the theories provide an analytical context with which to look at Native social, political, and cultural issues, a deep analysis remains absent. In the next two sections, I look at Racial formation, followed by the development of coalition building, transcommunality, and the intersection of race, class, and gender. In these pages, I explore the way in which race analysis has developed and the level of inclusion (or lack thereof) of Indian issues.

**Racial Formation: Race Analysis is Still Black and White**

In an effort to explore racism, Michael Omi and Howard Winant (1986; 1994) employ a new theoretical language with which to explore the polity of the state and public policy with their book, *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. The authors work off an internal colonial model of race theory in their description of “Racial Formation,” which is historically
defined by several situational “projects.” The authors define race as: “...a concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies” (pg. 55). This definition captures the reality of *racism* by adhering to a model of collective action, rather than individual thought, which I believe to be more akin to a definition of prejudice.

Omi and Winant define racial formation “as the sociohistorical process by which racial categories are created, inhabited, transformed, and destroyed” (pg. 55). Further, the way in which these processes are analyzed is by looking at “situated *projects* in which human bodies and social structures are represented and organized” (pg. 55). The writers define projects as, “simultaneously an interpretation, representation, or explanation of racial dynamics, and an effort to reorganize and redistribute resources along particular racial lines” (ibid.), which “are at the heart of racial formation” (pg. 60). The way in which these projects are defined in their work continues to operate on a Black/White dichotomy, thereby contributing to the symbolic annihilation of American Indians. Like American history textbooks at large, Native people are erased from critical analysis in higher education (Loewen, 1995).

Racial Formation as a model with which to look critically at race relations works well because it is a theory that does not assume exclusivity in terms of a Western worldview (perhaps it would be possible, then, to look at the racial formation of people in other countries as well). Surprising, or perhaps not so, is the way in which these writers still operate in a Black/White dichotomy,
even with a theory accessible to other groups of people of color. While they are inclusive however on a minor level of Asian Americans and immigrants, Chicano/as and Latino/as, Omi and Winant fail to recognize the achievements of American Indian political and cultural growth in the period the book analyses: the 1960s to the 1990s. For this section, I offer a brief critical analysis of their work.

Omi and Winant’s work, while useful in creating tools for developing a critical analysis of racial projects used by the US government to keep Indian people at the bottom rungs of society, is also deeply problematic because it continues in the tradition of operating in a Black/White dichotomy. Similar to the ways Indians are generally only represented in the context of history, Omi and Winant symbolically annihilate Indigenous activist contributions to social change by only dedicating one page to covering the location of American Indians. Their coverage, however, only serves the Vanishing Indian concept, because their analysis ends at the beginning: first contact of the explorers. Thus, they adhere to a popular methodology of “acknowledge-it-and-move-on” with a quick and dismissive sentence or two\(^1\). In their description of the *Evolution of Modern Racial Awareness* (pg. 61), the writers only acknowledge the project as one which, “signaled a break from the previous proto-racial awareness by which Europe contemplated its ‘Others’ in a relatively disorganized fashion” (pg. 62). The rest of the book maintains their focus on Black/White dynamics.
The first part of Omi and Winant’s book deals with the paradigms of race, ethnicity, class, and nation, where the writers discuss the way in which language defines how we think about racism and discrimination. I do not wish to comment extensively on this portion of the book, however, I want to note that their history of these paradigmatic developments are thorough, given what they cover. Still, they do adhere to the Black/White dichotomy in their descriptions and definitions. To wit, in “Nation”, the writers give notable significance to the Black Power movement as an almost ideal-type of cultural nationalism. Nevertheless, they argue that “...nation-based theory is fundamentally rooted in the dynamics of colonialism” and that, “In the nation-based paradigm, racial dynamics are understood products of colonialism and, therefore, as outcomes of relationships which are global and ephochal in character” (pg. 37). Given this critical definition, it would seem that something is amiss. They have the tools and the information with which to include the Red Power movement (a movement which collaborated with other groups such as Chicano/a and African American) of this same era, yet make an active choice not to include it.

Perhaps where Indians are most sorely left out in Omi and Winant’s analysis is in their discussion of Cultural Nationalism, which the writers define as, “...focus(ing) less on the political and economic elements of the nation-based approach than it has on cultural elements which gave rise to collective identity, community, and a sense of ‘peoplehood’” (pg 40). It is within this sense of ‘collective identity’ and ‘peoplehood’ that urban Indians mobilized for
radical social change during the Great Transformation, and forged a new pan-
Indian identity. This pan-Indian collective organization is represented by groups
such as Indians of All Nations, Inc. who orchestrated the takeover of Alcatraz
Island in 1969, and AIM. These events are completely ignored in *Racial
Formation*.

There is also no mention of American Indians in their discussion of
Internal Colonialism, a theory which nearly all Indian scholars have applied to
indigenous populations in the US who, quite literally, live in a “nation within a
nation.” It seems as though, given the theory of internal colonialism, Indian
people would not only be included in the discussion, but be the main focus. A
more in-depth discussion of the application of internal colonialism by Indian
scholars is included in a chapter of this thesis, but for now, I will note Omi and
Winant’s four elements (which draw on Mario Barrera [1979] and Robert
Blauner [1972]), which are as follows:

1. A colonial *geography* emphasizing the territoriality or spatial
   arrangement of population groups along racial lines;
2. A dynamic of *cultural domination and resistance*, in which racial
categories are utilized to distinguish between antagonistic
colonizing and colonized groups, and conversely, to emphasize
the essential cultural unity and autonomy of each;
3. A system of *superexploitation*, understood as a process by which extra-
   economic coercion is applied to the racially identified colonized
groups, with the aim of increasing the economic resources
appropriated by the colonizers;
4. Institutionalization of *externally based control*, such as that the racially
   identified colonized group is organized in essential political and
   administrative aspects by the colonizers or their agents (pg. 45).
By focusing this model as it relates only significantly to Blacks, Omi and Winant limit the usefulness of internal colonialism. Instead, I believe the theory could be used to analyze the position of different racial and ethnic boundaries to include a plethora of experiences including those of poor Whites (both in inner cities as well as rural communities, such as in Appalachia).

Henceforth, racial formation, as a conceptual tool for race analysis is useful for all groups of people living under circumstances elicited in the power-conflict model and internal colonialism. Racial formation theory has an interesting link with internal colonialism and standpoint theory. Racial formation and the idea of projects is useful because it can be specified to historical and situational circumstances for different groups. In this way it shares certain characteristics with standpoint theory. These theories lay out the parameters of experiences that groups experience, and the experience of Internal Colonialism shapes the resources available to groups, the parameters in which they operate.

What I would like to suggest is further work in race and ethnic studies that is inclusive of American Indians, and that by using the language of racial formation, there can be some possible implications for social change. Omi and Winant call for the opposition of racism to be rooted in our simply noticing race. To wit, “By noticing race we can begin to challenge racism…” (pg. 159). But in order to notice race, racial formation ideology must be inclusive of American Indians, who are part of one of the most successful projects in our history: that
which has rendered Native people nearly invisible in the landscape of race and ethnic studies in academics. Another body of theory which will be useful in that which explores the intersections of race, class, and gender. Most specifically multi-racial feminism, and that which focuses on coalition building and transcommunality.

**Race, Class, and Gender Intersections, Coalition-Building, and Transcommunality**

Scholarship and activism began to meld out of the political movements of the 1960s and 1970s, and writers emerged in an attempt to look at intersections of race, class, and gender. Various groups of people of color, poor Whites, as well as gays and lesbians began to work together for social change, and coalition-building strengthened in activist circles. Academic writing of those activist scholars provided a thrust for the development of ethnic studies departments in the ’70s, ’80s, and ’90s. These movements helped make the university system more accessible for people of color and White radical thinkers. As a result of the movement of activists into academics, the concept of anti-racism as a grass roots idea appeared within the academy.

Following the rise of ethnic and women’s studies departments in colleges and universities, scholars of color and White women began blending with other disciplines and developed some useful frameworks with which to look critically at the intersections of race, class, and gender in the United States. In the 1980s
and 1990s, Feminist Standpoint Theory was developed by women of color who rejected the White-centric focus of mainstream feminism. Patricia Hill Collins’ (1990) development of feminist standpoint theory looked at the ways in which women of color could bring an enriched analysis of gender and race because of their direct experiences of oppression.

Patricia Hill Collins (1990) developed a Black woman’s standpoint theory as a way to understand the experiences of people without an academic voice. She explains as follows:

Individual African-American women have long displayed varying types of consciousness regarding our shared angle of vision. By aggregating and articulating these individual expressions of consciousness, a collective, focused group consciousness into an articulated, self-defined, collective standpoint is key to Black women’s survival. As Audre Lorde points out, ‘it is axiomatic that if we do not define ourselves for ourselves, we will be defined by others – for their use and to our detriment’ (1984, 45).

African-American women draw on this Afrocentric worldview to cope with racial oppression. But far too often Black women’s Afrocentric consciousness remains unarticulated and not fully developed into a self-defined standpoint. In societies that denigrate African ideas and peoples, the process of valuing an Afrocentric worldview is the result of self-conscious struggle (pg. 27).

Hill Collins’ standpoint theory cut across race, class, and gender-based experiences, and is somewhat useful in terms of fighting the oppression one faces every day. For Black women, Hill Collins posited, a collective voice was essential for survival in a world where people of color, particularly women, were (and are) indeed being defined by others.
Standpoint theory articulated the specificity of experience of oppressed people, and enabled different groups of people of color to begin dialoguing with one another about commonalities and differences in experiences. In one such dialogue, Angela Davis and Elizabeth Martinez (1994) produced “Coalition Building Among People of Color.”

In this discussion, Davis and Martinez answered a series of interview questions around issues of coalition building. Specifically, what works, how it can work better, etc. Martinez’s opening comment defined much of the discussion. She posited that, “…we have to reject any hierarchy of needs of different communities. The whole idea of making a hierarchy of demands is sure death from the beginning…we have to fight together because there is a common enemy” (pg. 297). Davis added, “…this idea of ‘spending more time with one’s own group’ needs to be interrogated. How would you define ‘one’s own group’? For African-Americans, would that include every person who meets the requirements of physical appearance or every person who identifies as African-American, regardless of their phenotype? I think we need to be more reflective” (pg. 299).

The work of Davis and Martinez was seminal in creating an ongoing dialogue that pushes academic perspectives of race relations to new ways of theorizing. This is evidenced in the work of University of Santa Cruz sociology professor, John Brown Childs (1990) who writes about transcommunality.
Brown Childs is one of the few scholars focusing specifically on coalition building from an Indigenous perspective. He proposes, “that there is a way to maintain particularistic rooted affiliations, while creating broad constellations of inclusive cooperation that draw from multitudes of distinctly rooted perspectives. I call this way of cooperation ‘Transcommunality’” (pg. 145). Brown Childs has developed a possible way for coalition builders to successfully communicate and push for social change in the way of the Iroquois Confederacy’s Great Law of Peace Kaianerekowa (10th-15th Century), which aided in creating the US Constitution (September 17, 1737) (Hadley, 1995). Further, Brown Childs remarks:

Transcommunal cooperation emphasizes coordinated heterogeneity across ‘identity lines,’ not only of those such as ‘ethnicity,’ ‘race,’ ‘class,’ and ‘gender,’ but also of organizational, philosophical, and cosmologically diverse settings. Transcommunality entails a changed way of thinking, a paradigm shift, or to use the Andean indigenous terminology of Pachukutiq, ‘a change of direction’ (Delgado-P, 1995a: 1) that moves beyond the classic Eurocentric progressive emphasis on homogenizing ‘unity’ based on the leadership of a ‘vanguard party,’ while also escaping from the aimless, ever-splintering relativism of postmodernism’s emphasis on ‘diversity’ and multiculturalism (pg. 145).

In its essence, transcommunality works for coalition building because it is contrary to a Eurocentric world view, and much closer to an Indigenous one, which sees connections in all things.

While mainstream sociological thinking remains focused on a Black/White binary, these last theories I have explored demonstrate important contributions which move us past this binary. In particular, those which focus
on the ways that structural location may shape different groups' interpretations of the world, and shape identities with a consideration for that group's own efforts at self-identification and resistance to racism. Transcommunality is important as it is inclusive of group experience on par with coalition building and standpoint theory, yet it takes another step towards inclusion Native people by acknowledging Indigenous theory.

In The Final Analysis

The history of the study of race presented here is indicative of the slow pace of the social sciences when studying race relations in America. The fact that American Indians are significantly left out of social analyses of race is no mistake: most theorists are White. This is an important fact to notice, particularly because of the absence of American Indians from race analysis. There is an academic focus on Black-White relations, why is there an absence of an analysis on Indian-White relations? While Whiteness was constructed in relation to both Indianness and Blackness, scholars have not been able to ignore the experience of Blacks in the US. Perhaps this is a result of the visibility factor at the urban center, and the invisibility factor of the reservation.

Further, most social science theorists are generally concerned with teaching students about race and rarely profess to be focused on fighting racism. However, the theories focused on here, Internal Colonialism, Standpoint Theory, and Racial Formation are viable tools with which to look at Native issues.
To continue to operate in a Black/White dichotomy is to continue to push Indian issues off to the side, perpetuating the symbolic annihilation of an entire group of people. Aside from the typical “drive-by” (mostly anthropological) research on reservations, Indians are virtually left out of the studies of race, as well as economic disparities. Perhaps this is part of the refusal of many Indians to include themselves in governmental population measurement tools. The mere difference in psychological worldviews speaks to this.

Indians, a severely marginalized group in the US, suffer from discrimination patterns replicated in pedagogical frameworks, as has been demonstrated here. So the question, is then, “What are the ways in which we can bring Native issues to the classroom and be inclusive while we do it?” The section, “Indian Realities, Graduated Activism, and Praxis: A Working Pedagogical Practice” is a hopeful and humble attempt at beginning to look at the ways in which sociologists interested in race analysis can do just that. In the words of Vine Deloria, Jr. (2000), “…unless and until we are in some way connected with world history as early peoples, perhaps even as refugees from Old World turmoils and persecutions, we will never be accorded full humanity. We cannot be primitive peoples who were suddenly discovered half a millennium ago. The image and interpretation are all wrong, and we are regarded as freaks outside historical time” (pg. 76).

1 Smedley (1999) writes in this vein when she mentions briefly Indian-White relations at first contact. However, she does not elaborate on the experience of Native peoples further.
This section presents a very brief synopsis of American Indian activism over the past thirty years, noting the importance of the development of an urban Indian identity, and the ways in which activism is linked to the development of Indigenous knowledge in the academy. It is here where I will present what has been significantly left out of race analysis from the 1960s on, as presented in the previous section.

While activism has always been a part of the American Indian political climate, at least since the late-15th century Doctrine of Discovery, it is between 1969 and 1971, with the occupation of Alcatraz Island that Indian activism became more visible in the public sphere (Cornell, 1988 and Johnson, 1997). This activism was a direct response to specific events which began in earnest in the post-WWII era of what is now referred to as the “relocation years.”

During the 1960s and 1970s it was not uncommon for Indian students to be taking classes on “Native American culture” taught by White anthropologists (Deloria, 1999). The anthropology classes focused on bones and artifacts, with an historical bent, that did not acknowledge Indian presence in the contemporary public sphere, let alone an Indian presence on campus.

During relocation, the capitalist money economy intensely affected Native people, particularly when disagreements erupted within their community.
Many Indians were attracted to the “American Dream” of ownership, and bought into the notions of capitalism. (Even as far back as 1924, Indians could legally buy into this notion of capitalism when it became legal for Indians to become US citizens.)

The “Relocation Years”

A series of racialized projects were acted out by the Federal Government, one of the most intense being the Relocation Program, which would serve to displace Indian people in such a way that a new identity was inevitable for urban (and reservation) Indian survival. The Federal Relocation Program of 1954 was a step towards ending Indian identity and promoting American assimilation.

Reservation Indians were “moved” into urban areas, where they would receive a small Federal subsidy, and quickly be cut off under the governmental policy. When they were relocated as nuclear families, they were far from other members of their extended families and tribal members. With the Relocation Program, Indians were dumped in the poorest areas of the cities of Los Angeles, San Francisco, Boston, New York City, Chicago, and Detroit (Hadley, 1995). The assumption behind the Relocation Program was that Indians’ experience would be identical to White European immigrants, that is, they would assimilate. This model had a “bootstraps” mentality (Omi and Winant, 1986; 1994) which says, “the ‘difference’ that characterizes a minority group, once incorporated,
will be outweighed by the ‘commonality’ it shares with the majority” (pg. 21).

Henceforth, the “differences” of reservation Indians would eventually be outweighed by the “commonality” of White urban life, and assimilation would be almost a natural turn of events. However, as also mentioned, racial formation aptly applies to Indian people and is applicable here. Omi and Winant (1986; 1994) write, “Successful achievement of mobility – the achievement of high group status – reflects group willingness and ability to accept the norms and values of the majority” (pg. 21). Or so it is assumed, and was at least partially, during these years.

Many argue, myself included, that this so-called “bootstraps” model was merely an interpretive guise for cultural genocide. Ward Churchill (1997) quotes the United Nations’ definition of cultural genocide as meaning,

the destruction of the specific character of the targeted group(s) through destruction or expropriation of its means of economic perpetuation; prohibition or curtailment of its language; suppression of its religious, social or political practices; destruction or denial of access to its religious or other sites, shrines, or institutions; destruction or denial of use and access to objects of sacred or sociocultural significance; forced dislocation, expulsion or dispersal of its members; forced transfer or removal of its children, or any other means (pg. 433).

To put it mildly, indigenous people of this land experienced (and continue to endure) horrendous displacement and abuses, being forced off Native-possessed lands, and had every aspect of culture turned upside-down. For Indians, the urbanization of American cities during the relocation period affected the very core of life on the reservation. During relocation, they were forced to leave their lands and extended families and travel to cities to work,
often forever severing blood lines. More often than not there was no choice but to assimilate at least to the point of subsistence.

The Relocation Program falls under the rubric of cultural genocide because it sought to eradicate the cultural lifestyles of Native people, and so the attitude of a bootstraps model of assimilation served to annihilate a "traditional" culture. Out of this experience came a whole cohort of young "Urban Indians" who vehemently rejected the forced assimilation. Their experience was formerly rooted in the Urban center, and out of this experience grew the Pan-tribal movement, Indian of All Nations, Inc., shortly followed by the development of AIM. Within the cities, Indians set up intertribal councils and Friendship Houses in order to keep some semblance of community (Fortunate Eagle, 1992).

Rejection of forced assimilation led to a series of events which gave a boost for urban Indian activism. The first event was the nineteen month takeover of Alcatraz Island from 1969-1971. The activities following the Occupation included over seventy building and land takeovers (Johnson, Nagel, and Champagne, 1997), country and state wide marches, as well as the development of an intimate relationship with the FBI/CIA organization, Counter-Intelligence Program (COINTELPRO).

The period from 1969 (Occupation of Alcatraz) to 1978 (The Longest Walk) is referred to now as the Alcatraz-Red Power Movement (ARPM) and was "predominantly a struggle to secure redress for overwhelming conditions of
political, cultural, and economic disadvantage that mirrored the long history of Indian poverty, not only on reservations, but more recently in urban environments" (Johnson, Nagel, and Champagne, 1997, pg. 9).

Another important aspect in Indian activism and the development of ARPM was the American Indian Movement (AIM). In 1968, AIM was founded in Minneapolis when Indian urban communities were being harassed by police. Out of anger and betrayal and rooted in hundreds of years of indigenous resistance in the U.S., AIM members established themselves in 1968. They organized against police brutality, racism, and poverty. Initially urban-based and predominantly centered in the Dakotas and Nebraska, AIM quickly spread to both urban ghettos and rural reserve areas.

American Indian protest has been a part of the public landscape over the past thirty years with the development of the American Indian Movement (AIM) as well as other pro-Indian groups vying for social change. Following the relocation years, protest remained constant in Indian Country as well as in the greater United States, and is always in reaction to Indian-White relations.

It is important to recognize this era of activism because of the development of ethnic studies and Native American Indian studies programs around the country during and after the Alcatraz-Red Power Movement (ARPM) years of 1969 to 1978. Activism moved from the streets (although there is now and always will be “street” activism and occupations around Indian issues) to the Ivory Tower as Indian people pushed colleges and Universities for entry and
Indian scholars demanding textbooks reflecting contemporary experiences of living Indian communities, rather than the anthropologicohistorical textbooks of the day (Johnson, 2000). Given the importance of this era, I will now briefly explore it in the next section, where I provide a humble description of some of the events of the Alcatraz-Red Power Movement.

**A Decade of Red Power**

As Troy Johnson (1999) points out in an introduction of *Contemporary Native American Political Issues*, resistance has always been a part of Indian-White relations. At first contact, “Native American people rose up in groups and Indian prophets rose up individually to promote active resistance against the new invaders” (pg. 12). He continues that, “Prophets such as Handsome Lake, Tecumseh, Tenskwatawa, Neolin, Deganawida, and Wovoka led activism movements intended to repel or lessen the impact of the European onslaught” (pg. 9). I would add to his list of prophets and activists, Sarah Winnemucca (Paiute), who traveled around America in the 1860s speaking out about tribal issues, Minnie Hollow Wood (Sioux), the only woman in her tribe to wear a warbonnet during the 1920s, and Susan Laflesche (Omaha), the first female Indian physician (Green, 1992). It was in the following century, however, that the actions of Indian people became a movement toward recognition of all tribes as hundreds of Indians from all over the US mobilized for social change.
The ARPM began with the Occupation of Alcatraz Island in 1969. On November 20, Indians representing various tribes seized Alcatraz Island, an isolated island in the San Francisco Bay (Johnson, 1997). The purpose of the occupation included a plan for use of the space, including a center for Native American Studies, an American Indian spiritual center, an Indian center of ecology, and a “Great Indian Training School” (Fortunate Eagle, 1992).

Two events preceded the takeover and informed the plan of action for permanent Indian occupation: the burning down of a San Francisco Indian Center and a struggle at San Francisco State University to develop an Indian curriculum (Hadley, 1995). It was these events that motivated Indian people to take action, one which would provide a much needed space for Indian education and political action. This was obvious by a converted sign erected by the occupiers at Alcatraz which read in part, “United Indian Land,” reflecting the demand for the return of Indian land.

By mid-November, seventy-eight people moved onto the Island, and the concept of Pan-Indianism took flight as members of several tribes banded together for nineteen months (Fortunate Eagle, 1992). The occupation ended abruptly when, while members were shopping for supplies in San Francisco, police seized the Island and arrested those occupying the space (Hadley, 1995).

There were, however, some Native activist/scholars who felt the occupation needed to be in conjunction with some type of “program.” During
this time of activism, Deloria (1999) rejected the "seizure" type of event.

Deloria states,

My role in Alcatraz was sporadic and, in a few instances, not welcomed by some of the activists on the Rock. While I was director of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), I had worked for several years with the people in the Bay Area as part of the NCAI's concern for relocated Indians. I entered law school in fall 1967 and, by the time of the occupation, had already written *Custer Died for Your Sins*, which was released in early October 1969. Some years before, Richard MacKenzie and others had briefly landed on Alcatraz, and, in the years since that first invasion, Bay Area activists such as Adam Nordwall [Fortunate Eagle] had disrupted Columbus Day celebrations and, with some modest successes, generally tried to focus the attention of Bay Area politics on urban Indian problems.

"...Nordwall saw that the occupation would flounder unless it was tied to some larger philosophical issue that could be seen by the American public as important to their own concerns for justice. [In a meeting on the Island] we pointed out that a sensible program had to be articulated so that the administration could act, but we got not positive response (pp. 244-245).

Although the activists occupying the Island received droves of media (including a brief visit from television personality, Merv Griffin), *governmental* recognition of their efforts was in the form of arresting officers.

Following the occupation of Alcatraz, Indian activists (primarily AIM members) led American Indians in resistance on several occasions, such as the occupation of Plymouth Rock and the Mayflower ship replica to protest the celebration of "Thanksgiving Day" in 1970.

In 1972, Indian people from all corners of the country participated in "The Trail of Broken Treaties." AIM members staged a takeover of the BIA headquarters in Washington, DC following a series of failed broken promises by the BIA. AIM called for a radical return to Indian sovereignty, renegotiations of
all treaties, restoration of a 110-million acre land base, traditional culture, and exemption from all state laws (Nabokov, 1991). “The Trail of Broken Treaties” was meant to be a peaceful demonstration, in which thousands of Indians from all across the country attended. Upon their arrival, BIA informed the protestors (who were calling for US recognition of the state of Native America during this time): that they would not be permitted to conduct a blessing; they were evicted from reserved offices before they arrived; and housing that was set up for upwards of 10,000 people fell through (Hadley, 1995). As a result of the latter, people (including women, children, and elders) were forced to sleep in cars, subways, parks, and floors (ibid.). In response to this treatment, demonstrators occupied and destroyed the offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) (Dill, 1997).

Only a short time later, another event took place for which AIM is perhaps most infamous. On February 27, 1973, on the Pine Ridge reservation in South Dakota, AIM led what would come to be known as Wounded Knee II.

The event started when Sioux elders and traditionalists from the Oglala Sioux Pine Ridge reservation, requested the support of AIM in order to oppose the existing tribal council. This council was run with an iron fist by the BIA and Pine Ridge reservation chairman, Richard “Dick” Wilson. Traditionalists claimed that Wilson, backed by his authoritarian tribal police and local BIA officials, was denying the traditionalists a voice in tribal government. Eventually, 250 AIM members set up camp at Wounded Knee, the same site
where US troops massacred more than 200 Sioux (two-thirds of them women and children) in 1890.

Occupyng the reservation community church and general store, AIM riflemen posed with guns, as the national media exploited the spectacle of embattled Indians. AIM members were surrounded by the most heavily armed force of white soldiers to confront Indians in this century (Nabokov, 1991). Members of the FBI, CIA, and the BIA surrounded AIM members and held them hostage. Shots were fired, and two AIM members were killed in crossfire. The ensuing trial and conviction of AIM member Leonard Peltier provided a lightning rod for new Indian protests in the 1970s and into this century.

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, members of AIM would appear at court hearings, protests, and patrol urban areas with a high density of American Indians. AIM focused on the need Indian people had for protection from the police. According to AIM member Vernon Bellcourt, (Chippewa):

[AIM] got evidence of [police] beating and ripping people around with handcuffs too tight, ripping their wrist. It was very vicious. This sometimes becomes a way of life for the police. They just fall into it. They think that’s the way Indians have to be treated. So AIM would show up and have attorneys ready. Often they would beat the police back to the station. They would have a bondsman there, and they’d start filing lawsuits against the police department... (Nabokov, p. 361).

As a result of American Indian activism, several Federal Acts were passed in the 1970s and select land claims reverted back to tribes. State power over reservation Indians was curtailed in the areas of taxation, civil court jurisdiction, and Indian child welfare proceedings. For example, “The Indian
Self-Determination Act and Educational Assistant Act of 1975, formed within the Nixon administration, gave tribes the right to administer federal assistance and wrested control of such programs from the government officials who had dominated reservation affairs for a century (Josephy, 1991).

The Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act was also important in terms of the development of Indian activism within academics as it enabled an increase in the number of Indians who were able to obtain advanced degrees. According to Getches, Wilkinson, and Williams (1993), “Altogether, there are now more than 127,000 Native Americans enrolled in colleges and universities across the country. In 1993, $31.5 million was budgeted for scholarships: $29 million for undergraduate students and $2.5 million for graduate students. Fewer than 2% of all Native Americans have completed graduate or professional degrees, but the numbers are increasing” (pg. 19). These numbers are a direct result of the post-relocation activism.

The result of the activism that came out of the “Decade of Red Power” set the stage for the scholarship that followed. The Education act set the stage for Native students to enroll in colleges around the country. These students continue to occupy space in the classrooms today. The next section focuses on the ways in which Indian scholarship has flourished because of the struggles Native activists went through in the 1960s and 1970s. Additionally, I investigate the work of two Native scholars, Vine Deloria, Jr. and Elizabeth Cook-Lynn as representative of the span of Indigenous scholarship.
Indian activism of the 1960s and 1970s brought a fresh perspective to the academy. Thus, Indian activism does not only take place at sites such as Pine Ridge and Alcatraz, but also in the academy, where we are beginning to see some minor changes. It is, however, very necessary for outside action to continue and be supported by Indians and their supporters in the academy.

Native activists entered the academy in an effort to deal with the institutional racism within college campuses. Thus, Indian activism continued on university campuses. Some of these scholar/activists include Vine Deloria, Jr. (2000), Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (1996), Ward Churchill (1997), Eduardo and Bonnie Duran (1995), M. Annette Jaimes (1992), and Paula Gunn Allen (1998). Not all teach in universities (some, like Cook-Lynn, have made the active choice not to teach at the college who named her emeritus), but all write extensive work on developing indigenous theories, social, political, and cultural issues, and Native fiction. What many powerful Native scholar/activists bring to the academy is the way they describe the Indigenous experience, contrarily to a worldview rooted in Whiteness.
Indian Realities; Worldview Differences

The entrance into academic circles by Indian scholars came out of reactions to archaeologists and anthropologists seen scrambling for “findings” on and around Indian reservations. Deloria (1999) reflects,

Some of what I can gather as hard feelings from the Indian point of view stem back to the position that the scholarly community has enjoyed for the past century, that is, that only scholars have the credentials to define and explain American Indians and that their word should be regarded as definitive and conclusive (pg. 72).

Deloria is speaking also to the need to have Indians in higher education so that what has been put out by social scientists may be retold from Indigenous perspectives. Native scholarship, rooted in Native worldviews (Duran and Duran, 1995) and intellectual approaches (Cook-Lynn, 1996) produce an important counter-narrative to White centric stories about Native people. It is precisely that sort of scholarship that would provide a more accurate portrayal of the history of Indian-White relations. The alternate stories told (which are histories constructed) reflect differences in psychological worldviews and intellectual approaches taken by Indians and Whites.

White-centric views have attempted to know Indian histories by the size and shape, and burial date of Indian skulls. Vine Deloria (1999) states,
I have in the neighborhood of eighty books dealing in one way or another with pre-Columbian expeditions to the Western Hemisphere. These books range from utter nonsense to rather sophisticated and careful review of your own archaeological reports and the addition of new interpretations and efforts to interpret the anomalies that you seemed unable to understand at the time... My rule of thumb is that the Smithsonian is the last bastion of nineteenth-century science, so if people there are against any new theory, the chances are they are dead wrong (pp. 74-75).

Indigenous scholars have provided alternative ways of knowing. These scholars suggest that you come to an understanding of who you are and your place in the world via creation stories, and the stories of your ancestors.

Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (1996), in her work, *Why I Can't Read Wallace Stegner*, looks at Indian activism from an authorial perspective, confronting invented stories of United States history. In particular, she questions the motives of White scholars who claim highbrow knowledge of the Indian experience in the US. In her own words, “I maintain that when the ethical relationship between tribal nationhood and the imagination is ignored or falsified, flawed scholarship is the result” (pg. xiii).

Cook-Lynn and Deloria share a perspective regarding the situation Indian students and professors face in the Ivory Tower. When scholarship is carried in from outside of the community, it is seen as neutral and objective. However, Indian scholarship, which places Indian understanding and worldviews at the center, is dismissed. This problem exists as well because of the Native reliance on oral tradition, which is frequently dismissed out of hand.
by White scholars. A confrontation of this White-centric perspective of knowledge is taking place. According to Cook-Lynn,

The issue of evaluating what is thought to be scholarship, that is, scientific inquiry, research, and other intellectual study is even more essential to the development of the processes of explication in social history and attitudes in American institutional thought. For the past three decades, American Indian scholars have published a considerable body of that kind of academic work (1996, pg. 5).

There is a feeling by many Indian scholars that Indians are both subjected to inquiry (as objects) and then dismissed as active subjects. Deloria (1999) puts it best when he says, "We seem to occupy the curious position of being pilot projects and experimental subjects for one group of educators and the last communities to receive educational benefits as determined by another set of educators, primarily administrators" (pg. 137). It is precisely at this intersection that Indians are at once the subjects of interest and then dismissed as a vanishing people. The question looms: Where can Indian students get an education and go on to be educators when the very institution these students attend cannot support the vested interest of them as scholars?

The following story illustrates the way in which Indian students must deal with racism in the Ivory Tower every day. An (unnamed) Yurok friend of mine, attending a southern US university was asked during class, by her anthropology professor, to have her head measured so the professor could compare it with Indian bones she had in the class. This treatment created a hostile racist environment for this student and others and hence it is no small wonder so many Indian youths do not go on to higher education and that when
they do, many drop out, returning to the comfort of their community (Simpson, 1987).

Higher education is set up in such a way that it naturally caters to White students and their sensibilities. "Education in the English-American context resembles indoctrination more than it does other forms of teaching, because it insists on implanting a particular body of knowledge and a specific view of the world that often does not correspond to the life experiences that people have or might be expected to encounter" (Deloria, 1999, pg. 138). The philosophical approach to teaching leaves out American Indians systematically.

The intellectual effect White-centric philosophies of individual success have on Indian students is a puzzling one. How do we find a niche in the academy, when the Indian way of learning is not only ignored, but also vehemently dismissed by "learned" scholars? "Education in the English-American context resembles indoctrination more than it does other forms of teaching because it insists on implanting a particular body of knowledge and a specific view of the world that often does not correspond to the life experiences that people have or might be expected to encounter" (ibid., pg. 138).

The need for defense against a White power system is imperative when, for example, an Indian youth goes to college and continue on for an advanced degree. Remarking on the Indian scholarly experience at the university level, Vine Deloria, Jr. (1999) writes,
This condition, the separation of knowledge into professional expertise and personal growth (of the University experience), is an insurmountable barrier for many Indian students and raises severe emotional problems as they seek to sort out the proper principles from these two isolated parts of human experience. The problem arises because in traditional Indian society there is no separation; there is, in fact, a reversal of the sequence in which non-Indian education occurs: in traditional society the goal is to ensure personal growth and then to develop professional expertise. Even the most severely eroded Indian community today still has a substantial fragment of the old ways left, and these ways are to be found in the Indian family. Even the badly shattered families preserve enough elements of kinship so that whatever the experiences of the young, there is a sense that life has some unifying principles that can be discerned through experience and that guide behavior. This feeling and it is a strong emotional feeling toward the world that transcends beliefs and information, continues to gnaw at American Indians throughout their lives (pg. 139).

It is at this intersection of worldview differences that the concept of indigenous knowledge can be useful to understand the experience of Indian youth. Bonnie and Eduardo Duran (1995) describe this difference very simply:

The Native American worldview is a systematic approach to being in the world that can best be categorized as process thinking, as opposed to the content thinking found in the Western worldview. Process thinking is best described as a more action and ‘eventing’ approach to life versus a world of object relationships. …Western thought conceptualizes history in a linear temporal sequence, whereas most Native American thinking conceptualizes history in a spatial fashion (pp. 14-15).

The Native American worldview as posited by Duran and Duran (1995), informs the approach to activism in the classroom. The academic is essentially an activist, by virtue of place. Indians were never meant to receive an education from the Indian perspective. From the inception of Indian-White contact, Indian people were meant to assimilate, and surely not challenge the White ways of education, as many Indigenous scholars today are doing.
The Native Niche in the Ivory Tower: Carving it out for Ourselves

A Song for Healing

a touch from my hands brings you strength
hey-ya o hey-ya
the cries from my heart take away the pain
hey-ya o hey-ya
Now you will get better, stronger

Yo!
-Margot LeBrasseur (Brandt, ed. 1984)

Today, Indian youths have a different form of role models. Those Indian people who are entering the academy may be leaders of the next generation of activists, and will gain the academic background of the White world to confront racist paradigms in the realm of education. There is now a nation-wide movement of activists and academics to eradicate racist stereotypes (for instance, the use of Indians as sports mascots), efforts to repatriate Indian remains and "artifacts", and American Indian/Native American studies programs offering undergraduate and graduate degrees.

Additionally, American Indians have published a vast body of scholarly work in the past three decades, from redefined history and issues of repatriation to feminist scholarship and analyzing Indian activism in the past thirty years. This scholarship includes Deloria’s work on law and Cook-Lynn’s focus on authorial scholarship and literature.

This final section reviews the work of these scholars. An extensive bibliography in the final pages of this thesis, I hope, will prove useful for those
interested in pursuing a broader analysis of Indians in higher education. Clearly there is more work to do, and this only professes to be a humble introduction.


This book is a compilation of Deloria’s writings over the last few decades. His work covers Indian issues from ethno science, religion, philosophy, and higher education. For the purpose of this work, I will discuss his writings on Indians in higher education.

Deloria’s perspective of Indian-White relations reflects the struggles of many Indian scholars. He notes, “the position the scholarly community has enjoyed for the past century [is] that only scholars have the credentials to define and explain American Indians and that their word should be regarded as definitive and conclusive” (pg. 73). The scholarly community to which Deloria refers is the White scholarly community.

It is against this assumed righteousness of White historians and anthropologists that Indian scholars and students must rail against on a daily basis. Recall the story earlier of my friend who was asked to have her head measured in class. I doubt this experience is uncommon.

Neither is the experience I have had in lecturing in an Introduction to Native American studies class where several White students complained about what was being taught in the classroom. “Too much legal stuff,” remarked one student during a lecture, “I thought I’d be learning about culture, like dances
and religion.” It should not be surprising, though perhaps it is disturbing, that a student should be surprised to be confronted with contemporary legal issues Indians have with the Federal government in an introductory class around Indian issues. The history of studying Indians as anthropological history and excluding Indians from the academic lexicon of race relations promotes attitudes like this student’s.

Indeed, this experience, and others similar to it reflects the way in which higher education is set up. It caters to White students and their sensibilities, by virtue of design. Because education today is a training ground for “professionals,” it makes sense (however nonsensical it may be) that Native people are symbolically annihilated in higher education. The Ivory Tower is not designed for people of color, particularly Indians because it is based on a White-centric worldview which values rugged individualism and a measure of success that is, at best, dissimilar to the Indian way.

The basics of worldview differences reflect the unique struggle Indian students and scholars have in the university system. White worldview individualism dominates higher education, yet American Indian collectivism struggles for an accessible learning environment, that draws on a pan-Indian community, within that. This collective “feeling, and it is a strong emotional feeling toward the world that transcends beliefs and information, continues to gnaw at American Indians throughout their lives” (pg. 139). This “feeling” is
further agitated in an environment in which it also requires an immersion into student life on a social scale.

In the final analysis, Deloria states that, “We cannot change the American educational system to make it more humane — or even to make it comprehensible to anyone. But we can remember that it is primarily a measure of ability and accomplishments in the narrow field of professional expertise” (pg. 142). His argument is on par with Derrick Bell’s (1992) who argues that despite the fact that racism “won’t end,” fighting the good fight is still worth the struggle.

Seen in this light, there is no defeat, even though real change may never happen. By being involved in protests for social change in higher education, Indian people can maintain a sense of integrity through the power of family, community, and collective voice. For survival and self-esteem’s sake, the “fight is still worthwhile.”

Elizabeth Cook-Lynn’s Why I Can’t Read Wallace Stegner and Other Essays; A Tribal Voice (1996)

Dedicated to the “Indigenous writer in the modern world” (1996), Cook-Lynn’s essays reflect the way in which the tribal literary voice provides a framework for indigenous scholars. In her preface section, Cook-Lynn remarks on her choice to leave the academy following what she sees as “a backlash [to affirmative action] so severe it makes me shudder. The courts have been
stacked, Oliver North runs for a seat in the US Senate, and the racist science in the name of the bell curve flourishes” (pg. ix).

Cook-Lynn pulls no punches in expressing her attitude toward the Ivory Tower. To wit, she attempts to, “create a dialogue concerning the principles of critical analysis, which I believe should be the work of Native American Studies scholars” (pg. xiii). Here, her argument is on par with Deloria’s and many other scholars, although she is admittedly on the cutting edge of race relations analysis, calling for new Tribal narratives. She explicitly tackles the Black/White dichotomy and suggests that Indians need to be rewriting the discourse. I agree.

Although Cook-Lynn’s book, like Deloria’s covers an array of Indian issues, I have chosen to focus here on her critiques on the Ivory tower and the way in which it needs to be reframed from an indigenous discourse of race relations.

In her essay, “Why I Can’t Read Wallace Stegner,” Cook-Lynn discusses the ways that the work produced by White writers about American Indians is afforded the mantle of authority and objectivity. “It arrives in academia unscathed, to be spoon-fed to future generations” (pg. 29). This should not be a shock to anyone who has taken an American history course in high school (or college, for that matter). Her argument aligns with that of James Loewen (1995) who writes, “American Indians have been the most lied-about subset of our population” (pg. 99).
Indian students and academics must confront the historic amnesia that plagues the Ivory Tower when it comes to understanding the American Indian perspective. The Ivory Tower does not, in fact claim to understand the American Indian perspective or experience, rather, the academy only professes to interrogate and reinvent it. “Always vivid in the imagination of the American public,” Cook-Lynn states, “Indians in general have been freely examined by outsiders’ – White scholars and fiction writers... The culture of empire has always been reflected in the novel, and novels about Indians are no exception” (pg. 65).

Cook-Lynn may be perhaps more hopeful for strides in Indian scholarship than Deloria. She argues that, “Preliminary work in anthropology, linguistics, native studies, or sociology must be continued in the next decades in order to find complete answers to questions concerning the role of modern women in modern Indian societies... change is inevitable” (Pg. 105). While she is discussing “The American Indian Woman in the Ivory Tower,” Cook-Lynn’s analysis can be seen as a plug for the possibility of a heightened awareness of Indian issues across disciplines.

Finally, Cook-Lynn, in her essay on Dinesh D’Souza’s (1995), “America’s Oldest Racism,” states what I have been arguing throughout this thesis: that the “major flaw” in academic theorizing around race relations is that the “... discourse in this country since the Civil War, [has been focused] on the black/white paradigm almost exclusively. This exclusive and narrow look at
American society has skewed the discourse on cause and effect to which we are all now subjected" (pg. 138).

For those scholars investigating the paradigm of racism on campuses, one of the main thrusts for Indians in higher education is getting the general student body to understand the basics of Indian realities. The difficulty of this is tremendous, most specifically because higher education is designed, historically, with Whites (men) in mind. Vine Deloria, Jr. (1999) states that, "Western science is wed to the evolutionary scheme of interpretation that suggests that there is an end purpose in everything that is reached by sheer chance" (pg. 63). Thus, the very roots of scientific thought is separate, like a grid. Henceforth, whereas the Indian reality sees all things as connected, Western science (both "hard" and "soft") is a contradiction to indigenous thought.

What then, must be the next plan of action for successful and meaningful discourse of race relations that steers away from the Black/White dichotomy and towards a proactive inclusion of Native people? Further, as Indian students (both full and mixed blood, urban and rural), what should we expect from the academy? It may be fair to answer that in such a way that we recognize there is no real answer. We need to carve out our own niche, because certainly if there is to be space for indigenous thinking, indigenous thinkers must create it. The ability to do this, however, is threatened by "fiscal" thinking that justifies cutting such programs.
As Deloria (1999) puts it, college administrators "eager to cut budgets, are now wielding financial axes with reckless abandon. The first programs to be cut back will be Ethnic Studies. The trend is so great that I expect Ethnic Studies to disappear in the next decade" (pg. 158).

If this is true, and if Cook-Lynn is also correct in assuming a continued strong influx of Native voices in academics, then it is of vital importance that social science departments not only participate in coalition building with NAS departments, but they also vehemently rally for support of the programs, so that they do not fail.
CONCLUSIONS

"...Imagination is the source of history, an ambiguity of some importance to scholars.”
-Elizabeth Cook-Lynn

It is important we stay cautiously away from the White worldview approach to Indian educational development in the Ivory Tower. That White-centric approach has been one of forced assimilation and symbolic annihilation. Instead, we should develop (or continue) the approach begun by Indian scholar/activists which focuses on empowering marginalized groups and incorporating alternative worldviews into the production and consumption of knowledge. A working approach calls for the empowerment of Native academics (both students and faculty) to support their activism and demand inclusion in an academic setting.

That kind of new approach further calls for a new approach to race analysis. If we are going to utilize the sociological tools with which we are equipped, then we need to do so in a way that will be all-inclusive. Theories such as Internal Colonialism, Racial Formation, and Standpoint Theory are all viable theoretical models with which to construct a new pedagogical approach to studying Native issues. Particularly if we can do so in a way that honors Native voices and realities.

Further, there is a need for intercultural sensitivity that “demands new awareness and attitudes” (Bennett, 1986:179). This need for intercultural
sensitivity is rooted in the understanding of Native American psychology (Duran and Duran, 1995) since European contact, and is helpful in understanding where Indian people are *placed* in the university system, not necessarily in a physical manner, but rather in a fundamentally spiritual way. To fully understand the basic tenets of indigenous philosophy, sacredness, wholeness, balance, and interconnectedness (Delorme, 1999), is to understand and respect the needs of Indian people.

In terms of activism, I believe that we are in an excellent position to push through and gain recognition with the intersection of activism and academics. As a sociologist, it is important that I recognize the proliferation of racism that is out there, especially when it is in my place of business: the Ivory Tower. I have a responsibility to be aware of social problems and confront the Black/White paradigm that so redolently refuses to go away. The infusion of Indian academics with activism helps me and helps my colleagues to force an inclusion of Indians by confronting that binary. It is a necessary relationship as are coalitions among departments.

Perhaps the most important thing we gained from the activism of the 1960s and 1970s is the fact that not only are we still here, but Indian people now have a platform from which to voice our concerns. While I agree with Derrick Bell’s (1992) argument that racism will not end, I also agree with him that in order to live an activist/academic life with integrity, we need to fight the good
fight. The past thirty years of Indigenous resistance to the White power structure we are living in is proof positive that change can happen.

Perhaps a future of coalition building is the answer, following the model of Brown Childs' (1990, 1998) "transcommunality." Providing spaces within which to meet, with a Native perspective, may serve to aid in the development of a stronger ethnic studies department, rather than bear witness to its suggested inevitable demise.

I strongly suggest social science departments band together and support one another. I do not think it is necessary, nor beneficial, to participate in academic Olympics. As scholars entering the 21st century, we have a responsibility to acknowledge our historical mistakes and not create amnesia around them. Vine Deloria (1999) writes, "...education is more than the process of imparting and receiving information, that it is the very purpose of human society and that human societies cannot really flower until they understand the parameters of possibilities that the human personality contains" (pg. 139). A healthy approach to race analysis would do well to honor those "parameters of possibilities" rather than continue to adhere to the Western values around education which tend to ignore the very humanness of history.

Moreover, while it is of vital importance to remain steadfast in the academy, Indian scholars need to also be in constant touch with the indigenous community around them. We cannot afford to get lost.
WORKS CITED


American Indian Movement homepage.  
http://www.dickshovel.netgate.net/IMIntro.html.


