3-1-1971

The New Indian Militancy: Its Roots, its Message, and its Significance for the Church

Victor Willmann
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_willmannv@csl.edu

THE NEW INDIAN MILITANCY: ITS ROOTS, ITS MESSAGE, AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE CHURCH

A Research Paper Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for elective
P-200

---

by

Victor D. Willmann

March 1971

Lorenz Wunderlich

Adviser

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Issue

Before the late 1960's the terms "Indian militancy" or "red power" were largely unfamiliar to most American people. In fact, it is probably safe to assume that until the present decade most American people, even those living near Indian-populated areas, had largely forgotten about the native American, the American Indian. Perhaps the popular conceptions of American history were to blame for this unconscious memory lapse concerning the American Indian. Popular thought disassociated the native American from the beginning of American history by linking its beginning to the exploits of Amerigo Vespucci or the landing of Christopher Columbus in 1492. The westward expansion of the newly emerging nation under the doctrine of Manifest Destiny was often described without regard to the natives who populated the land before it was claimed by the United States. The Removal Policy of President Andrew Jackson tended to remove the Indian from the consciousness of the American public. However, the lid of silence was finally sealed when Big Foot's band of Miniconjou Sioux, men, women and children, were massacred by the Seventh U. S. Cavalry on December 29, 1890, at Wounded Knee, South Dakota. Many historians consider this to be the last major confrontation between the Indian and the United

States. Out of these series of events in the history of white America's dealings with the Indian grew the stereotyped image of the Indian as being a vanishing, powerless people. Also, other characteristics such as silence, patience, dignity, respect, shyness and servility became stereotypes applied to Indians. While these stereotypes have had a degree of validity, they are becoming less significant.[1] A writer for Time Magazine stated in the February 9, 1970 issue:

> After more than a century of patience and passivity, the nation's most neglected and isolated minority is astir, seeking the means and the muscle for protest and redress. . . . the new American Indian is fed up with the destitution and publically sanctioned abuse of his long-divided people. He is raising his voice and he intends to be heard.[2]

William Hedgepeth, writing the lead article in the June 2, 1970 issue of Look magazine, stated:

> The upshot is a wholly new thing: pan-Indian nationalism--the thinking of themselves as Indians, rather than as Sioux or Crow or Navajo. And with this new awareness has grown new militancy--a determination to judge life according to their own values . . ..[3]

Thus, at the beginning of the decade of the 1970's two of the nation's leading magazines were sensitizing the nation to the sentiments of Indian people which began arising in the early 1960's in such people as Mel Thom, a Paiute, who in 1960 proclaimed, "And we felt that Indian Affairs were so bad that it was time to raise some hell."[4] This new Indian militancy which is now becoming apparent to the American public is the central issue of this paper.

The Author's Reasons for Investigating the Issue

While the author was in his third year of studies at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, he was assigned as an intern (or vicar) to St. John Lutheran Church, Parmelee, South Dakota, located on the edge of the Rosebud Reservation. As part of his orientation for this assignment he attended the 1969 Lutheran Council in the U. S. A. (LCUSA) Indian Ministry Conference and the 1969 Annual Assembly of Lutheran Church and Indian People (LUCHIP) which were convened jointly at Augustana College, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, July 29-31, 1969. This joint conference and the subsequent joint conference in the summer of 1970 left no doubt in the author's mind that the church could no longer avoid facing the issue raised by a newly emerging Indian militancy. A short description of these conferences will validate this observation.

Shortly after the opening of the 1969 LCUSA and LUCHIP conferences the agenda was challenged and the floor was yielded to Mr. Clyde Bellecourt who represented the American Indian Movement (A. I. M.) from Minneapolis, Minnesota. The conference Minutes states,

> Mr. Bellecourt said that as far as the church was concerned, other than allowing Indians the use of clubrooms, gyms, and providing them canned goods and used clothing, they have been of very little help to Indian people in urban areas. He said as emphatically as he could that the churches need to let Indians design their own programs.[5]

Mr. Bellecourt then yielded the floor to Mr. Dennis Banks, also a representative of A. I. M., who then presented to the

conference a document entitled "Challenge to the Churches" which represented the feelings of the Minneapolis Indians who had formed A. I. M. The conference voted to suspend its original agenda and to devote the entire conference to discussion and action on the seven points of the "Challenge to the Churches." The 1969 conference concluded with the adoption, in a slightly modified form, of the "Challenge to the Churches." The seven challenges as adopted by the conference are as follows:

1. That a National Lutheran Board on American Indian concern be set up with 75% of its members Indian Americans and that the chairman of this Board be Indian.

2. That this National Lutheran Board commit itself to supporting Indian groups in their efforts to determine their own needs, priorities and actions.

3. That this National Board assume a positive role in influencing legislation created or supported by Indians and beneficial to the welfare of all Indian Americans.

4. That this Board promote the restructuring of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and all government services to Indians with a view to eliminating criminal acts against Indians and providing for maximum self-determination for both reservation and off-reservation Indians.

5. That this Board demand that their churches employ their influence as an organized body in meeting the urgent need for adequate housing available to Indians, and that they support the efforts of Indian groups and individual families to provide themselves with more adequate housing.

6. That this Board be allocated no less than $1.00 per year for services for each Indian American for the next ten years. This allocation would come from the Lutheran bodies constituent in the Lutheran Council in the U. S. A.

7. That this Board make freely available all Lutheran church facilities for use by all minorities on an equal-share basis.[6]

This 1969 conference also voted to present these challenges during the following year to the various boards of LCUSA and the three Lutheran bodies constituent in LCUSA.

The 1970 conference entitled "The 1970 Lutheran Indian Conference and LUCHIP Assembly" was designed to assess the response to the "Challenge to the Churches" by LCUSA and its membership and to implement the challenge. The Indian people in attendance formed a separate "Indian caucus" and elected an eighteen-member all-Indian board in accordance with the challenge. Shortly after its election, the Indian board adopted the following resolution:

> The Lutheran Churches of America were presented seven challenges in July of 1969, to date there has been no response, just promises made and broken. Again we feel that we can wait no longer than three months from today, August 1, 1970, for the commitment of no less than $750,000. If a written commitment does not arrive at that time, the National Indian Board will at that time sever its relationship with the Lutheran Churches and expose them completely for what they have done in relationship to the exploitation of Indian people through their soliciting process and Indian Mission programs.[7]

The actions taken at the 1969 and 1970 conferences described above are a result of a newly emerging Indian militancy that is focusing on the church as well as other elements of society. These actions affecting the Lutheran Churches have not been fully understood or accepted to date in these denominations. 1971 will be a critical year for Lutheran-Indian relationships. Much of what happens will

depend upon how well non-Indians understand the message articulated by Indian people themselves.

The Scope and Limitations of this Study

The term "Indian militancy" will immediately bring to mind in some readers the images of Black militancy and Black power. For others, Indian militancy may create impressions of direct-action groups, violence and intimidation. However, in using the term "Indian militancy" or its correllary term, "Red Power," this paper does not attempt to limit them to the narrow meanings ascribed to the corresponding terms of the Black civil rights movement. For the purposes of this study, Indian militancy and Red power will include those who advocate direct action through peaceful or disruptive means as well as those who are now beginning only to vocalize the needs, feelings and frustration of their people. Therefore, Indian militancy in this paper will be defined in its broadest possible sense; the opposite of which would be described as those Indians who do not feel compelled to do anything about their current conditions, or who are willing to accept and abide by the current attitudes and programs of American society.

Much of the literature published by Indian militants or militant Indian organizations contains references to the Christian church. While one may assume that specific denominations are in the mind of the Indian writer, seldom do

these writers direct their comments about the church to any one particular denomination. Because of this phenomenon, this paper assumes that as a general rule these Indian writers hold that what is true of one denomination can also be true of most other denominations. Therefore, in keeping with current militant Indian literature, this paper will use the term "the church" instead of constantly isolating particular denominations. However, specific denominations will be referred to as illustrations of specific points at issue.

The investigation of the topic in this paper will proceed topically rather than historically in each chapter. While each component of the new Indian militancy has a long historical background, this paper will stress the current status of Indian militancy and its current significance for the church. Therefore, the roots of the new Indian militancy will be described in terms of their components, with the historical data serving only to illuminate each component rather than describing the Indian militant movement as a whole. Likewise, the message of the new Indian militancy will be treated topically. The diversity of emphasis in the message prohibits describing it in terms of historical development.

The reader should note that this paper will analyze the roots and message of the new Indian militancy as well as its significance for the church. The primary sources for this paper will be Indian spokesmen or those non-Indians who speak for Indian people. In this sense the paper will be

biased toward the Indian view of his own situation and the Indian view of the church. No attempt will be made to counter the points made by Indians through evidence supplied by non-Indians. This paper is designed to investigate the new Indian militancy and Indian-church relationships from the Indian point of view. A natural result of this approach is the seeming lack of statistical, factual data to substantiate Indian views. However, this is the nature of the literature currently written by representatives of the new Indian militancy. Therefore, feelings and attitudes often become more important than statistical data. This paper seeks to reflect this emphasis held by current Indian militants.

The research involved in this paper was limited mainly to the 1960's. For some issues, notably the termination issue, some reference had to be made of the 1950's. The reasons for this limitation to the 1960's are based on three presuppositions. First, prior to the 1960's the Indian people lacked sufficient educated leadership to begin any kind of movement designed to express themselves on issues affecting them and to design their own destiny amid the confused status of current Indian affairs. However, by the 1960's the level of Indian education had risen to a level high enough to make their message credible to the American public. By the 1960's articulate and educated Indians were beginning to write and to utilize the American judicial system to gain an audience for their message.

Secondly, by the late 1960's the civil rights movement among Blacks had lost much of its headline attraction. However, the civil rights movement accomplished two things to help bring about a new Indian militancy: (1) it focused attention on the rights of people, and (2) it focused attention on racial minorities in the United States. With the decline in the intensity of the Black movement in the late 1960's, Indian people were able to achieve a listening.

Thirdly, the 1960's marked a break in the status quo of Indian-American relationships. Perhaps for the first time Indians successfully challenged a piece of major Indian legislations by the Congress, the Indian Omnibus Bill of 1967. This decade saw the rise of many Indian rights organizations such as the National Indian Youth Council, American Indians United, United Native Americans, American Indian Movement and many others. Also in the 1960's Indians began uniting for direct action, such as the "fish-ins" in Washington state and the occupation of Alcatraz. These and other actions were designed to emphasize treaty rights which Indians have guaranteed to them.

For these reasons, the Indian militancy in this paper can be described as "new." It is a phenomenon of the 1960's. The "old militancy" era ended when Big Foot and his people were massacred at Wounded Knee in 1890. However, seventy years later, conditions proved favorable for a new Indian militancy to develop.

FOOTNOTES

[1]"The Angry American Indian: Starting Down the Protest Trail," Time Magazine (February 9, 1970), p. 14.

[2]Ibid.

[3]William Hedgepeth, "America's Indians," Look (June 2, 1970), p. 23.

[4]Stan Steiner, The New Indians (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 40.

[5]Minutes for the 1969 Lutheran Council in the U. S. A. Indian Ministry Conference and 1969 Annual Assembly of Lutheran Church and Indian People (July 29-31, 1969), p. 2.

[6]Ibid., p. 11.

[7]Minutes for the 1970 Lutheran Indian Conference and LUCHIP Assembly (July 31-August 2, 1970), p. 9.

CHAPTER II

THE ROOTS OF THE NEW INDIAN MILITANCY

The Present Status of Indian People

The present status of the American Indian as a grouping in American society is difficult to determine with clarity. The simple matter of determining the Indian population is extremely difficult. There is no one legal definition of an Indian. Over the years there have been formulated 389 treaties, more than 5,000 statutes, 2,000 Federal Court decisions, 141 tribal constitutions and 112 tribal charters--all of which provide numerous legal definitions of an Indian.[1] Another problem in determining the present status of Indian people is the numerous different sets of statistics released to the public. Various agencies and bureaus are involved with Indian people. Each one usually makes its own surveys and releases its own statistics which may very well conflict with other reports. Some of these reporting sources include tribal organizations, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Public Health Service-Indian Health Division, United States Office of Education, Office of Economic Opportunity and various Congressional study committees. Even with this diversity of reports and statistics, enough facts emerge to indicate some basis for the change in mood and action among the American Indians in the 1960's.

Population

There are many Indians in the United States regardless of whether or not one defines Indianness in a broad or narrow sense. By defining an Indian as anyone who has Indian ancestry, one source places the Indian population somewhere between five and fifteen million.[2] Using a narrower definition based on tribal enrollment or self-declaration, the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1968 placed the Indian population of the United States at 552,000. Of this number, approximately 300,000 reside on identifiable reservations or federal trust lands.[3] The remaining 252,000 are scattered throughout the nation often congregating in the larger urban areas. These Indian people are often designated by the title "off-reservation" in many reports. For example, Los Angeles has approximately 60,000 Indian inhabitants, while San Francisco has 20,000. There are 15,000 on Chicago's North Side. Minneapolis, Minnesota, has an estimated off-reservation Indian population of 15,000.[4] Other cities with identifiable Indian populations are Brooklyn, New York, Cleveland, Detroit, Omaha, Denver, Phoenix and Seattle.[5]

In 1968, Vine Deloria, Jr., estimated that half of all tribal Indians may be urban Indians. At the same time, the San Francisco Indian Center published a report estimating the off-reservation Indian <u>adult</u> population at 198,000, a figure representing more than half of all adult Indians.[6] More significant is the fact that the urban Indian population is

rapidly increasing. In 1956 Ralph Nader published the estimated figure of 100,000 as the urban Indian population.[7] By comparing this 1956 figure with the 1968 Bureau of Indian Affairs figure of 252,000 it is clear that the urban Indian population has more than doubled in just over a decade.

That the emerging Indian militancy has a strong root in these population figures is apparent by a few observations. First of all, the large mass of Americans who can claim at least some Indian ancestry provides a potentially large source of pro-Indian sympathy as the demands of the American Indian are raised to the conscious level of Americans. There is little pressure in our society to hide one's Indian ancestry as compared to Latin American culture.[8] Therefore, more and more people are asserting their Indian identity, even though they never valued that identity in previous years. Secondly, while 552,000 American Indians may not constitute a large minority power block in American society, their number is rapidly increasing. The Bureau of Indian Affairs reports that the Indian birth rates are approximately double those of the United States as a whole.[9] If this rapidly increasing Indian population is successfully united in a militant movement a significantly new power block will be created. Thirdly, the growing urban Indian populations are germinating centers for Indian militancy. Once an Indian leaves the reservation for the city he removes himself from the scope and range of many Bureau of Indian Affairs assistance programs. Traditionally, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has limited its

concern primarily to the reservation Indian.[10] Therefore, often the assistance programs in housing, employment, education and health are no longer available to the urban Indian, often placing him in a worse position than his reservation counterpart.

Indian Health

The present health status of the American Indian provides another clue to the roots of the new Indian militancy which began developing in the 1960's. In 1967 it was reported that the status of Indian health was twenty years behind that of the general population.[11] Since 1955 the United States Public Health Service had been delegated by law to carry out the Indian health programs previously conducted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. However, as of 1967 only 380,000 of the American Indian population are served under this national agency. As a result, while the public Health Service has reduced the tuberculosis death rate by 56 percent, the Indian death rate from tuberculosis still remains 5 to 7 times higher than the rate for the rest of the United States. Indian infant mortality rates are twice that of all other groups.[12] The incidence rate of hepatitis among Indians is 800 percent higher than the national average. Gonorrhea is 500 percent higher. Strep throat is 1,000 percent higher. Meningitis is 2,000 percent higher, while dysentery is 10,000 percent higher than the national average.[13]

Accidents are the leading cause of death with an incidence rate of 20.9 percent compared to 6.1 percent for the nation in general. Sixty percent of the general population lives to age 65 or older as compared to only 33 percent of Indians.[14] The average life expectancy for the American Indian is 44 years as compared to 71 years for white Americans.[15]

Mental health among Indians is also a tragic description. A graphic illustration is the fact that 4 percent of all Indian deaths result from suicide or homicide as compared to the national average of 2 percent.[16] If mental health problems are construed to include alcoholism, child neglect and delinquency, then the health picture becomes dimmer. In South Dakota delinquency among Indian youth was 9 times the national average. Five times as many Indian children are in foster homes as the national average. In 1960, arrests relating to alcohol among all Indians were 12.2 times those of the general population. In all, 71 percent of all Indian arrests are due to drunkenness.[17]

The Indians involved in the emergence of the new Indian militancy are not content with this picture of Indian health. Militant organizations such as United Native Americans are increasingly picketing Public Health Service facilities protesting inadequate staffs and treatment. Some Indians merely express their bitterness such as the Cherokee nurse, employed by the Public Health Service, who said, "If the government doctors improve our health, what's so

great about it? After all, it was the whites who infected our people with most of these diseases in the first place."[18]

Economic Status

During the administration of President Lyndon Johnson, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall stated:

> Our country has moved into an unprecedented period of peacetime prosperity . . . yet in that period of rising economy the poverty question of which the Indian people are only a part becomes more and more embarrassing.[19]

Secretary Udall was referring to the fact that in the 1960's the average annual income of Indian people only rose from $1200 to $1500, still only one-half the national poverty level. At the same time, Indian unemployment ranged from 40 to 80 percent on different reservations.[20] All this happened at the same time that the War on Poverty of the Johnson Administration was pouring millions of dollars into Indian economic programs. The militant Indian reaction to this phenomenon was summed up by a spokesman for the San Francisco Indian Center as follows: "So the Indians and all the 'poverty' stricken Americans wonder if this 'War' is just another political exploitation, and another bureaucratic program."[21]

Education

The present status of Indian education has frustrated many Indian leaders because of its failure to meet the needs

and situation of Indian students. The reasons for this frustration are reflected in the 1969 report of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Indian Education which found:

> The average educational level for all Indians under Federal supervision is 5 school years; more than one out of every five Indian men have less than 5 years of schooling;
> Dropout rates for Indians are twice the national average.[22]

Furthermore, the Subcommittee found:

> Only 18 percent of the students in Federal Indian schools go on to college; the national average is 50 percent;
> Only 3 percent of Indian students who enroll in college graduate; the national average is 32 percent.[23]

The rise of new Indian militancy is in part a reflection of this frustration over an educational system in which Indian people themselves have little or no control.

However, the education process is a contributing factor to Indian militancy in another way. While the number of Indian college graduates is very small, many of those who do graduate are becoming the critically needed leaders required to get a movement going. Mel Thom and Herbert Blatchford, co-founders of the militant National Indian Youth Council, are both college educated. Lehman Brightman, president of the militant United Native Americans, is a graduate college student. Vine Deloria, Jr., a mildly militant free-lance writer and spokesman for many moderate Indians, is college trained and currently studying law. Educated Indian youth have made the new movement a possibility.[24]

The Unique Legal Status of Indian Tribes

The uninformed, well-meaning non-Indian civil rights activists often alienate themselves from Indian militants because of ignorance. These non-Indians often assume that Indian militancy is evolving out of the same issues as Black militancy evolved in the early 1960's. Therefore, when Indian leaders refuse to take part in protest actions along with Blacks, these non-Indians tend to question the seriousness and commitment of those Indian leaders. However, these Indians tend to view the current civil rights movement as good, but primarily concerned with Black rights.[25] The new Indian militancy finds its roots in a radically different concept than that of Black militancy. This special basis is the unique legal status of Indian tribes.

For the sake of contrasting in a simplified manner the differences between the Black and Indian militant movements, the following points have been suggested by Ernest Schusky: (1) The Blacks are striving for assimilation with the dominant white society, while the Indians are striving to resist a process of <u>forced</u> assimilation. (2) Blacks have nothing to preserve in the way of land, indigenous culture and language; they are an uprooted people struggling for equal legal rights. However, Indians by virtue of 389 treaties and other special Congressional legislation have full legal rights which they are struggling "to retain rather than attain."[26] Schusky's arguments for the unique legal position of Indian tribes can

be summarized under the following four points: (1) Indians are the only minority group which was not intrusive on this continent. (2) Since their present homelands are a product of federal policy, the nature of their homeland differs from other American communities. (3) Indian rights are dependent upon treaties or Acts of Congress which have made Indians unique from other minorities. (4) Supreme Court decisions must be taken into account in understanding the uniqueness of Indian tribes.[27]

The exact nature of tribal legal statues is crucial to Indian militants. At the heart of the issue is the question of whether or not Indian tribes are distinct nations with special legal rights outside of the Constitution of the United States. Michael Smith, quoting the 1961 report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, states:

> The sovereignty of Indian tribes has been confirmed and reconfirmed in numerous cases; some of recent vintage. While the Indian's right to self-government is firmly rooted in treaties and judicial decisions, the right itself has been held inherent; that is, it preceded and was not created by the Federal Government.[28]

However, already in 1895 the United States Supreme Court (Talton v. Mayes) declared that tribes are immune from the restrictions of the Federal Constitution on the grounds that tribes "are not creatures of either the Federal or state governments."[29] Under this ruling Indian people do not enjoy the guarantees of the Bill of Rights. On the other hand, tribes are free to make restrictions on religious activities and retain traditional judicial systems which

would not be possible under the Federal Constitution. However, numerous court decisions have attempted to redefine the 1895 Supreme Court opinion and thus modify the legal status of tribes. Two recent examples indicate some confusion in the interpretations. In 1959 the United States Court of Appeals of the Tenth Circuit ruled:

> Indian tribes are not States. They have a higher status than that of States. They are subordinate and dependent nations possessed of all the powers as such only to the extent that they have been expressly required to surrender them to the superior sovereign, the United States.[30]

In 1962 this same court ruled that this national sovereignty of the tribes was an "ever-changing concept of an artificial entity."[31] Despite the legal confusion surrounding the issue, Indian militants have sufficient legal basis for demanding self-determination rather than appealing to a humanitarian basis. However, this unique legal status depends on the maintenance of all previous treaty agreements by the United States. When the United States formally ceased making treaties in 1871, Congress declared its obligations in treaty maintenance by stating that "no obligation of any treaty lawfully made and ratified with any Indian nation or tribe prior to March 3, 1871, shall be invalidated or impaired."[32]

The Termination Policy of the Federal Government

If ever the American Indian needed a reason in recent history to become angry and militant, the reason was supplied by the 83rd Congress on August 1, 1953. On that date, the United States House of Representatives passed House Concurrent Resolution 108 which inaugurated the Termination Policy of the 1950's. The resolution states:

> Whereas it is the policy of Congress, as rapidly as possible, to make the Indians within the territorial limits of the United States subject to the same laws and entitled to the same privileges and responsibilities as are applicable to other citizens of the United States . . .; and
>
> Whereas the Indians within the territorial limits of the United States should assume their full responsibilities as American citizens: Now, therefore, be it
>
> Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is declared to be the sense of Congress that, at the earliest possible time, all of the Indian tribes and the individual members thereof located within the States of California, Florida, New York, and Texas, and all of the following named Indian tribes and individual members thereof, should be freed from Federal supervision and control and from all disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians: The Flathead Tribe of Montana, the Klamath Tribe of Oregon, the Mencominee Tribe of Wisconsin, the Potowatamie Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska, and those members of the Chippewa Tribe who are on the Turtle Mountain Reservation, North Dakota.[33]

In essence, Resolution 108 meant that Congress would begin to terminate as soon as possible all federal services to those Indian tribes mentioned in the resolution. Individual states would assume responsibility for Indians as they do for other citizens of the state. However, the broader interpretation of termination of federal services to all

Indian tribes became apparent in 1954 when Congress took its first action based on Resolution 108. The first tribe to have its federal service terminated was the Paiute Tribe of Utah, a tribe not even named in Resolution 108.[34] In the late 1960's the Colville Tribe of Washington State and the Seneca Nation of New York State have also been the objects of Congressional efforts toward termination of federal policies even though they were not mentioned in the 1953 Congressional resolution.[35] However, there were other threatening implications contained in Resolution 108 which frightened Indian people. The original resolution made no provision for securing tribal consent prior to Congressionally enacted termination. Also, since there was no provision for obtaining the consent of the state involved, some Indians were fearful that they would be forced into a relationship with a state that was both unprepared and unwilling to assume responsibilities toward Indian people.[36]

Another piece of legislation involved in the termination issue is Public Law 280 which was passed by Congress and became law on August 15, 1953, just fourteen days after the passage of Resolution 108. Public Law 280 transferred to state governments the criminal and civil jurisdiction over Indian people in the states of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon and Wisconsin. Before passage the law was amended to provide the possibility of other states assuming the same jurisdiction.[37] While it did provide for consulting with

Indian people, conspicuously absent from the law as it was passed was the provision for prior Indian consent to the state assuming legal jurisdiction over Indians. S. Lyman Taylor expressed the concern of Indians as follows:

> The principle of consent is vital to the welfare of democracy and essential to the health of religion. Consultation without the necessity of attaining consent is at best an empty gesture. At its worst it is a mark for coercion, which is the opposite of consent.[38]

The efforts of Congress which began in 1953 to terminate federal responsiblities and services toward Indian people was in direct opposition to the pledge of Congress in 1871 to uphold all previous lawful treaties. Termination meant the abolition of the special treaty rights and relationships which Indian people had with the Federal Government. The Citizenship Act of 1924 which gave all Indians full citizenship in the United States did not affect the special rights of Indian people. However, the termination policy of Congress in the 1950's and 1960's indicated that Indians must now relinquish their special rights in order to become full citizens.[39] Shirley Witt, a Mohawk Indian, described the resulting effects on the Indian community as follows:

> The termination legislation sounded like a death knell to all Indians, reservation and non-reservation alike. It rang as the finale to the remnants of an Indian homeland, a way of life and a heritage. Alarm was universal. After its initial impact, however, Indians went into action.[40]

Action came from several directions in the Indian community. Older established organizations such as the National Congress of American Indians began forcefully

petitioning Congress for the inclusion of a policy of Indian consent prior to any act of termination by the Federal Government. New Indian organizations and alliances were formed to fight the effects of the termination policy. On June 12, 1961, the University of Chicago convened the American Indian Chicago Conference which brought together representatives from 210 tribes. This conference issued a statement entitled "A Declaration of Indian Purpose," a comprehensive statement on Indian jurisdiction, taxation of Indian lands and treaty rights.[41] The action-oriented National Indian Youth Council which was formed in August, 1961, also evolved from the American Indian Chicago Conference. When the state of South Dakota assumed jurisdiction over Indians within the state in 1963, without Indian consent, the United Sioux Tribes was immediately formed to work for repeal of the jurisdiction legislation.[42] Therefore, the termination policy of the Federal Government spurred Indian people into active concern over their rights by the early 1960's.

The Paternalism of the Bureau of Indian Affairs

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has affected the lives of American Indians for many years. The original Bureau of Indian Affairs was established by Congress in 1824 to administer Indian policy and programs under the Secretary of War in the War Department. However, when the Department

of Interior was established in 1841, the Bureau of Indian Affairs was transferred to the Interior Department where it is today.[43] Therefore, the responsibility of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is to carry out the obligations and services pledged by the United States to the Indians as a result of the 389 treaties and several thousands of statutes and court rulings. The result has been the development of an enormous bureaucracy which operates with a procedural manual consisting of 33 volumes and 2,000 regulations.[44] In addition, the Bureau of Indian Affairs employs approximately 16,000 people--which averages out to one employee for every 38 Indians.[45] This massive agency of the Federal Government touches virtually every aspect of the lives of the American Indian. Its sheer size presents numerous problems for the average Indian who is not accustomed to dealing with bureaucratic structures.

The size of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is not the aspect which bothers the American Indians the most. The prevailing attitude exhibited toward Indians in most Bureau of Indian Affairs programs is the cause for most tension. Indians summarize this attitude of the Bureau of Indian Affairs as "paternalism." Basically, paternalism means that even though the American Indian has the inherent right to self-government and has had United States citizenship since 1924, he is not free to control his own life. In a report by the Citizen's Advocate Center published in 1969 this

feeling is summarized as follows:

> From birth to death, the Indian's home, land, schools, jobs, stores where he shops, the tribal council which governs him, the opportunities available to him, the way in which he spends his money and disposes of his trust property are all determined by the B. I. A. It is his realtor, banker, teacher, social worker, police department, waterworks, power company, ambassador and spokesman to and from the outside world.[46]

Paternalism is graphically portrayed in the status of Indian lands. According to the Indian policy of the United States the Secretary of the Interior holds the title to the approximately 55,000,000 acres of Indian land in trust for the Indians. The actual control of this title has been delegated to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. No Indian tribe or individual may rent, lease or sell his land without prior approval of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Bureau has the power to declare any Indian "incompetent" in order to determine the disposition of any income from that Indian's land.[47] This power over Indian lands has involved the Bureau of Indian Affairs in much controversy over land use. The most notable controversies have involved the alliance between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Army Corp of Engineers in building dams which flood Indian lands rather than non-Indian lands. Recent examples are the Garrison Dam in North Dakota and the Kinzua Dam in New York. Indians feel that the trustee status of Indian lands makes these lands especially vulnerable to expropriation by non-Indian interests.[48]

The paternalism of the Bureau of Indian Affairs

was also revealed in a statement by former Commissioner of Indian Affairs Glenn L. Emmons in his evaluation of the Federal Government's termination policy:

> Basically, it seems to me, that the relationship between the United States Government and the Indian people on reservations can be likened in some respects to the relationship which so many of us have as parents toward our own children. During the formative years and while they are still unsophisticated in the ways of the world, we shelter the children from the assumption of responsibilities and make most of the more important decisions on their behalf. At the same time, however, if we are good parents, we also make it clear that the time will come when they must be prepared to stand on their own two feet and face the world unafraid.[49]

Some Indian organizations are claiming that it is precisely the paternalistic policies of the Bureau of Indian Affairs which prevent Indians from assuming their place in society. Paternalism often evolves into discrimination against Indians even within the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Indians for National Liberation, an organization located in Denver, Colorado, points to the situation at the Plant Management Engineering Center of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Littleton, Colorado, as an example. On March 12, 1970, the 17 Indian employees at the plant filed a discrimination complaint with the Department of Interior. They charged that only 17 out of 120 employees are Indian in an agency which is to serve Indian need. Also, the Littleton plant used different policies for Anglos and Indians in promotion and job training. Only $350 out of $11,382 spent for job training was actually spent on Indians.[50] On a

national level, the Indians for National Liberation discovered that (1) Indian employees are a minority in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (5,691 out of 12,225 employees) and that (2) the annual Indian pay scale in the Bureau of Indian Affairs is the GS-4 level (approximately $4,300), whereas, the average non-Indian is at the GS-9 level (approximately $9,500).[51]

The paternalistic disregard for Indian self-determination can be seen in the fact that a non-Indian was always appointed by United States presidents to the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs until 1966. In 1966 President Lyndon Johnson appointed the first Indian, Robert Bennett of the Oneida Tribe, to that position. However, he resigned during the Nixon Administration because he felt that the Administration "has completely ignored the Indians."[52] However, President Richard Nixon appointed another Indian, Louis Bruce, to the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

The 1969 report of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Indian Education disclosed an enormous paternalistic attitude in the Bureau of Indian Affairs educational programs and policies. The Subcommittee cites an example from the Navajo reservation where the Bureau of Indian Affairs decided in 1953 to launch a crash program to improve the level of education. By 1967, supervisory positions in the Bureau headquarters increased 113 percent; administrative and

clerical positions in the schools increased 94 percent. However, at the same time, teaching positions increased only 20 percent.[53] The Subcommittee also discovered that despite a Presidential decree in 1967, only one of the 226 Bureau of Indian Affairs schools are governed by an elective school board.[54] In addition, only a very small number of all teachers in government schools are Indians.

The paternalism found in the Bureau of Indian Affairs has caused Indians to begin to react. Clyde Warrior, a past president of the National Indian Youth Council, declared that such governmental agencies are "concerned only with procedure, progress reports and regulations, and couldn't care less about the average Indian."[55] However, Peter Collier has the following sharp commentary on the Bureau of Indian Affairs:

> The B. I. A. is the Indian's point of contact with the white world, the concrete expression of this society's attitude toward him. The B. I. A. manifest both stupidity and malice; but it is purely neither. It is guided by something more elusive, a whole world view regarding the Indian and what is good for him. Thus the B. I. A.'s overseership of human devastation begins by teaching bright-eyed youngsters the first formative lessons in what it is to be an Indian.[56]

The new Indian militancy is dedicated to ending this kind of paternalism over their destiny. A central part of the program of every militant organization or militant Indian individual is some plan to restructure the Bureau of Indian Affairs in such a way as to make it a truer reflection of Indian ideas and goals.

The Paternalism of the Christian Churches

The new Indian militants have not overlooked the present posture of the Christian churches in dealing with Indian people. In fact, the relationship which the church has had with Indian people in the past has contributed in part to the rise of Indian militancy. Many Indians are now claiming that the paternalism which is so prevalent in the Bureau of Indian Affairs is also present in the Christian churches. Most churches which serve Indian people are mission churches which depend on the national church body for financing. Ernest Schusky points out that national funding of local churches has greatly contributed to the attitude of paternalism toward Indians.[57] Often the national bodies find it difficult to allow local control when providing the finances. Thus, Indian participation in the control of churches has not been sought or encouraged. Schusky concludes, "In this regard, missions resemble the Bureau of Indian Affairs."[58] Schusky found that the behavior and attitudes of Indians toward national church bodies often parallel those displayed toward the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the following three ways: (1) The national office is a distant and somewhat hostile force, while local officers are often liked and respected; (2) the national office often serves as a scapegoat for many local matters over which it really has little control; (3) programs and ideas which come from the national office are often met with suspicion,

apathy or hostility.[59]

Allen Nephew, an Indian who served the Presbyterian Church in South Dakota, also confirms that Indian people often view the church as a paternalistic agency similar to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Many Dakota people view the church as another white man's organization. "It is a monstrous agency that says something good and turns and does something just the opposite."[60]

Vine Deloria, Jr., a Sioux from South Dakota, comes from a clergy family. In 1969, he was a member of the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church. However, he feels that the greatest sin of the church has been its determination to keep Indian congregations in a mission status.[61] Deloria also maintains that Indian clergymen are traditionally accorded lower status than white missionaries simply on the basis of race. He challenges anyone to investigate the reservation churches and discover for themselves the fact that white missionaries generally hold the positions offering the best housing, the best fringe benefits and the best opportunity for advancement.[61] Deloria summarizes the situation in the Indian missions as follows:

> No other field of endeavor in America today has as much blatant racial discrimination as does the field of Christian missions to the American Indian people. It is a marvel that so many Indian people still want to work for the churches.[63]

Actually, the new Indian militancy is producing two groups of Indians. One group, like the American Indian Movement,

is still willing to try working with churches in an effort to change the paternalistic role of church missions to Indian people. However, a second group, such as the League of Nations Pan-American Indians, is seeking a return to native religions and a rejection of Christianity as a viable religious expression for Indian people. Somewhere between the extremes of these two groups of militants lies the Native American Church which combines elements of native religion and Christianity around the use of the peyote cactus button. Vine Deloria, Jr., predicts that this Native American Church will eventually replace Christianity among Indian people.[64]

FOOTNOTES

[1]Stan Steiner, The New Indians (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 322.

[2]Stuart Levine and Nancy Oestreich Lurie, editors, The American Indian Today (Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, Inc., 1968), p. 11.

[3]United States Department of the Interior--Bureau of Indian Affairs, Answers to Your Questions about American Indians (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, May, 1968), p. 2.

[4]"The Angry American Indian: Starting Down the Protest Trail," Time Magazine (February 9, 1970), p. 19.

[5]Steiner, p. 177.

[6]Ibid., p. 176.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Levine and Lurie, p. 11.

[9]United States Department of the Interior--Bureau of Indian Affairs, p. 2.

[10]Steiner, p. 177.

[11]"Health Problems of the American Indian," Currents in Public Health (February, 1967), p. 1.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Steiner, p. 197.

[14]"Indians Die by Accident," Rosebud Sioux Herald (August 25, 1969), p. 3.

[15]"The Angry American Indian," p. 16.

[16]"Indians Die by Accident," p. 3.

[17]Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education: A National Tragedy--A National Challenge, 1969 report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 18.

[18]Steiner, p. 197.

[19]Ibid., pp. 201-202.

[20]Ibid., pp. 211-212.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, p. XII.

[23]Ibid., p. XIII.

[24]Steiner, p. 34.

[25]Levine and Lurie, p. 12.

[26]Ernest L. Schusky, The Right to Be Indian (n. p., 1965), p. 9.

[27]Ibid., pp. vi-vii.

[28]Michael Smith, "Tribal Sovereignty and the 1968 Indian Bill of Rights," Civil Rights Digest (Summer, 1970), p. 9.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Steiner, p. 272.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Ibid.

[33]Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor, The Indian and the White Man (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1964), pp. 397-398.

[34]Vine Deloria, Jr., Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto (London: Collier-Macmillan, Limited, 1969), p. 62.

[35]Ibid., p. 76.

[36]Levine and Lurie, p. 111.

[37]S. Lyman Tyler, Indian Affairs: A Study of the Changes in Policy of the United States Toward Indians (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University, 1964), p. 148.

[38]Ibid.

[39]Deloria, Jr., Custer, p. 75.

[40]Levine and Lurie, p. 111.

[41]Ibid., p. 112.

[42]Steiner, p. 246.

[43]R. Pierce Beaver, Church, State, and the American Indian (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966), p. 63.

[44]"Our Shameful Failure With America's Indians," Reader's Digest (April, 1970), p. 106.

[45]Ibid., p. 105.

[46]Ibid.

[47]Ibid., p. 106

[48]Ibid.

[49]Tyler, pp. 142-143.

[50]Indians for National Liberation, Speak Out, An organizational news bulletin published irregularly, (Spring, 1970), p. 1.

[51]Ibid., p. i.

[52]"The Angry American Indian," p. 17.

[53]Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, p. XIII.

[54]Ibid.

[55]Steiner, p. 72.

[56]Peter Collier, "The Red Man's Burden," Ramparts (February, 1970), p. 31.

[57]Schusky, The Right, p. 55.

[58]Ibid.

[59]Ernest L. Schusky, "Mission and Government Policy in Dakota Indian Communities," Practical Anthropology (June, 1963), p. 111.

[60]Allen C. Nephew, "Christian Education and the American Indian," Religious Education (Novermber-December, 1967), p. 506.

[61]Deloria, Jr., Custer, p. 112.

[62]Ibid., p. 118.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Ibid., p. 113.

CHAPTER III

THE MESSAGE OF THE NEW INDIAN MILITANCY

Many Spokesmen

An important characteristic of the new Indian militancy is that there is no one spokesman for all Indians, or even, for all militant Indians. On the contrary, there are many spokesmen representing many organizations and many individuals who are not closely allied with any organization. Therefore, the message of the new Indian militancy is often just as varied as the spokesman. At times it becomes confusing for the non-Indian to understand what Indian militants are saying and whom to believe. A recent Time article offers the following interpretation:

> Indian grievances are specific, but the goals of redress so far remain diffuse. There are no Indian leaders who, with any confidence of national support from their people, can speak on precisely what should be done.[1]

Individual spokesmen vary widely in their formal qualifications, their position within the spectrum of militancy and their manner of presenting their message. Vine Deloria, Jr., is an example of one type of individual spokesman. Although he has recently been considered by Commissioner of Indian Affairs Louis Bruce for the position of Deputy Associate Commissioner for Education and Programs within the Bureau of Indian Affairs, he is not currently actively associated with any national organization in a major position.

From 1964 to 1967, he served as Executive Director of the National Congress of American Indians.[2] Deloria prefers to distinguish between a militant (one who seeks publicity) and a nationalist (one who seeks to raise the self-concept of an entire group of people).[3] By these definitions, Deloria would be classified as a nationalist. Deloria's medium of expression is the book. To date, he has published two volumes. Custer Died for Your Sins, published in 1969, describes the root causes for the new rise of Indian nationalism. His second book, We Talk, You Listen, describes the Indian concept of tribalism as the salvation for American society.[4]

Another example of an individual spokesman is Buffy Sainte-Marie, a Cree Indian. Although she holds a degree in Oriental philosophy, Buffy Sainte-Marie expresses herself in music using the folk idiom. Her song, "My Country 'Tis of Thy People You're Dying," is typical of her message in that she writes,

> Now that the pride of the sires receive charity,
> Now that we're harmless and safe behind laws,
> Now that my life's to be known as your heritage,
> Now that even the graves have been robbed,
> Now that our own chosen way is a novelty,
> Hands on our hearts, we salute you your victory.
> Choke on your blue-white-and-scarlet hypocrisy.[5]

Concerning Indian organizations, no accurate count is available of all the different Indian organizations which seek to represent Indian opinion. The number of such organizations may run as high as several hundred. (Appendix A

lists ten of the most prominent Indian rights organizations.) Many organizations evolve and then dissolve after a short period of time, while others have only a local influence. By using a broad definition of militancy, many of these could be classified as militant. While some have been in existence for many years, many have organized within the last ten years in response to a rising Indian identity. The All-Pueblo Council is an example of an extremely old organization which is working for Indian rights. Seventeen pueblos in New Mexico banded together around 1680 in order to resist the Spaniards. However, after 242 years of inactivity it was revived again in 1922 to oppose legislation which adversely affected Pueblo land.[6] Another old organization is the National Congress of American Indians which was founded in 1944 so that "Indians themselves could freely express their views and wishes on national legislation and policy."[7] Both the All-Pueblo Council and the National Congress of American Indians are organized along tribal lines. However, the National Congress of American Indians attempts to unite all tribes in the United States rather than in a smaller geographic area like the All-Pueblo Council.

There are other organizations which do not represent tribal groups. One example is the National Indian Youth Council which was organized in August, 1961, as a result of the American Indian Chicago Conference in June, 1961. The Preamble to the Constitution of the National Indian Youth

Council states,

> We, the younger generation, at this time in the history of the American Indian, find it expedient to band together on a national scale in meeting the challenges facing Indian people . . . we recognize the future of the Indian people will ultimately rest in the hands of the younger . . ..[8]

In its founding resolutions, the National Indian Youth Council resolved (1) to clarify the inherent rights of Indians, (2) to oppose federal termination, (3) to demand Indian consent in all matters affecting Indian people and (4) to demand that the United States uphold the rights guaranteed to Indian people by legal statutes.[9] To achieve these goals, the National Indian Youth Council engages in direct action kinds of protest such as the exercise of fishing rights in Washington State where the state no longer recognized those rights which were previously guaranteed by treaty. Other organizations which have evolved in the 1960's have stressed the conditions of Indians in the urban areas more than tribal rights. The American Indian Movement which was founded by urban Indians in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area of Minnesota is one example. In the last two years, however, this organization has been establishing branch organizations in other cities. Even more recently, the American Indian Movement has broadened its concern to include reservation Indians.

One of the biggest problems within the new Indian militant movement is the problem of having many spokesmen which retards Indian unity. The National Congress of American

Indians works toward helping all Indian tribes to adopt modern, efficient tribal political organizations in an effort to secure a better life for Indians. On the other hand, the League of Nations Pan-American Indians tries to achieve the same goal through a revival system of chiefs and clans.[10] The United Native Americans and the American Indian Movement compete for national membership while offering many of the same goals and objectives. Until conflicts such as these are resolved, Vine Deloria, Jr., says, "we will not be able to move forward as a united people."[11]

The biggest need in resolving the problem of diverse spokesmen is the development of a leader capable of uniting the many factions among Indian people. This need has created a tendency among militant leaders to speak and act in the name of Crazy Horse, the great warrior who successfully united the Sioux in the final days of the Sioux Nation. In the closing chapter of his book, Custer Died for Your Sins, Vine Deloria, Jr., says,

> I conclude my comments by reminding the Indian people of the great war chief of the Oglala Sioux--Crazy Horse. Crazy Horse never drafted anyone to follow him.[12]

Later, Deloria writes, "Until we can once again produce people like Crazy Horse all the money and help in the world will not save us."[13]

New Indian Identity and Self-Awareness

Apart from the fact that the new Indian militancy has many different spokesmen who offer a variety of solutions for Indian people, there are common elements in each spokesman's message. One such element in virtually every message from the new Indian militant movement is a new sense of Indian identity and self-awareness. Sometimes it is clearly verbalized; at other times it is simply strongly implied. Seldom are the terms "identity" and "self-awareness" used by Indians. However, words such as tribalism, Indianness, Indian nationalism, traditional Indianism and pan-Indianism are used to describe this new or renewed realization of being Indian.

This new Indian identity and self-awareness is derived from a variety of sources. In most cases it is a result of a growing rejection of white society, culture and values. Stan Steiner describes this new mood as follows:

> The new Indians seek "proper adaptation." But to them it means adaptation of the non-Indian society to their modern Indianness. It means a rejection of the melting pot.[14]

This rejection of white society is further demonstrated by Vine Deloria, Jr., who says, "The primary goal and need of Indians today is not . . . to be classified as semi-whites and have programs and policies made to bleach us further."[15] Another Indian has said, "We've been surrounded by whites for too long, and we're too white."[16] Indian people are

beginning to consciously realize all the more that they are Indian, and they must be Indian.

Another source of new Indian identity seems to come from a sheer stubborn refusal of Indians to be removed from the consciousness of American society. The cumulative effect of the paternalism of government agencies has been the perpetration of two lies about Indian people: (1) Indians are incompetent wards, addicted to governmental paternalism, and (2) Indians are an anachronism whose future lies in assimilation. Since they feel that anthropologists and administrators are constantly promoting these lies, Indian people are determined not to vanish from American life. They seek to become visible by actions such as the occupation of Alcatraz.[17]

The new Indian identity is given different expression depending on the group or organization involved. Some groups present this new awareness in the form of a heightened tribal awareness. To a certain extent, the National Congress of American Indians fits into this category. It endeavors to raise the self-concept of tribes and tribal leadership by helping them acquire more sophisticated political organization and power whereby they can bargain more effectively with the Federal Government. Working on a narrower tribal basis is the United Sioux Tribes, an organization representing the nine Sioux tribes of the Dakotas. Part of its purpose is "to present the correct image of the Sioux, promote Indian

unity, and representation wherever possible."[18] While representing only Sioux tribes, the United Sioux Tribes is similar to the National Congress of American Indians in that it utilizes modern political methodology to achieve its goal of a greater Indian identity and self-awareness.

Not all organizations choose to operate with modern tribal political methodology. Therefore, their message sounds different. The League of Nations Pan-American Indians is dedicated to a revival of the traditional way of life in tribes as a means of restoring Indian identity. Their Newsletter states,

> Traditional Indian is the revival of the rich and peaceful spirit of the first native American Indian. Each Indian Nation or Tribe has its own traditional and spiritual guidance. The wisdom of their great ancestors has been passed from generation to generation. We ask our people to return to their old cultural and religious way of life. For example, the Longhouse people of the Iroquois are a government within a religion, and a religion within a government. This is a true Traditionalist Indian way of life. It is time to put it together again by putting together the fragments of our traditional, cultural way of life that has been scattering in all directions.[19]

While a return to a traditional way of life is interpreted by some Indians as an escape from the real Indian issues of the day, the League of Nations Pan-American Indians becomes involved in advocating favorable Indian legislation and direct action against State and Federal governments which violate Indian treaty rights. Like the other organizations mentioned above, the League of Nations Pan-American Indians operates within a tribal frame of reference.

Other organizations make no attempt to generate a new Indian identity within tribal groupings. These organizations attempt to unite followers across tribal lines solely on the basis of their Indianness. The efforts of these groups are generally labeled as "pan-Indianism" or "Indian nationalism." The National Indian Youth Council attempts to unite all Indian youth together in a purposeful organization because of a belief in a "greater Indian America."[20] Tribal concerns and identity become second to their concern for the rights of Indians in general. In recent years the National Indian Youth Council has formed an alliance with various urban Indian organizations to work for urban and young Indian people. With rise in education and sophistication of the urban Indians above that of the reservation Indian, this alliance may become more significant in the future.[21]

The rapidly expanding urban Indian population in the United States necessitates an investigation of the process of renewed Indian identity and self-awareness in the urban situation. Central to this process are the various urban Indian centers. In 1969, it was estimated by Indian sources that there were more than thirty such centers in existence at that time.[22] More centers are opening each year. Vine Deloria, Jr., predicts, "The urban areas show the most potential for strong lasting organizations, however, and once the urban Indians stabilize themselves they will experience phenomenal growth."[23]

The experiences of Indian people upon arriving in urban areas portray the reasons why Indian centers are forming. Basically, there are three reasons. (1) Urban Indians are abandoned by the many federal assistance agencies which were formerly available to them on the reservation. (2) Generally, Indians coming to the cities are ill-prepared and know little about city agencies which might be of help to them in the transition from reservation to urban living. (3) Most of all, these Indians suddenly find themselves separated from their tribe and family, both of which formerly provided a sense of security and identity.[24] Therefore, Indian centers become a way in which these urban Indians can protect themselves culturally, politically and economically. Stan Steiner observes that these Indians are

> not building an Indian urban community, but are building an Indian consciousness that is no longer tribal, but is extratribal. It too is an embryo of Indian nationalism.[25]

These urban Indian centers are something that Indian people can do <u>for</u> and <u>by</u> themselves.

Regardless of the diverse organizational forms into which the new Indian militancy is evolving a common message of a new Indian identity and self-awareness is being communicated. Stan Steiner quotes Mel Thom, the first chairman of the National Indian Youth Council as saying,

> Our Indian community exists at every level of society--in the universities, in the cities, on the reservations, in the government. It doesn't matter where Indians are any more. They remain Indian. They are, in fact, becoming more consciously Indian."[26]

Self-Determination and Red Power

The emergence of a new Indian identity and self-awareness is leading Indian people to take a closer look at their own situation. Indians are discovering that they have special rights inherent in treaties and previous Congressional acts. Also, they are discovering that the health, educational and economic status of their people is one of the worst in the United States. The result of these two discoveries is a realization that Indian people do not have to quietly and idly accept the latter discovery because of the former discovery. Legally, Indians are in a position to bargain with the Federal Government for better treatment. The success of the Black movement in appealing to moral principles in order to gain the demands of Blacks has also lent the element of moral principle to the Indian movement. Therefore, armed with legal support and moral appeals, Indian groups are proclaiming their message of self-determination and "Red power."

Both "Red power" and "self-determination " mean the same thing in the language of the new Indian militant movement.[27] Red power means that Indians are demanding power and control over their own lives. The paternalism of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the church, the deplorable health and economic conditions of Indian people are all dominated by non-Indian people. In the name of self-determination Indians are demanding "Indian control over

Indian destiny."[28] To get this message heard some Indian groups are engaging in direct-action protests. One example is the Indians for National Liberation who occupied the Offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Littleton, Colorado, on March 18, 1970, protesting job discrimination. They also demanded that the Office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs be discontinued as a politically appointed office which is not responsible directly to Indian people. Instead, they advocated that the Commissioner be an American Indian who is chosen by major established Indian organizations.[29] The Indian occupation of the abandoned federal prison facilities on Alcatraz Island in 1969 is another example of Indian people exerting power. The island was seized under a treaty right which gave abandoned federal lands to Indians. Neither the Federal Government nor the State of California intended to give the land to Indians.[30] The Sheep Mountain Pow-wow on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota during the summer of 1970 was a similar protest over the return of land. The Federal Government had planned to give a portion of the land formerly used for a bombing range to the Badlands National Monument rather than restoring it to the Pine Ridge Reservation.

Red power is also defined in the political sense. Vine Deloria, Jr., sees it in terms of Indian voting power and the development of a strong internal Indian leadership.[31] The political activity of Red power can be seen in the 1968

passage of the Indian Bill of Rights (Title II of the 1968 Civil Rights Act) by Congress. Although patterned after the Federal Bill of Rights, Indians successfully modified the Indian Bill of Rights to fit the Indian situation. The Indian Bill of Rights does not prohibit the establishment of religion by tribal governments, an element vitally necessary to the existence of traditional tribes such as the Pueblo. Also, the right of legal counsel is guaranteed to an individual only at his own expense, an element reflecting the economic status of most tribal governments.[32] However, the spirit of self-determination has caused some Indians to even oppose this Indian Bill of Rights. Domingo Montoya, Chairman of the All Indian Pueblo Council says,

> Imposed from the outside, these changes will deprive our citizens of the two most fundamental of all civil rights; the right to order within their own communities and the right to self-determination.[33]

Another aspect of Indian self-determination evolved out of the controversy over Congressional legislation on Indian affairs in the winter of 1966-67, called the Omnibus Bill because it was the "first general legislation in Indian Affairs since the Indian Re-organization Act of 1934."[34] Tribal leaders from thirty tribes were invited to Washington, D. C., by the Lyndon Johnson Administration to provide support for the passage of the Omnibus Bill. However, these tribal leaders voted 44 to 5 to reject it. Instead, they proposed the "Resolution of the Thirty Tribes" which demanded that the Federal Government deal with Indian people through

the same innovative aid programs which it extends to emerging nations of the world.[35]

Beneath the surface of the message of Red power and Indian self-determination are other implications which go beyond Indians controlling their own destiny. Red power is a re-affirmation of Indian culture and history. Indian militancy demands that Indian history and culture not only be respected by non-Indians but also be allowed to remain with Indian people.[36] Therefore, Red power is a rejection of the mass assimilation concept of modern urban society. More and more, Indian militants are condemning the Federal Indian boarding school system which removes Indian children from their traditional environment and teaches them a non-Indian concept of culture and history.[37] However, another implication of the Red power movement is that Indians have a superior way of life. Indians claim to have a more human philosophy of life in that they think in terms of people and not of property. The object of Red power as seen by Vine Deloria, Jr., is "to cut the whole country's value systems to shreds."[38]

Indictment of the Church

The new Indian militancy has not omitted the church from its message. On the contrary, its message contains a clear indictment of the Christian church as an oppressor of Indian people. Vine Deloria, Jr., summarized this feeling

by saying, "One of the major problems of the Indian people is the missionary."[39] The church has been involved with Indian people ever since white men landed on this continent. Therefore, Indian people today have a long history from which they document their indictment of the church. R. Pierce Beaver in his book, Church, State, and the American Indians, claims that the record of the church in dealing with the Indian people is not much better than that of the general public.[40] When viewed from the perspective of the new Indian militancy, this history of the involvement of the church with Indian people can lead to the following statement addressed to the church by the American Indian Movement:

> The conversion or brainwash to change religions was so successful that the Indian became almost ashamed of his heritage and culture. Three hundred and fifty years have been wasted by the churches through indoctrination that white people were our saviors . . ..
>
> In becoming almost ashamed, the young Indian adult has shied away from the church, in fact he has condemned his own teachers.[41]

Allen Nephew, an Indian and a Christian, sees the white church operating with certain presuppositions concerning Indians which have led to the failure of the church among Indians. Some of these are as follows: (1) The Indian is bad; (2) his family life is primitive; (3) his religion is pagan; (4) his customs are heathen; (5) he has to be changed; (6) he has to become Christian.[42] Nephew claims that the church has remembered the Great Commission but has forgotten that "our Lord did not say how this was to be done,

only that it was to be done."[43] Therefore, the attitude of most churches even to the present time is that what is not American culture or religion has to be made American. In reality, whatever is not European is not civilized and must be changed.[44] The new Indian militancy has exposed this bias of the church.

The indictment of the church charges that the church has always been too closely involved and allied with a culture, a system of government and non-Indian agencies which have systematically destroyed Indian people. Therefore, Indians are beginning to question the credibility of the church. Allen Nephew writes, "It is a sad note that under white skin came the good news of the Great Spirit's love for all men, as well as guns, whisky, greed for land and a desire to extinguish people."[45] The Newsletter of the League of Nations Pan-American Indians states,

> The Christian Church has too long associated itself with the capitalistic structures that have continually oppressed Indians. Missionaries have shown much concern for the soul of the Indian. Why have they not had the same concern for their bodily needs, the injustices inflicted on them, and treaty rights violations? Is the power structure too big to overcome?[46]

The new Indians are discovering that the church in America has historically been a mirror of the cultural and political systems of non-Indians. Theology and political ideology have always been confused, despite the concept of separation of church and state in America.[47]

The new Indian militancy also indicts the church for

being insensitive to the real needs of Indian people. The church has failed in many ways to develop critically needed Indian leadership. The failure of the church to substantially release its control over Indian missions to local Indian people contributes to the lack of self-government on the reservations.[48] Indians are disappointed over the relative lack of native Indian clergy even in those denominations that have historically dominated the Indian missions.[49] Various church sponsored youth leadership workshops for Indian youth have relied on non-Indian anthropologists to provide the input. Invariably, the message is the same at these workshops: Indians are folk people, while whites are urban people; the two can never be reconciled. This approach has blocked Indian youth leadership development rather than helped by providing the excuse for Indian failure. Therefore, young Indians avoid creatively thinking through their status in the modern urban world because they already know that they will fail.[50]

Charles Hatch, an Indian, claims that today the church does not relate to some of the key problems which Indians face, such as job training, unemployment and self-help.[51] For example, in the past the Niobrara Conferences of the Episcopal Church among the Sioux used to provide spiritual, as well as, political, social and economic leadership. However, today these conferences are for worship only.[52] Vine Deloria, Jr., charges that the church shows its insensitivity

toward Indians by its preoccupation with Blacks.[53] When the church does concern itself with Indian people it has the tendency to lump Indian concerns and Black concerns together in a common civil rights effort, thereby betraying the special rights and status of Indian people.[54] An example from the United Presbyterian Church demonstrates this betrayal of Indian people. In 1964 the General Assembly adopted a report calling for the end of the one all-Indian presbytery, the Presbytery of Dakota, in accord with the principle of "a nonsegregated church in a nonsegregated society." However, the Indians in the presbytery were never consulted for their consent or suggestion. The 1967 General Assembly set 1976 as the deadline for the Presbytery of Dakota to begin steps toward merging with the white Presbytery of the Black Hills. The Reverend Mr. Paul Firecloud objects to this procedure on the following grounds: (1) This is paternalism; (2) it shows that the white man once again overrules the Indians; (3) the Indian presbytery should decide when to merge with the whites, if at all.[55] Vine Deloria, Jr., predicts that the future of Indian people within the church depends on the willingness of the church (1) to stop proselyting from each other and to start helping Indian people, (2) to stop dictating to Indian people the form in which they must worship God, and (3) to end religious trusteeship of Indians.[56]

The indictment of the church by the new Indian militancy

indicates a refusal on the part of Indians to be excluded from playing a central role in an institution which has controlled their lives for so long. However, there are signs that the new Indians are not going to wait very long for an answer to their indictment of the church.

Revival of Traditional Indian Religion

The disappointment of Indian people with the church and the insensitivity of the church to Indian people are leading a number of Indians to seek meaning in traditional Indian religions. Just in recent years, the Sun Dance has been revived by the Oglala and the Rosebud Sioux, while the old Medicine Lodge religion has been gaining influence among the Chippewas and Winnebagos.[57] The Native American Church which combines Indian traditional ceremony, Christianity and the use of the peyote button has doubled its membership in just a few years. Vine Deloria, Jr., predicts that eventually the Native American Church will replace Christianity among Indian people.[58]

Indian prophets are appearing on the Indian scene. In 1967, Thomas Banyaca from the Hopi Tribe traveled from reservation to reservation with the message of traditional Hopi prophesy. Some Iroquois prophets accompanied Banyaca spreading the Iroquois prophesy regarding the end of the white man and the restoration of the Indian. In June of 1968, Banyaca and a Tuscarora prophet named "Mad Bear" Anderson

held two national conventions on native religion.[59] Shortly after the Indians in San Francisco occupied Alcatraz in 1969 they announced plans to include an American Indian Spiritual Center in the development plan for the island.[60] As pointed out before, the League of Nations Pan-American Indians is dedicated to the revival of the old traditional religious way of life.[61] That such a revival is even conceivable after such a long period of Christian involvement by the church with the Indians indicates the seriousness of the Indians' indictment of the church.

FOOTNOTES

[1]"The Angry American Indian: Starting Down the Protest Trail," Time Magazine (February 7, 1970), p. 20.

[2]Coalition of American Indian Citizens, Guts and Tripe, I(Sore Eye Moon, 1970), pp. 11-12.

[3]Vine Deloria, Jr., Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto (London: Collier-Macmillan, Limited, 1969), p. 227.

[4]Vine Deloria, Jr., We Talk, You Listen (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1970), p. 13.

[5]Buffy Sainte-Marie, "My Country 'Tis of Thy People Your Dying," The Blue Cloud Quarterly, XIV,3, p. 7.

[6]Stan Steiner, The New Indians (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 296.

[7]Ibid., p. 295.

[8]Ibid., p. 303.

[9]Ibid., p. 304.

[10]Deloria, Jr., Custer, p. 278.

[11]Ibid.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Ibid., p. 279.

[14]Steiner, p. 44.

[15]Deloria, Jr., Custer, p. 27.

[16]Steiner, p. 91.

[17]Peter Collier, "The Red Man's Burden," Ramparts (February, 1970), p. 28.

[18]Steiner, p. 295.

[19]League of Nations Pan-American Indians, Newsletter (May, 1970), p. 1.

[20]Steiner, p. 303.

[21]Deloria, Jr., Custer, p. 21.

[22]Ibid., p. 19.

[23]Ibid.

[24]Steiner, p. 186.

[25]Ibid., p. 187.

[26]Ibid., p. 41.

[27]Ibid., p. 271.

[28]Indians for National Liberation, Speak Out, An organizational news bulletin published irregularly (Spring, 1970), p. 2.

[29]Ibid., pp. 2-3.

[30]J. Coleman, "Lord of the Rock," America (May 2, 1970), p. 466.

[31]"An Indian Church for Indian People," Episcopalian (July, 1969), p. 8.

[32]Michael Smith, "Tribal Sovereignty and the 1968 Indian Bill of Rights," Civil Rights Digest (Summer, 1970), p. 12.

[33]Ibid., p. 15.

[34]Steiner, p. 297.

[35]Ibid., p. 284.

[36]Coleman, p. 467.

[37]Ibid.

[38]Steiner, p. x.

[39]Deloria, Jr., Custer, p. 101.

[40]R. Pierce Beaver, Church, State, and the American Indian (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966), p. 212.

[41]Minutes for the 1969 Lutheran Council in the U. S. A. Indian Ministry Conference (July 29-31, 1969), p. 10.

[42]Allen C. Nephew, "Christian Education and the American Indian," Religious Education (November-December, 1967), p. 507.

[43]Ibid.

[44]J. McMullen, "Indians Are Minorities, Too," Catholic Library World (May-June, 1970), p. 572.

[45]Nephew, p. 507.

[46]League of Nations Pan-American Indians, p. 2.

[47]Deloria, Jr., We Talk, pp. 202-203.

[48]Ernest L. Schusky, The Right to Be Indian (n. p., 1965), p. 70.

[49]Deloria, Jr., Custer, p. 119.

[50]Ibid., pp. 82-83.

[51]"Standing Rock Speaks," Episcopalian (March, 1969), p. 5.

[52]Ibid., p. 50.

[53]Deloria, Jr., Custer, p. 75.

[54]Ibid., p. 170.

[55]James W. Hoffman, "A Comeback for the Vanishing American," Presbyterian Life (January 15, 1969), pp. 34-35.

[56]Deloria, Jr., Custer, p. 276.

[57]Ibid., p. 113.

[58]Ibid.

[59]Ibid., p. 114.

[60]Coleman, p. 466.

[61]Supra, p. 44.

CHAPTER IV

THE SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE CHURCH

The new Indian militancy is placing much attention on the church regardless of whether or not the church likes it. Therefore, the church cannot ignore this new Indian movement. Allen Nephew, an Indian Christian, says,

> we, the church, have, and are, in the name of Christ, inflicting an American Christianity upon the Indian. We are caught in our own legacy. And the Indian has rejected our infliction to a large degree. Now the time is upon us to seek to recapture that which has been lost for a people who are rightfully crying for dignity and respect in this day and age. As Christians how are we to listen?[1]

The fact is, however, that the concerns of Indian missions and Indian rights attract the action and sympathy of only a small percentage of church members. This was true even during the 1950's when Indian people were struggling against the threats of termination.[2] However, the church has responded in the past years and is continuing to struggle with the implications of the message of the new Indian militancy. This chapter will explore some of the avenues open to church response.

Effects on Policy

The new Indian militancy is forcing the church to look at its policies for mission. Changes in church policy are needed if their demands are to be met. The lack of self-determination among Indian missions, the lack of a large indigenous ministry and the lack of sensitive approaches

to the problems of Indian rights indicate policies which the new militants are no longer willing to accept. The very concept of denominationalism has been questioned by Indians as a relevant approach to Indian people. It has even been suggested by Indians that the best thing that the national denominations could do to revitalize their mission among Indian people would be to allow Indians to consolidate all the denominational resources expended on Indians into a national Indian Christian church.[3]

Before any policies can be radically affected by the new Indian militancy the non-Indian membership of the church will have to gain a better understanding of Indians. This especially applies to those non-Indians who relate directly to Indian people. Therefore, the basic policy change needed is a new realization that non-Indians need to be trained and sensitized to the special status and unique position of Indians among other minority groups with whom the church ministers. Furthermore, non-Indians need to be trained (1) to listen to the culture of Indian people and (2) to know the history of past missions to Indian people.[4] When the church begins to sensitize its non-Indian membership through proper education, perhaps they will begin to realize that the Indian must be confronted by Christianity where he is. Those tribal values which once were considered bad, heathen, and pagan are the very ones through which the Gospel must travel.[5] As the Jesuit Theodore Zuern states,

> God knew what he was about when he created Indians as Indians. The Indians want to retain their identity as Indians; and as missioners, working in their interest, it is our purpose to help them be their true selves.[6]

The most extensive effect of the new Indian militancy on the policies of the church is reflected in the document, Goals for the Indian Ministry, adopted on March 12, 1968, by the Program Board--Division of Christian Life and Mission of the National Council of Churches.[7] This document formulates ten broad goals which bring the life and the structures of the church in contact with every phase of Indian life--religious, social, cultural, political and economic. The various objectives which accompany these goals spell out concrete ways in which the church can responsibly implement these goals. This document advocates an Indian mission policy which is not tied to the establishment of institutions, which allows for maximum Indian involvement and an indigenous Indian church, which involves an interdenominational approach and which provides for the maximum self-determination of Indian people in all areas of their life.[8] These broad goals and objectives could revolutionize the church's approach to ministry with Indian people if these goals would be adopted by the constituent members in the National Council of Churches. However, at the July, 1970 meeting of the National Fellowship of Indian Workers' Conference sponsored by the National Council of Churches, only sporadic efforts to implement these goals were reported. The National Council of Churches can only advocate their implementation. Therefore, Indians have

to wait on each member denomination to decide for itself on the extent to which it will adopt the Goals for the Indian Ministry as denominational policy.

Other policy changes are taking place in the face of the rise of a new Indian militancy. Some churches are allowing community Indian organizations to use church property for non-church related activities, a policy not widely accepted in the past.[9] As a result of the "Challenge to the Churches" that was presented to the 1969 Lutheran Church and Indian People Conference by Indian people, a National Indian Lutheran Board was elected at the 1970 conference.[10] Of the twenty-four members elected to the Board, eighteen were elected by the Indians themselves. However, most significant was the fact that only eight of the twenty-four members are Lutheran.[11] It remains to be seen whether or not the national Lutheran bodies can accept a policy of non-Lutherans deciding mission priorities for Lutheran Churches.

Effects on Structure

The rise of the new Indian movement has affected the structure of the church in addition to influencing policies. The structures by which the church relates to Indian people have been affected as well as the structures which the church provides for Indians to influence it. In 1962 The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod adopted a convention resolution stating,

> That our Board for North and South American Missions, in conjunction with the Districts and local congregations where the needs are most evident, thoroughly explore the possibilities of reaching and ministering to all neglected groups such as. . . Indian Americans who are being relocated from their reservations to urban centers . . ..[12]

As a result of this resolution, Reverend W. Walter Weber was called to the South Dakota District in May, 1964, as National Indian Ministry Consultant for The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. In that role, Reverend Weber was to sensitize the Synodical Mission Board and other agencies of the church to the needs and situation of American Indians. In 1966 the Annual Conference of the Lutheran Church and the Indian American resolved to change its scope to include more Indian expression. The result of this resolve was the formation of a new organization called Lutheran Church and Indian People.[13] Since 1966, Indian participation has increased substantially so that in 1970, 166 conference delegates were Indian as compared to 100 non-Indian delegates.[14]

The Episcopal Church has also had its structures affected by the new Indian movement. In the 1960's the Episcopal Church helped form the United Scholarship Service to help provide educational opportunities for Indians. By 1969 this organization was operating with funds of $325,000. Also, the Episcopal Church has established the permanent position of a consultant for the recruitment and counseling of indigenous Indian ministerial candidates.[15] Other denominations are making structural changes also. Some have devoted efforts

to establish Indian community centers such as the Indian Welcome House in Los Angeles by the United Presbyterian Church and the Community Center in Rapid City, South Dakota, by the United Church of Christ.[16] The Roman Catholics can point to change in their structures by referring to Our Lady of the Sioux Catholic Church in Oglala, South Dakota. Here an extensive effort has been made to incorporate Indian culture and symbolism into the worship service. The pastor, Father Steinmetz, says,

> Indians should be encouraged to interpret Christianity through symbols of their own heritage, rather than sacrifice their old beliefs and, with them, their Indian identity.[17]

Even the above mentioned changes are not sufficient to satisfy all the demands of the new Indian militant movement. They are demanding that church structures change to allow Indians to control the funds which denominations collect and spend on Indian missions. Indian militants see this change as a necessary step on the part of churches in allowing the self-determination of Indian people. This basic philosophy is behind the "Challenge to the Churches" which were presented to the Lutheran Churches in 1969 demanding that the Lutheran Churches give $750,000 per year for ten years to an Indian board to spend as it chooses.[18] Also, in reflecting this current Indian mood, the Goals for the Indian Ministry calls for more structural changes than have occurred to date. The church must create structures to enable it to "dialogue with the larger Indian community" beyond its parochial

membership.[19] Structures must also be changed to help provide better economic development and better housing, sanitation and health for Indian people.[20] In all, the new Indian militancy is testing the ability of church structures to make significant changes in a relatively short period of time.

Effects on Political Stance

The new Indian militancy is reminding the church that the American doctrine of separation of church and state is a myth. In fact, they charge that the church has always been so closely allied with the American government and culture that the church has lost its ability to speak out against that government and culture even when it wrongs Indian people. Out of this confrontation has evolved the necessity for the church to examine its political stance. The Goals for the Indian Ministry states the following as its ninth goal: "Recognition of the church's responsibility to see that legislation, appropiations, and administrative actions are acceptable to Indian people and meet their needs as they see them."[21]

Typical of the effort on the political stance of the church is the events reported in the following news account:

> After debating whether the Synod should involve itself in political issues, delegates to the July 27-30 convention of the North Wisconsin District here voted to support a bill before the U. S. House of Representatives to grant 13,000 acres of land in Shawano County to the Stockbridge-Munsee Tribe of American Indians.[22]

The church may be debating whether or not it should become involved in politics in behalf of Indian people; however,

Indians are demanding that involvement. Therefore, the July, 1970, National Fellowship of Indian Workers' Conference passed a unanimous resolution supporting the Alaskan Federation of Natives in their attempt to secure a just settlement of the Alaskan native land claims.

Indians are not only demanding that the church support them in their political and legal struggles. In addition, they are calling the church to oppose the government when it attempts to pass legislation which Indians believe to be detrimental to their existence. Also, the new Indian movement is demanding that the church use its influence to prevent the various means of mass media from presenting biased or condescending information regarding Indian people.[23] The new Indian militant movement is not about to let the church easily forget that its failure to prophetically challenge the American government and culture is largely responsible for the American Indian's situation today.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Allen C. Nephew, "Christian Education and the American Indian," Religious Education (November-December, 1967), p. 510.

[2]R. Pierce Beaver, Church, State, and the American Indian (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966), p. 212.

[3]Vine Deloria, Jr., Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto (London: Collier-Macmillan, Limited, 1969), pp. 122-123.

[4]J. McMullen, "Indians Are Minorities, Too," Catholic Library World (May-June, 1970), pp. 572-573.

[5]Nephew, p. 509.

[6]T. Zuern, "Indians Must Be Indians," Catholic Digest (April, 1969), p. 80.

[7]See Appendix B. Reproduced from the tract entitled Goals for the Indian Ministry published by the Division of Christian Life and Mission--National Council of Churches, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York.

[8]Appendix B, pp. 75-78.

[9]Indians for National Liberation, Speak Out, An organizational news bulletin published irregularly (Spring, 1970), p. 7.

[10]Supra, pp. 4-5.

[11]Lutheran Church and Indian People, Spearhead (December, 1970), p. 5.

[12]The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, Proceedings of the Forty-Fifth Regular Convention [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1962] , p. 94.

[13]Minutes of the 1970 Lutheran Indian Conference and LUCHIP Assembly (July 31-August 2, 1970), p. 11.

[14]Ibid., p. 14.

[15]"Standing Rock Speaks," Episcopalian (March, 1969), p. 44.

[16]James W. Hoffman, "A Comeback for the Vanishing American," Presbyterian Life (February 1, 1969), pp. 37-38.

[17]D. Collins, "The Christians of Oglala," Catholic Digest (December, 1969), p. 75.

[18]*Supra*, p. 5.

[19]Appendix B, p. 79.

[20]Appendix B, pp. 81-83.

[21]Appendix B, p. 86.

[22]Lutheran Church and Indian People, p. 5.

[23]Appendix B, 86-87.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This paper has been an attempt to review the roots and the message of the new Indian militancy along with an evaluation of its significance for the church. The evidence shows that there is a substantial base already present in the nearly 600,000 American Indians and numerous other people of Indian heritage for a militant movement to create an impact upon America. Indian people are unique among racial minorities in having substantial legal bases for prosecuting their demands. Their extremely miserable conditions of poverty and poor health coupled with their awakening conception of the paternalism of governments and churches have combined to create a catalyst for Red power. Indian people are beginning to realize that their own silence has allowed them to be pushed out of their land and heritage.

While there are many spokesmen in the Red power movement who often contradict and compete against each other, there are common elements to their message. Indian people are beginning to assert their Indianness; and in so doing, they are finding a means to unity across tribal lines. They are committed to determining their own destiny in spite of their past submission to governments and churches. Even though Indian militants angrily indict the church for its failure among Indian people, it is significant that they are continuing to talk to the church. How long this contact with the church will last is not certain. The rise of traditional

Indian religious groups seems to be setting a time limit on Indian involvement with the church. Even if traditional religious groups do not completely replace the church among Indian people, their renewed presence will significantly alter the mission of the church to Indian people.

This paper has also attempted to show that the new Indian militancy is placing a great pressure on the church to change its policies, structures and political stance in order to relate meaningfully to Indian people. This paper did not attempt to go deeper and analyze why Indians are so concerned about the church. Further study is needed to determine if the new Indian militancy is concerned with the church only because it is a large potential source of political power, or if these Indians are in some way still concerned about Christianity. Whether or not native religion will ever replace Christianity may depend on the nature of this Indian concern for the church. However, the mandate from the new Indian militant movement is clear: the church must change if it is to remain in touch with a growing segment of the American Indian people.

APPENDIX A

INDIAN ORGANIZATIONS

The following is a listing of ten of the more prominent existing Indian organizations actively engaged in seeking Indian rights:

Alaska Federation of Natives
Albert S. Kaloa Building
16th and C.
P. O. Box 3408
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

American Indian Movement
1337 East Franklin
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404

Association On American Indian Affairs
432 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10016

Coalition of American Indian Citizens
P. O. Box 18421, Capitol Hill Station
Denver, Colorado 80218

Indians for National Liberation
P. O. Box 18285, Capitol Hill Station
Denver, Colorado 80218

Indian Rights Association
1505 Race Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

League of Nations Pan-American Indians
1139 Lehman Place
Johnstown, Pennsylvania 15902

National Congress of American Indians
1346 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Room 1019
Washington, D. C. 20036

National Indian Youth Council
3102 Central S. E.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

United Native Americans, Incorporated
P. O. Box 26149
San Francisco, California 94126

APPENDIX B

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES' GOALS FOR THE INDIAN MINISTRY

PREAMBLE

The Indian Ministry of the many churches, individually and through the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA, is a Christian ministry. Its foundation is the Lordship of Christ over all of life. Its motivation is Christ's command to "Feed my sheep." Its overarching purpose is that the more abundant life which Christ came to make available shall indeed be the experience of all.

"Abundant life" for the Christian means the regenerate life of personal faith in Jesus Christ as God and Savior of mankind. Such life naturally moves toward establishing acceptance in the human community, first class political citizenship, and adequate economic levels of living for every human being under the gracious rule of God.

Dynamic forces are at work among the 600,000 or more American Indians in the United States. Church forms, missionary structures and programs, however well suited to conditions of a generation ago, may be of doubtful effectiveness under today's conditions.

A renewed Church in terms of a vital and relevant ministry to persons and in terms of acceptance of responsibility to help change social conditions and structures is an imperative for this day of rapid and demanding changes.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

In the light of the foregoing, the Program Board of the Division of Christian Life and Mission, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA affirms the following Goals and Objectives for the Indian Ministry and commends them to the proper units of the Division of Christian Life and Mission and its constituent denominations for fullest possible implementation.

GOAL I

A STRONG CHRISTIAN WITNESS THROUGH INDIAN PARTICIPATION AND INTERCHURCH PLANNING

Communication of the Gospel is sowing the seed, not transplanting churches. It is lighting the spark, not establishing an institution. An indigenous church is the living response of people to the life demands of the Gospel.

Objectives:

A. That Church boards and agencies implement all necessary restructuring to make possible full participation by Indian people in all levels of planning and implementation of programs within the life of the Church;

That denominational and interdenominational agencies consider the creation of advisory committees on Indian work with a majority of the members Indian;

That Indians be placed in positions of responsiblity and leadership in recruitment and training.

B. That national denominational and interdenominational

agencies provide for continuous cooperative planning for Christian work with Indian people.

C. That development of area and regional interchurch planning such as the Navajo Fellowship of Indian Missions and Protestant Indian Council of Oklahoma be encouraged.

D. That Indian people in facing unique needs share fully in all the service, leadership and helping ministries of the Church, such as social welfare service, programs of rehabilitation, urban planning, Christian Education, and leadership development.

E. That trained professional Indian leadership be developed as rapidly as possible.

F. That there be increased use of Indian lay workers for full time salaried service such as:

1. Those who are not fully trained (in areas where there is lack of trained leadership) with access to trained resource people and continuing education.

2. Partially trained lay workers with leadership capacities who in particular situations have a high degree of rapport among Indian people.

3. Highly trained Indian lay specialists.

G. That all workers be given training in the culture, history and values of the tribes they serve.

H. That judicatories and interchurch groups engage in experimental projects and sharing of experiences. The Indian Section of the NCC should be the clearing house for the exchange of findings.

I. That periodic evaluation of the Indian programs of the churches, on an area, regional and national level be done.

GOAL II

AN EFFECTIVE CHRISTIAN WITNESS IN THE LOCAL CHURCH

Objectives:

A. That materials and methods be used that are meaningful in the life experience of Indian people.

B. That better salaries have a high priority.

C. That there be extensive experimentation in vital worship services:

1. For all age groups.

2. Related to experience of the people.

3. Utilizing indigenous symbolism.

D. That there be much fuller involvement in the total life of the community through:

1. Establishment of an interchurch committee to cooperate with tribal councils, governmental agencies, other churches and agencies.

2. Creation of informal interagency dialogue groups to share insights.

3. More effective utilization of present staff and budget through interchurch planning, specialization and group ministries.

4. Greater use of area and mobile ministries in combination with lay leadership.

5. Ministries into the community through the use of

voluntary workers.

6. Ministries in relation to federal, state, and local economic development.

GOAL III

FULLEST OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION

Objectives:

A. That the Church and its agencies support Indian groups in their efforts to determine their own needs, priorities and actions best suited to fulfill those needs.

B. That the Churches collect and disseminate information on resources, methods and channels for writing and submitting projects related to community development and organization.

C. That denominations give highest priority to recruitment and training of indigenous community development personnel, using such resources as the Inter-religious Foundation for Community Organization.

D. That support be given to a national Indian policy which would give Indian people responsibility for the control of their own affairs, with government officials and other qualified persons serving only as resource people.

E. That services of all units of the U. S. Government be made available to Indian people and that Indian people be involved immediately in planning and administration of such programs.

F. That conflict in varying degrees be recognized as an element in all social change and that the churches, in dialogue with the larger Indian community, be prepared to share with them their concerns and needs in the social and political struggles that exist.

G. That the churches encourage Indian people in programs of political education and voter registration, in becoming candidates for public office, and in full participation in community and public decision-making.

GOAL IV

MAXIMUM OPPORTUNITY FOR INDIAN YOUTH IN SELF REALIZATION AND TRAINING FOR ANY SOCIETY

Objectives:

A. That the Christian Education units of denominations be urged to commit their trained resources to the assessment and upgrading of the quality and quantity of Christian education available to Indian youth both on the reservation and in relation to BIA boarding schools.

B. That there be increased numbers of accessible, trained counselors who are trusted by youth, understanding home situations, and pressures upon youth.

These could be:

1. Leaders trained through special seminars in youth guidance.

2. Public and BIA school counselors fully trained in guidance of Indian youth and who can understand the cultural

differences which often block Indian students from continuing to higher education.

3. Trained counselors from mission school staffs such as Bacone College, Cook Christian Training School, Ganado Mission High School, and Rehoboth Mission School which provide helpful programs designed to assist youth to find objectives and motivations.

C. That there be made available, through educational institutions and other agencies, such motivational research aids and experimentation as may be a useable resource for counselors, teachers, ministers, and other guidance personnel. For example, efforts should be made by responsible interdenominational committees to have motivational material included in textbooks geared to needs of Indian youth.

D. That there be provision of adequate scholarships for secondary, vocational, and higher education, recognizing the excellent educational counseling service of the United Scholarship Services, and church related colleges.

E. That greater emphasis be given to involving specialized agencies within or outside the church in the exploration of better ways of teaching English as a second language through research, experimentation, and demonstration.

F. That education be provided Indian youth which emphasizes a healthy and natural pride in being Indian within present society.

G. That training opportunities be provided for youth as

future community leaders, and that they be given apprenticeship training in the work of the reservation.

H. That Indian people be encouraged in their demand for more control over educational policies and programs at all levels.

I. That greater utilization be made of the specialized facilities of Cook Christian Training School, particularly in its emphasis on the Transitional Program, the personalized services to students, and the intern program.

GOAL V

INVOLVEMENT OF THE CHURCH IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Objectives:

A. That paramount importance be given to providing job opportunities.

B. That churches participate in or initiate programs to eliminate poverty recognizing that many behavior patterns are due to the culture of poverty as well as Indian culture.

C. That specialists, e.g., agronomists, be challenged to volunteer to help develop natural resources of the reservation in cooperation with tribal leaders.

D. That people from various vocations be recruited to help motivate young people to seek vocational and professional training.

E. That greater use be made of the church related schools and scholarship funds for vocational training as well as for higher education.

F. That a Committee of Christian leaders of industry be created to challenge industrialists to establish branch plants in border communities and on reservations affording job opportunities for Indian people, working in cooperation with the National Congress of American Indians and the Branch of Industrial Development, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

G. That there be an awareness of the results of industrialization, e.g., in situations where the people are moved from isolated reservation areas to areas where no provision is made for adequate schools, housing and social life.

H. That efforts be extended to create interest and involvement in cooperatives and other self-help enterprises to spread effective ownership and control of economic resources. This should include participation in training of leaders in the cooperative movement, and effective relationship with secular organizations active in this field such as the Cooperative League of the USA and others.

GOAL VI

INVOLVEMENT OF THE CHURCH IN SECURING BETTER HOUSING AND SANITATION

Objectives:

A. That the churches be aware of the urgent need for adequate housing available to Indian people.

B. That they acquaint themselves in depth with the working details of government and private resources including those for individuals and group self-help housing.

C. That the churches disseminate such information and support the effort of tribal groups and individual families to provide for themselves more adequate housing.

GOAL VII

ACHIEVEMENT OF HEALTH LEVELS COMPARABLE TO PREVAILING AMERICAN STANDARDS

Objectives:

A. That church leadership become informed about continuing health needs, and acquainted with available services.

B. That the church cooperate in so far as possible with all health agencies, including those dealing with family planning.

C. That the Church cooperate with agencies dealing with alcoholism, provide ministries of its own, and enable workers to take specialized training.

D. That the Church recognize the urgent need for psychiatric and psychological services, and stimulate the development of services to meet this need.

GOAL VIII

RECOGNITION OF MOVEMENT OF INDIANS TO METROPOLITAN AND NON-METROPOLITAN CENTERS AS A CHALLENGE TO EXTEND FRIENDLY UNDERSTANDING AND CHRISTIAN PRESENCE

Objectives:

Metropolitan

A. That Indian concerns be related to urban groups planning total urban strategy.

B. That responsiblity for Indian concerns and coordination of ministries be assigned to a specific unit within metropolitan councils of churches, and denominational judicatories.

C. That an urban ministry be encouraged in every major center to which significant numbers of Indians migrate.

D. That, while recognizing an integrated Church as the ultimate goal, denominations should encourage indigenous efforts toward Indian churches with open membership, where there is demonstrated need and desire.

E. That churches encourage experimentation in forms of congregational life meaningful to the Indian newcomer e.g., the "store-front" church, house groups, worshiping and fellowship groups within established churches, and street ministries.

F. That churches and church judicatories give high priority support to self-determining Indian organizations such as Indian Centers, political action groups, cultural and athletic groups.

G. That there be established more effective religious follow-up programs, working through the Offices of Employment Assistance, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and other agencies and groups making contact with Indian people.

H. That classes be conducted in education for understanding of the Indian newcomer through Councils of Churches, judicatory leadership or local churches.

I. That there be created orderly means of communication

between directors of Indian Ministries, Councils of Churches and metropolitan pastors on one hand, and the reservation and rural church leaders on the other.

J. That there be developed at the reservation level effective training and orientation experiences for Indians preparing to move to metropolitan areas.

Non-Metropolitan

K. That the Employment Assistance Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs be petitioned to expand its services of job training and placement to include small cities and towns adjacent to reservations.

L. That state Councils of Churches in those states with sizable border-town Indian populations be urged to create committees to:

1) Foster mutual understanding.

2) Encourage Indian participation in community activity and decision making.

3) Encourage local congregations to open ministries with Indian people.

4) Facilitate relationships between border-town congregations and reservation churches.

M. That there be established service centers with programs designed to fill at least two major needs:

1) Friendship Center to enable newcomers to achieve adjustment to community life.

2) A rest center or day service facility for Indians

from reservations spending a few hours in the non-metropolitan community.

GOAL IX

RECOGNITION OF THE CHURCH'S RESPONSIBILITY TO SEE THAT LEGISLATION, APPROPRIATIONS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS ARE ACCEPTABLE TO INDIAN PEOPLE AND MEET THEIR NEEDS AS THEY SEE THEM

Objectives:

A. That there be recognition of the sanctity of those treaties and agreements given general validity through history and record, until the day when the nation's moral and legal obligations are fulfilled, and that there be recognition of the right of consent by Indians where such treaties and agreements may be altered.

B. That there be support for legislation providing for self determination in the areas of housing, education, economics, etc., as illustrated by Goals and Objectives elsewhere in this document.

C. That the Church assume a role relative to legislation which will not only support that which is positive but readily oppose such legislation which may be deemed detrimental to the welfare of Indian people.

GOAL X

AUTHENTIC, NON-CONDESCENDING PUBLIC INFORMATION REGARDING AMERICAN INDIANS

Objectives:

A. That formal overtures be made to all mass media requesting greater sensitivity in programming.

B. That knowledgeable Indian people be involved in the initial stages of planning and production of all mass media programs.

C. That strong encouragement be given by the NCC Section on Indian Work and the Council on Indian Affairs, to church, professional and governmental educational agencies, and to editors and publishers of text books and general educational materials that information relative to Indians and Indian affairs be inclusively adequate, historically accurate, and up-to-date.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

Deloria, Vine Jr. Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto. London: Collier-Macmillan, Limited, 1969.

Steiner, Stan. The New Indians. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

B. Secondary Sources--Books

Beaver, R. Pierce. Church, State, and the American Indian. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966.

Deloria, Vine Jr. We Talk, You Listen. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1970.

Levine, Stuart, and Nancy Oestreich Lurie, editors. The American Indian Today. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, Inc., 1968.

Schusky, Ernest L. The Right to Be Indian. Institute of Indian Studies, The University of South Dakota and Board of National Missions--United Presbyterian Church. n. p., 1965.

Tyler, S. Lyman. Indian Affairs: A Study of the Changes in Policy of the United States Toward Indians. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University, 1964.

Washburn, Wilcomb E., editor. The Indian and the White Man. Anchor Book "Documents in American Civilization Series." Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1964.

C. Secondary Sources--Periodicals

"The Angry American Indian: Starting Down the Protest Trail," Time Magazine, February 9, 1970, 14-20.

Coleman, J. "Lords of the Rock," America, May 2, 1970, 465-467.

Collier, Peter. "The Red Man's Burden," Ramparts, February, 1970, 30-33.

Collins, D. "The Christians of Oglala," Catholic Digest, December, 1969, 72-80.

"Health Problems of the American Indian," Currents in Public Health, February, 1967, 1-3.

Hedgepeth, William. "America's Indians," Look, June 2, 1970, 23.

Hoffman, James W. "A Comeback for the Vanishing American," Presbyterian Life, January 15, 1969, 6-9, 34-37.

_____. "A Comeback for the Vanishing American," Presbyterian Life, February 1, 1969, 16-19, 36-38.

"An Indian Church for Indian People?" Episcopalian, July, 1969, 8-10.

McMullen, J. "Indians Are Minorities, Too," Catholic Library World, May-June, 1970, 572-574.

Nephew, Allen C. "Christian Education and the American Indian," Religious Education, November-December, 1967, 503-510.

"Our Shameful Failure With America's Indians," Reader's Digest, April, 1970, 104-109.

Sainte-Marie, Buffy. "My Country 'Tis of Thy People You're Dying," The Blue Cloud Quarterly. XIV. 3, 1-8.

Schusky, Ernest L. "Mission and Government Policy in Dakota Indian Communities," Practical Anthropology, June, 1963, 109-114.

Smith, Michael. "Tribal Sovereignty and the 1968 Indian Bill of Rights," Civil Rights Digest, Summer, 1970, 9-15.

"Standing Rock Speaks," Episcopalian, March, 1969, 3-5, 44-50.

Zuern, T. "Indians Must Be Indians," Catholic Digest, April, 1969, 76-80.

D. Secondary Sources--Miscellaneous

Coalition of American Indian Citizens. Guts and Tripe. An organizational news bulletin published irregularly. I (Sore Eye Moon, 1970), 1-15.

Indians for National Liberation. Speak Out. An organizational news bulletin published irregularly. Spring, 1970.

League of Nations Pan-American Indians. Newsletter, May, 1970, 1-4.

Lutheran Church and Indian People. Spearhead, December, 1970, 4-5.

The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. Proceedings of the Forty-Fifth Regular Convention, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1962.

Minutes for the 1969 Lutheran Council in the U. S. A. Indian Ministry Conference and 1969 Annual Assembly of Lutheran Church and Indian People. July 29-31, 1969. (mimeographed)

Minutes for the 1970 Lutheran Indian Conference and LUCHIP Assembly. July 31-August 2, 1970. (mimeographed)

Special Subcommittee on Indian Education. Indian Education: A National Tragedy--A National Challenge. 1969 Report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

United States Department of the Interior--Bureau of Indian Affairs. Answers to Your Questions about American Indians. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, May, 1968.