

Part I

# *Contexts*

# **I** *Witness to Change* Fifty Years of Indian Activism and Tribal Politics

*Donald L. Fixico*

The field of American Indian studies has gone through a series of upheavals since the late 1960s, with much of the debate revolving around research methodologies and the need to recognize Native agency and voice.<sup>1</sup> Donald L. Fixico, since 1969, when he began his college career, has been a central participant in this debate, and his work has been instrumental to the rewriting of twentieth-century American Indian history. Here he offers a personal reflection on the everyday experiences and formal literature that have shaped his thinking about the relationships between politics, activism, and scholarship. His argument for useable histories focused on the internal dynamics of Indian persistence charts a course for new studies of politics and activism.<sup>2</sup> Fred Hoxie, in chapter 2, builds upon this analysis with a critique of the Western historical canon.

Looking back at the years of growing up in Oklahoma, I am amazed that so much has happened in my part of Indian Country. The same can be said for the rest of Indian Country. What I remember most about my rural childhood during the 1950s and early 1960s involves going to stomp dances in eastern Oklahoma, yet so much occurred during this decade that threatened my four tribes (Shawnee, Sac and Fox, Muscogee Creek, and Seminole) and others. I did not fully realize this until I began my graduate studies at the University of Oklahoma in federal-Indian relations during the twentieth century. In my world of the Seminole and Muscogee Creeks, “Red Power” related naturally to the Red Stick warriors of the Creeks, and activism did

not equate to much of anything relevant in my growing up years around the towns of Shawnee and Seminole.

When I focused my research on the policy of termination during the 1950s and 1960s, I came to the realization that most Indians knew very little about it—unless, that is, they were citizens of the tribes that had been terminated, like the Menominee of Wisconsin or the Klamath of Oregon. In fact, most Americans knew very little about termination when it was happening. And they still do not know. It is almost as if this dreadful Indian policy was and is a big secret.

I was born during the years of the Korean War and at about the same time as the federal government began its push for termination. In addition to ending tribes' trust relationships, it was offering relocation to all American Indians. The government hoped that if Indians left tribal communities and moved to big cities, they would lose their culture and their attachment to the land. As I mentioned, during my own childhood much of what mattered to me had little to do with termination, relocation, or how tribes responded to these. It took graduate study to sort out all of this much later. But during that time, I came to realize that these federal decisions were, in large measure, a response to the Second World War and to the onset of the Cold War.

My heroes were Uncle Telmond and Uncle Otis. I remember seeing their pictures on the walls in their houses as a youngster and admiring them in their uniforms. I never asked questions about their war experiences, but I thought that if they wanted to talk to me about them, I would be ready to listen. They were two of an estimated twenty-five thousand Native men and several hundred Native women who served in the armed forces during World War II. The United States was our country too, and there was no doubt about this as another ten-thousand-plus Indian men fought in Korea. Heroes emerged during both conflicts, such as the Navajo Code Talkers and Oklahoma Indians Ernest Childers, a Creek, and Jack Montgomery, a Cherokee, both of whom earned the Medal of Honor. Ironically, the Native patriotism of people like Childers, Montgomery, and my uncles is what convinced the United States government that a new policy of assimilating Indians into the American mainstream seemed right.

World War II changed attitudes about everything, including Indians. I remember saluting and saying the Pledge of Allegiance to the American flag in school every morning. I went to a rural public school, Bethel School, outside Shawnee, Oklahoma. My younger brother and I were about the only Indians at Bethel. I still recall writing with the big, thick pencils on heavy, dark red Big Chief tablets in the first and second grades. I was Indian, and everyone knew it because I looked Indian. Somehow I felt connected to the picture on the front of the Big Chief tablet, and this was not a good feeling.

In those days at a country school, it seemed that everyone used those tablets in the first and second grades. I was always the only Indian in class, and only years later did it dawn on me why I was seated toward the front of the class only once, in the second grade. My assigned seat was always the last seat in the row during the first through sixth grades, although I usually was one of the best students with the highest marks in every class.

This is what it was like for me to be Indian when Dwight Eisenhower, the American war hero, was president of the United States and Oklahoma was a provincial state. I also remember the ring of the bell that started those all too common drills in elementary school. I remember hiding in the school's basement or in hallways. In case of a nuclear attack, we were to sit in rows against the wall, ducking our heads. The imminence of it seemed real, and I was taught to understand the serious threat Communism posed to democracy in the world. Despite this, I continued to go to stomp dances in my tribal community, and that seemed right. Our ground was Gar Creek. My family's connection to that place was through the Ceyvha band of Seminoles. They started the ceremonial fire for their community after removal to Oklahoma from northern Florida in the late 1830s.

Only later did I begin to comprehend just how detrimental the 1950s were for tribal communities. The government tried to dismantle tribal leadership across Indian Country, and with a firm, paternalistic hand it attempted to suppress any leadership movement among tribes. I remember feeling frustrated about this helpless situation, and it contributed to my decision to study termination and relocation as my doctoral dissertation topic. I kept thinking, what could be more important than writing about the termination policy? It seemed so ultimate, so final. If termination had been carried out to its full, logical conclusion—and in some cases it was—it would have brought an absolute end to treaties and the complete nullification of trust responsibilities that the federal government really did not want to live up to anyway. Through my studies, I came to learn that the Eisenhower administration's view on Indian affairs derived from a small group of Western congressmen—Arthur Watkins, Patrick McCarren, Hugh Butler, and Richard Neuberger—whose constituents' interests conflicted with tribal resources on reservation lands in states such as Utah, Nevada, Wisconsin, and Oregon.

As I naively began research into this enormous national topic (which I do not recommend to Ph.D. students), I was questioned more than once by people who were put off by the fact that I was paying critical attention to their "favorite sons." They were the relatives of terminationists or, in some cases, archivists who did not want me to see these congressmen's papers. I also remember that during one visit to a regional National Archives center, the archivists did not even believe that I was a doctoral student. I was an

Indian, and an Indian had never been there to conduct manuscript research in federal documents.

After the 1986 publication of my book *Termination and Relocation*, which was essentially a policy study, I began to explore more deeply the idea that one must comprehend not only what happened in Washington DC but also the nature and complexity of tribal and Indian politics.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, with time I further concluded that tribal and Indian politics should not be taken as synonymous. In my mind, tribal politics involves the internal dynamics of communities, whereas Indian politics consists of tribal relationships with outsiders, including local, state, and federal governments, as well as other tribes.

My increased sensitivity to these complexities derived, in part, from a surge of activism during the 1960s and 1970s. There were fishing rights protests at rivers in the Northwest throughout the 1960s and then, during the next decade, the even more audacious occupations of abandoned government facilities, the Bureau of Indian Affairs headquarters in DC, and a place called Wounded Knee in South Dakota. Defiant calls for change surrounded all of us. At the University of Oklahoma, I watched with other students as a part of the south campus consisting of military barracks burned down. On another cool night, we were called out of our twelve-story dorm by campus police because someone had started a fire on the other end of it. Outside, in pajamas and bathrobes, we watched firefighters and policemen working hastily, trying to control the flames and prevent students from needlessly breaking more windows. These events became the norm, a part of daily life in those unpredictable times.

The rise of the American Indian Movement (AIM) was important to those of us who were coming of age during the late 1960s and 1970s (see tables 4 and 5). I was seventeen in 1969 and getting ready to enter Bacone Junior College in Bacone, Oklahoma. AIM had been founded in Minneapolis, Minnesota, the year before. At first, it was primarily a grassroots effort to stop police brutality against Indian people. George Mitchell, Clyde Bellecourt, and Dennis Banks—all of them Ojibwes—co-founded the organization with other Native people to stop their friends and relatives from being beaten. Eventually, the organization grew to include more than forty chapters in the United States and Canada. Russell Means (Lakota), Dennis Banks, and their compatriots soon connected with reservation-based elders and spiritual leaders. They articulated and showed the rest of the nation a new kind of militant leadership that was founded on a respect for tribal traditions. They said that they were willing to die for their people. AIM grew quickly, and their protests seemed to occur everywhere. Red was one of AIM's principal colors, and I recall that any Indian wearing something of that color



Figure 2. Vine Deloria Jr. (1933–2005) authored more than twenty books on topics ranging from theology to law. He is seen here in a photo taken during the late 1970s. From the Miami University Archives, Oxford, Ohio.

would likely catch a second glance. The 1970s were high times for militant activism.

I began my master's work at the University of Oklahoma in 1974. I remember being affected not only by the activism of AIM but also by the explosion of American Indian Studies programs on various college campuses. For me, Indian intellectualism was a critical part of activism. At that time, three books served as particularly powerful expressions of this kind of Red Power. Vine Deloria Jr., a Standing Rock Sioux lawyer, published *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* in 1969 (figure 2). It was a blazing criticism of the United States and white society and remains essential reading today. That same year, Kiowa scholar N. Scott Momaday won the Pulitzer Prize for his novel *House Made of Dawn*. Then, in 1970, Dee Brown's famed *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* challenged Americans to entertain the views of American Indians on the history of Indian–white relations. Even

now, when asked about the most read book about Indians, many people cite *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee*.<sup>4</sup>

These pivotal works aroused and shook America's conscience. But what did Indians want? For one, many of us felt passionately about the importance of ensuring a place in the academy so that our own perspectives on our own histories could be heard. When I began studying twentieth-century American Indian history as a graduate student in the late 1970s, I found that I could talk to only a few scholars who knew much about it. I am grateful to Francis Paul Prucha for discussing research sources with me during those confusing years and to scholars like Floyd O'Neil, who actually worked with tribes. For the most part, though, Indian politics was considered a part of tribal histories. Some graduate students selected these topics to write about, but very few scholars ventured to study the twentieth century—until it was almost over. In retrospect, I suspect that part of the reason was that ignoring modern Indians and writing about dead ones was much easier than facing possible criticism from people who might still be alive. Red Power had had a major impact.

In addition to Deloria, a few brave, early scholars wrote about Indians and their concerns. This group included Angie Debo, who focused on Oklahoma tribal politics in her classic *And Still the Waters Run: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes*; Wilcomb Washburn, who edited a volume on federal-Indian relations, *The American Indian and the United States*, as well as *Red Man's Land/White Man's Law: A Study of the Past and Present Status of the American Indian*; Alvin Josephy Jr., who edited *Red Power: The American Indians' Fight for Freedom*; Edgar Cahn, *Our Brother's Keeper: The Indian in White America*; Stan Steiner, *The New Indians*; and Hazel Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements*.<sup>5</sup>

In most works, however, the general story was victimization, or how a tribe was usurped by a federal government that suppressed Indian initiative of any kind. As a doctoral student, I began to ask whether scholars were asking the right questions, whether they were even looking for Indian agency or exploring the internal logic of political activism. Salish Kootenai intellectual D'Arcy McNickle insightfully suggested this approach in his *Native American Tribalism: Indian Survivals and Renewals*, but most did not.<sup>6</sup> So I began to think about my own growing up experiences again, about my family, and my own communities.

This introspection affected the way I conceptualized politics in my books *The Invasion of Indian Country in the Twentieth Century* and *The Urban Indian Experience in America*. Both of these explored tribal politics (how individuals and families adapted to changes and confronted challenges inside their own communities) and Indian politics (how formal organizations

related these concerns to outsiders).<sup>7</sup> I found that within tribes and communities, internal politics witnessed a new rise in leadership as more mainstream-educated individuals assumed important positions, especially in tribal business areas. In addition to the constant political struggle within, tribes persisted in their political dealings with other Indian groups and state governments. At the national level, tribes maintained a political relationship with the federal government. Pantribal organizations, such as the National Congress for American Indians (NCAI), the National Indian Youth Council (NIYC), AIM, and the Council of Energy Resource Tribes (CERT), gained ground as well. In each instance, leaders representing a large constituency of Native peoples that transcended tribal boundaries came to the forefront. And they became recognized by the United States.

It was not always this way. During the first fifty years of the twentieth century, Native people had limited influence. The Bureau of Indian Affairs controlled their lives. As we say, *BIA* stood for “Boss Indians Around.” This is not to suggest that Indian people did not control their own communities within. Tribal communities continued old ways on reservations and in rural areas like the Seminole stomp ground where I grew up. My grandfather was a leader among our people at Gar Creek. He took care of the dance ground as the medicine maker, and as a child I watched him sprinkle the ground and give instructions to men who helped him. He was not the leader of the stomp ground or *Mikko*, who was in charge of political matters. In his role, my grandfather was an adviser to the *Mikko* about medicinal issues, and he had the respect of the community. Many years later, my uncle would fill the same role as the medicine maker and adviser to the *Mikko*. Among Indians, a real leader has the respect of the people, and he or she is more like a servant to them. This is the role that Indian leaders accept in life—to help their people.

My grandfather, like Native elders in many other communities, led his people in the internal way of tribal politics. Beyond the gaze of the dominant society, Native culture remained strong as devoted individuals continued to sing and dance traditional songs. This is what I remember so well. There seemed to be two worlds when I was growing up. Inside the communities, Indian women were also important leaders. My grandmother was the matriarch. Her daughters and their families and my family were under her protection. She played an even more important role after my grandfather died, and her word was final because she made decisions based on the wisdom gained from a long life of experiences. She had all our interests at heart. She was a strong woman.

When I wrote *The American Indian Mind in a Linear World*, I reflected on this personal dimension of politics in the context of stompdancing. The



dance begins about midnight, usually after, and continues until dawn to welcome the cycle of night into day, the rebirth of life, coming from the dark into the light. Throughout the dances, invited singers lead the dances, one at a time, as people dance around the ceremonial fire. Women shake shells or cans nowadays, with the men responding in chants to the leader. The dance itself takes on a reality of its own as the present and the past merge into one. At times, I look at other dancers across the fire, and sometimes I see an elderly person dancing and I think that I see my grandmother, grandfather, or an aunt or uncle who has passed away. In the dark and by firelight, people resemble other people. Or are they actually there, singing and dancing to ancient songs that have been and always will be carried down through the generations? Past and present are confused, and the only thing important is that you are dancing. Sometimes when I am alone, especially late at night, I hear these ancient songs, the shells shaking, and can smell the smoke of burning wood that feeds *toca*, the fire. These kinds of “unseen forces” that shape individuals, collective action, and, by extension, history are intriguing.<sup>8</sup>

It is also true that, although federal paternalism controlled our communities externally, educated Indian individuals engaged the government and mainstream with early organizations such as the Society of American Indians (SAI). By and large, these were people who had been educated in either federal boarding schools or in the dominant society. They encountered education in the context of mainstream standards, but they utilized the knowledge acquired from this experience to speak for justice and better conditions for tribal communities. The General Citizenship Act of 1924 allowed the remainder of Indians to become American citizens, but my grandparents, like other elderly Indians, were not citizens of this country for most of their lives. So how does one survive in a colonial system as a minority? How do indigenous communities survive? Why do they persist? The Society of American Indians asked these questions; so did the NCAI, AIM, and CERT. And so did my grandparents. We Indian people have been asking these questions for a long time.

Many of the chapters in this volume explore how Indian people answered these questions, and much more work needs to be done. I am heartened to see that, increasingly, the ones doing it are Indian scholars trained in Indian schools. In the Twin Cities in Minnesota, AIM introduced the alter-*Native* elementary school when it created the Heart of the Earth School in 1972. Since the 1960s, sustained attention has been devoted to restoring Indian control over higher education. Navajo Community College began in 1969 as an experiment in this arena, and many more tribes have formed their own institutions within the boundaries of their homelands.

Today the American Indian Higher Education Consortium represents thirty-four tribal colleges and Haskell Indian Nations University, and the *Tribal College Journal* disseminates news of curricular innovations across Indian Country.

As I mentioned earlier, my own higher education began at Bacone Junior College. Located just outside Muskogee, Oklahoma, it was founded in 1880 as a missionary school called Indian University. It was later renamed to honor Baptist missionary Almon C. Bacone and is now a four-year college. I attended Bacone for a year and a half and learned much about many tribes from many parts of Indian Country. One fond memory is playing intramural basketball against other tribal teams, such as the Navajos, who preferred a fast running game up and down the court, and the Sioux, who liked to muscle you under the basket inside. Every team had its Indian name: “Cheyenne Dog Soldiers,” “Bad Medicine,” “Five Tribes.” I also remember that I never saw an Indian professor, except for Dick West, a Cheyenne who was in charge of the art department. During the 1960s there were few Indian instructors. As I recall, I had two Indian teachers in the public schools, one in seventh grade and the other in ninth. My point is that you rarely saw a brown face at the front of the classroom.

The late 1960s and the 1970s saw the emergence of nationally recognized Indian intellectuals, such as Vine Deloria Jr., Alfonso Ortiz (Pueblo), Bea Medicine (Lakota), and N. Scott Momaday. They burst onto the scene with their books, and they had something important to say. Along with their predecessors D’Arcy McNickle, Edward Dozier (Pueblo), and Charles Eastman (Dakota), they cleared the academic way for the rest of us. Now Vine, Alfonso, and Bea are gone. But they were, all of them were, leaders. They helped start an Indian renaissance. They gave reliable if sometimes discomfiting information to a public that wanted to learn more about American Indians. Their publications captured the interest of academicians too. I credit them with providing much of the momentum that led to the creation of Native studies programs during the rest of the twentieth century. The results were remarkable. One study done in the 1990s indicated that there were nearly one hundred American Indian studies programs, departments, and centers in the United States and Canada.

Despite the growth of studies programs, being an Indian in the academe was not easy during the 1980s. My first faculty position was at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee. At that time, Ojibwe people were asserting their treaty-protected, reserved rights to spearfish in waters outside their reservations. Non-Indians met them with violent resistance. On one afternoon during my second year, I received a call in my office. An unfamiliar male voice said that “they” were going to kill my wife that night. To this

day, I remember calling her at home. I tried not to sound nervous as I announced that I would be home very soon and suggested that she lock the doors and windows. She asked why, and I said that I would explain as soon as I got there. After I hung up, I immediately called the campus police and my department chairman. I drove home quickly, the threat repeating again and again in my head. I had never been directly involved with the American Indian Movement, but members of that organization came through for me on that occasion. They heard about the threat, and for the next few days I had a bodyguard from AIM sitting in my classes and watching my house, making sure that my wife and I were safe. To this day, I wonder what I did. I cannot think of anything that would provoke such a threat. This was Indian–white politics at its worst as the spearfishing controversy heated up in northern Wisconsin (see tables 5 and 6).

I also remember when an organization called PARR (Protect Americans' Rights and Responsibilities) invited me and another professor from UW-Milwaukee to attend one of its first meetings in northern Wisconsin. Apparently, they wanted the academic community to know what they were about. I accepted without knowing what I was getting into, but it became quite clear early on that they were anti-Indian and firmly against Ojibwe fishing rights. They, too, must have been taken aback. At one point, the organizer of the meeting came up to me and whispered, "You didn't tell me that you were Indian." They proceeded to question my academic credentials until I showed them my faculty identification.

My colleague and I took our seats in a special reserved section of the second row. With the American and Wisconsin state flags prominently displayed, PARR blasted away at Ojibwes, arguing that Indians received unfair advantages and that the legal rights of non-Native fishermen were being violated. I was very glad to leave that meeting when it ended. That night the state police patrolled, with dogs, the halls of the motel where the conference was held—something I had never seen before. By more than happenstance, it turns out, Ojibwes and their supporters were planning to hold a meeting at the same motel the next day. News companies sent in their television cameras and reporters, fully expecting a fight. This was one occasion when one never broke out. But I remember being right in the middle of things as I checked out the next day. You could feel the tension as people on both sides showed up to make their presence felt at the meeting.

In Wisconsin and elsewhere, the 1980s and 1990s saw a new generation of sophisticated Indian leaders make changes to both tribal and Indian politics. They developed new techniques and responded to new issues and concerns under a new federal Indian policy called "Indian self-determination." College-educated, urbane, and articulate, tribal leaders and directors of

Indian organizations have bicultural backgrounds and operate in both the tribal and mainstream worlds. People often think of a dichotomy between Indian traditionalism and the white mainstream. These leaders revealed the simplicity of that way of thinking by moving comfortably between those two poles. Many were boarding school educated, like my current colleague Peterson Zah (Diné) at Arizona State University and my good friend Karen Gayton Swisher (Standing Rock Sioux), the first woman to serve as president of Haskell Indian Nations University.

In the same sophisticated ways, distant relative Mary McCormack has served as the chief of the Sac and Fox and presently Kelly Enoch Haney, also a distant relative, serves as the chief of the Seminole Nation in Oklahoma. They are intelligent and talented, they possess foresight, and they are very articulate. They are tremendous leaders with determined personalities to advance tribal causes. Mary and Kelly are good people. Their hearts are good. Their mannerism is simultaneously old and new, traditional and mainstream, cultural and modern. Mary comes from an educated family that gets involved and does things for the tribe. Kelly is very wise and always has a plan in mind to get things done.

They lead our tribes, and other tribal leaders lead their people during these difficult and exciting times. The booming explosion of unregulated Indian bingo that has led to a twenty-billion-dollar Indian gaming industry today demands the sophisticated and heads-up leaders of American Indian tribes. In the age of economics of the late twentieth century and early twenty-first century, Indian leadership is filled with pressure and instant national attention. This calls for effective Indian business leadership at the highest level of economically sound management. In an extraordinary way, Indian gaming has created a new arena of Indian–white gaming politics involving gaming tribes, other gaming operations, state governments, and the federal government. Although Indian gaming has been around since the late 1970s, today it is still in its early stages. Tribal leaders must negotiate conflicts with local and state governments, from California to Florida, as well as with other gaming interests, including other tribes.

But Indian leaders cannot do it alone, and they need the help of non-Indians. In my current study of American Indian leadership, I have observed that any great changes on a national scale necessarily require the involvement of people in powerful positions. In the recent past, this has included figures such as former United States senators James Abourezk from South Dakota and Fred Harris from Oklahoma. Colorado's Ben Nighthorse Campbell (Northern Cheyenne) and Senator Daniel Inouye of Hawaii have served as especially major players over the past few decades. All these men like to get things done; they are believers in good causes and they hate

injustice. When you are around them, you can sense their strength. They are forceful leaders who introduced and pursued the passage of milestone Indian legislation during the 1970s and 1980s (see tables 4–6).

Meanwhile, internal tribal histories can help others to discover the nature of Indian politics and activism and to understand the origins of modern Indian sovereignty, tribal self-determination, decision making, communal sustainability, importance of place, leadership, and modern Indian ethos. This is where much of modern scholarship in Indian history is presently being directed—at the tribal roots level, inside communities. Ethnohistorians, anthropologists, political scientists, and historians increasingly realize the importance of visiting Native communities and their places of government. Moreover, scholars have begun reciprocating by sharing their research, defining projects according to the needs of tribal communities, and writing truer accounts of Indian activism and tribal politics. All of this makes clear that if you are afraid to talk to Indians, you are afraid to do what it takes to understand us.

We need continued emphasis on the internal dynamics of Indian persistence, on how tribal people have continued to function as separate communities against sometimes overwhelming odds. The exploration of the complex, internal nature of Indian politics requires combining anthropology, history, sociology, and other disciplinary approaches. These new perspectives should engage Indian activism at various analytical levels that will help us account for the success of Indian politics and today's prosperity of tribal governments in the twenty-first century.

Looking at the inside of tribal communities and Indian organizations is not so easy, but we must if we are going to learn more about the reality of Native politics. Knowing how and why a centuries-old or new community works enables us to understand Indian people. As we look back over the years, the Indian world has become more complex, with sophisticated, modern tribal governments and dynamic leadership in organizations. As an enrolled Sac and Fox, I have watched endless tribal council discussions dealing with issues that outsiders have brought into our communities. And I have seen how fundamental Indian values persist in and through them. These moments remind me of childhood days when Creek and Seminole elders sat during summer days under the Green Corn arbors. They spoke Muscogee as one or two held sticks and drew on the ground, making important decisions for their people. And they still do this today.

Having witnessed the past fifty years of federal–Indian relations and Indian politics from the vantage points of scholarship and personal experience, I find it remarkable how much things have changed. Yet in general, it seems that things occur in cycles. Indian life does. Perhaps Indian progress

does too. On one hand, the twentieth century was not entirely good for Indians. There were decades when being Indian or looking dark skinned was a curse and light-skinned Indians denied being Native at all. On the other hand, the late 1960s and the 1970s were proud times—with the advent of hippies, New Agers, and the early environmental movement, it seemed as though even white people wanted to be Indian. It is often hard to be Indian, especially having been Christianized, Americanized, “citizenized,” urbanized, boarding-schooled, allotted, terminated, relocated, and assimilated. What does this feel like? What does it feel like inside? Like tribal politics, what is happening inside is where you learn about leadership, clan influence, kinship blocs, community, nepotism, and medicine. It is where you learn about continuity and survival. Tribal leaders change, but the politics stays much the same. Too often we do not look inside. But that is exactly where we should turn our gaze, because the heart of tribal politics and Indian activism resides within.

## Notes

1. These changes can be traced through time in Calvin Martin, ed., *The American Indian and the Problem of History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987); Donald Fixico, ed., *Rethinking American Indian History* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997); Devon Mihesuah, ed., *Natives and Academics: Researching and Writing about American Indians* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998); Russell Thornton, ed., *Studying Native America: Problems and Prospects* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1998); Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (New York: Zed Books, 1999); Philip Deloria and Neal Salisbury, eds., *A Companion to American Indian History*, Blackwell Companions to American History (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2002); Nancy Shoemaker, ed., *Clearing a Path: Theorizing the Past in Native American Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2002); Thomas Biolsi, ed., *A Companion to the Anthropology of American Indians*, Blackwell Companions to Anthropology (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004); and Clara Sue Kidwell and Alan Velie, *Native American Studies* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005).
2. Waziyatawin Angela Wilson and Michael Yellow Bird, eds., *For Indigenous Eyes Only: A Decolonization Handbook* (Santa Fe, NM: SAR Press, 2005).
3. Donald Fixico, ed., *Termination and Relocation: Federal Indian Policy, 1945–1960* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1986).
4. N. Scott Momaday, *House Made of Dawn* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1968); Vine Deloria Jr., *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (New York: Macmillan, 1969; reprinted with a new preface, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988); and Dee Brown, *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee: An Indian History of the American West* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970–1971).
5. Angie Debo, *And Still the Waters Run: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes* (1940; Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968); Stan Steiner, *The New Indians* (New York, Evanston, IL, and London: Harper and Row Publishers, 1968); Edgar Cahn, ed., *Our Brother's Keeper: The Indian in White America* (New York: A New Community Press Book, 1969); Hazel

Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1971); Alvin Josephy Jr., ed., *Red Power: The American Indians' Fight for Freedom* (New York: American Heritage Press, 1971); Wilcomb Washburn, *Red Man's Land/White Man's Law: A Study of the Past and Present Status of the American Indian* (New York: Scribner, 1971); and Wilcomb Washburn, ed., *The American Indian and the United States: A Documentary History* (New York: Random House, 1973).

6. D'Arcy McNickle, *Native American Tribalism: Indian Survivals and Renewals* (1973; New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

7. Donald Fixico, *The Invasion of Indian Country in the Twentieth Century: American Capitalism and Tribal Natural Resources* (Niwot: University Press of Colorado, 1998); *The Urban Indian Experience in America* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000).

8. Donald Fixico, *The American Indian Mind in a Linear World: American Indian Studies and Traditional Knowledge* (New York: Routledge, 2003).