DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 275 RC 006 959

TITLE	This Land Is Our Land: The American Indian in American Society, 1970.
INSTITUTION	Episcopal Church, New York, N.Y. National Committee on Indian Work.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	40p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*American Indians; Cultural Differences; *Eskimos; Ethnic Groups; Evaluation; *Nonreservation American Indians; Religious Cultural Groups; Relocation; *Reservations (Indian); *Socioeconomic Status; Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

In February 1969, the Executive Council of tne Episcopal Church established a National Committee on (American) Indian Work (NCIW). This was in keeping with the General Convention of the Episcopal Church's policy of supporting self-determination among the poor and the powerless in American society. This document is the NCIW's analysis of the situation of the American Indian. The committee has 10 Indian members, elected in 1969 by 5 regional conferences of Indians related to the Episcopal Church in: the Great Lakes area, the Northern Plains, the Northwest, the Southwest, and Alaska. There were also 5 bishops whose dioceses include significant Indian populations. Major topics were: identity of an Indian, culture and value contrast, Indians in society, churches' relationship to Indians and Eskimos, Indian isolation, Indian situation today, rural and urban Indians, problems of Indian youth, and a few general observations of the Indian's situation today. (FF)

THIS LAND IS OUR LAND

THE AMERICAN INDIAN IN AMERICAN SOCIETY 1970

The National Committee on Indian Work
of the Episcopal Church

American Indians are looking forward to the 1970's as "the decade of the American Indian," the decade in which they will chart and move on their own course, not only for overcoming the inequities they have suffered for over 200 years, but also for starting once more the great contributions they have to make to the lifeways, thought and culture of American society

The Rev George A Smith, Chairman
National Committee on Indian Work
of the Episcopal Church

THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
815 SECOND AVENUE, NEW YORK, N Y 10017

Contents

AN OPENING WORD

In February 1969, the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church authorized establishment of a National Committee on Indian Work. It did this in keeping with the policy established by the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in 1967 of supporting self-determination among the poor and the powerless in American society. It was also acting in response to many requests from Indian Episcopalians throughout the country, and from clergy serving them, for greater involvement of the Indian people in the work of the church.

The committee has ten Indian members, elected, two each, in the summer and fall of 1969, by five regional conferences of Indians related to the Episcopal Church: in the Great Lakes area, the Northern Plains, the Northwest, the Southwest and Alaska. Also serving on the committee are five bishops whose dioceses include significant Indian populations. These bishops were appointed by the Presiding Bishop.

In the resolution authorizing establishment of the committee, the Executive Council gave the committee the job of evaluating the effectiveness of the church's current work among Indians and Eskimos and the relevance of this work to the realities of the situation in which Indians and Eskimos find themselves today. It was also given the task of developing recommendations for the future work of the church among these two groups of people.

In undertaking this assignment, the committee has adopted a planning process in general use by the church for developing recommendations of programs and priorities during the years 1971 1976, to be considered by the General Convention of the church in the fall of 1970. In this planning process, the first step is the development of a clear statement of the situation in which program plans are to be developed. The statement includes all the important facts in the situation, striving for a clear picture of the total situation without judgmental evaluation.

After this statement, or situation analysis, has been developed, it is examined closely to determine the basic issues in the total situation and their interrelatedness. Issues are defined as major problems to be resolved, major needs to be met, and major opportunities awaiting exploitation. As issues are being defined, thinking is stimulated on the order for dealing with these issues. Goals are then established, which are based on the issues in the situation and, again, planning of priorities becomes part of the process. Finally, the questions are asked: what

programs are needed and what strategies will yield the most effective results in dealing with the issues that have been recognized? What shall the priorities be for the wisest use of whatever resources are available?

This document is the National Committee on Indian Work's analysis of the situation of the American Indian in American society.

WHO IS AN INDIAN?

The fact that the name "Indian" was given by mistake to the people whose situation this paper attempts to describe tells us something. They were named by an explorer who knew nothing about them and who, in fact, mistook them for inhabitants of another land halfway around the world.

This initial confusion continues today mainly because people other than the American Indians have done all the defining of who or what an American Indian is.

The American Indian still has to define who he is, what he is, and what distinguishes him from the rest of the population.

The federal government, which historically has had more to do with American Indians than any other part of American society, has a legalistic definition of who an Indian is. This definition is based on the federal government's responsibility as the trustee over Indian lands and as the provider of public services to Indian people. It is an eligibility-for-services definition that leaves out hundreds of thousands of people who consider themselves Indian. It is a definition that is in the process of breaking down as more and more people who are eligible for services move away from the reservation areas, and thus change their status because they are no longer residents on the lands held in trust for them by the federal government.

The Bureau of the Census uses a definition that makes more sense, particularly in off-reservation areas. An Indian is one who regards himself as an Indian and identifies himself as such to the Bureau of the Census enumerators. This helps in counting Indians. It still doesn't say what or who an Indian is.

This paper defines an Indian as a person who, first of all, has certain attitudes toward nature and the land; who has a distinctive way of relating to and working with other people; and who places much less value than the members of the dominant society do on aggressiveness, competitiveness, accumulativeness, formalized organization, and time. An Indian is also a person who, secondly, has developed certain

attitudes and behavior patterns as a result of his peculiar experience in American society. The elements in this first set of criteria give the Indian pride in his own identity; those of the second set are basic causes for his disadvantaged position in American society and for his feelings of bitterness, insecurity, and inferiority.

What is meant by the first set of criteria can best be explained by contrasting them with what prevails in the dominant society. What is meant by those elements in the second set of criteria can best be covered by the main features of the Indian's peculiar experience and peculiar place in American society, and by describing the peculiar characteristics that have resulted from this experience.

A CONTRAST OF CULTURES AND VALUES

When the successive waves of western Europeans came across the Atlantic in search of new homes and a new future, they found people in the North American continent who had been there for 10,000–some say 25,000–years.

While there were some exceptions, most Indian groups had a set of values, a way of life, a social organization and rules of interpersonal relationships which, if not diametrically opposed to what western Europeans brought with them, were certainly at wide variance with it. This variance in the two ways of life made mutual understanding almost impossible. In fact, many Indians still cling to their own different ways despite more than 100 years of effort by the dominant society to change them.

Indians had a deep, personal, religious attachment to the land where they lived and whose products sustained them. Many of them, in their religious ceremonials, still refer to the land as "Mother Earth." The chief values of the land for them were what the earth, the lakes, the streams, and the forests produced for their sustenance.

The land area controlled by a tribe or band was common property. It belonged to all the people. No one person or group of persons could give the land away by treaty or by sale. The only ways people could lose or give up the land where they lived were by common consent, through conquest by a stronger group, or by having to leave it because of extended drought or some other disaster.

While the early European settlers were also largely dependent on the land for sustenance, they brought with them a concept of property that was completely foreign to the Indian: that an individual could draw

lines or put a fence around a piece of land and claim it as his own to the exclusion of his neighbors, and that these pieces of land could be bought and sold.

The main reason hunting and fishing rights are still a heated issue with many Indians today goes back to the Indian's concept that the chief value of any land area was what the land produced for sustenance. Time after time, when Indians were compelled to cede their lands to the technologically superior forces of the white invaders, they felt they were striking a shrewd bargain when, though they had to move out of a given area, they reserved the right to hunt and fish in the ceded area. The early white settlements were usually small, and the Indians thought the area could continue to support them with their hunting, fishing, and trapping.

But the Indian soon found that the white man had another strangely different way of regarding the land – that the earth's chief beneficial

resources for man could be ravaged and sold for money that would make a few individuals rich while hundreds, or even thousands, would be deprived of the food that used to come from that resource. They saw this as the lumber companies moved across the northern woods, clear-cutting square mile after square mile of rich virgin forests, which had been the habitat for many kinds of game animals. They saw this as thousands of buffalo were slaughtered for their hides, and their carcasses left to rot on the plains.

The Indian could be sure, when he first heard the story about the man who killed the goose that laid the golden egg, that this greedy and foolish man was a white man. It didn't take long for the Indian to decide that the white man was crazy. Many Indians make that observation today, and many white men are joining in this judgment of themselves as they begin to suffer increasingly the results of their own destruction of the environment.

Another major difference between the two groups is that the white man prides himself on his ability and his drive to change his physical and natural world to meet what he considers to be his needs. The Indian is ecologically oriented, accepting the force of nature as a superior force and accommodating and adjusting to the situation in which he finds himself rather than trying to change it. Further back in his experience than he can remember, he developed the qualities of persistence and endurance in the face of adversity. This practice of accommodation and adjustment, however, has kept him at a serious disadvantage in the midst of a society that places high value on aggressiveness, acquisitiveness, and exploitation.

While the dominant society places high values on aggressiveness, acquisitiveness, and accumulation of personal wealth, Indians generally have tended to view with suspicion a person with these qualities. (Psychiatrists would probably be on the side of the Indians in this evaluation of personality.)

With Indians, sharing has always been an important value. The Indian who might acquire riches through some special skill or prowess could maintain his position as a person of respect in the community only by periodic feasts at which he would give away much that he had.

The ability to take care of oneself in any physical situation was another value for men and women, and was instilled and encouraged in the individual from childhood. Physical strength, alertness, resourcefulness, courage, and the ability to endure through periods of adversity

were all part of this value. The individual who could not take care of himself or herself commanded little respect.

Industry, constant, day-after-day application to the job has been held up as another value in the dominant society, at least for the wage-earner class, though in recent years it has become less so. But constant application to work, formal structured organization, advance planning and meeting time schedules–all values in the dominant society--have reached a point where people are slaves to these devices. Indians have traditionally taken a dim view of these things. While many individual Indians have had these practices instilled in them as values in their school experience and on the job, and while they are important for functioning successfully in modern American society, these are values Indians have had to acquire.

Most Indian societies were classless societies. Industry in providing for one's own family and in meeting obligations within the extended family and the community was a value, but to work for someone wealthy enough to pay another to work for him was unknown. And Indians in their traditional communal undertakings (many of them of vast size and complexity) were and still are blessed with great skill in organization.

While the United States prides itself on being a great democracy, it has never had a democratic society. Its talent has been in its development of representative government which, again, is made up of concepts foreign to traditional Indian social organization and political practice. While some Indian groups developed larger, more complex forms of government, most Indian groups were organized socially and politically in bands in which all members of the group were related by family or by clan.

In dealing with issues in which all of the group were concerned, their practice was, and in some places still is, almost pure democracy, in which discussion and individual expression of opinion go on until a consensus is reached. Every person is allowed time and the opportunity to say what he thinks, even when what he has to say may not differ from what one or more other persons have already said. Majority rule is not the rule Almost complete consensus is strived for and even one or two strong dissenting opinions will bar final decision on the course of action to be pursued. The concept of representative government–one person speaking for a whole group or community in a larger assembly–is something most Indian people have had to learn, and one with which many still feel ill at ease.

Much more could be written about how Indians differed, and in many respects still differ today, from the people who make up what is called the dominant society.

Some final observations are in order about the Indian's religious and spiritual orientation and how it differs from the religious and spiritual orientation of the white man.

The Indian's religion was, and for many Indian people still is, basic to all of life. It is not something to put on and then take off while you go about something else. The day begins with a song–a song of praise to whatever power controls his life, with a prayer of thanksgiving and a prayer for protection from whatever evil may threaten.

Indians were converted to Christianity by the thousands in the early days of their relationships with the white man. Which of Christ's teachings spoke to them? Those that come most readily to mind are man's dignity as the son of God; the priority of the spiritual life over the material–"Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you"; Christ's love of little children; the importance of praise and thanksgiving; the importance of maintaining harmony with one's fellowman; the brotherhood of man. Perhaps most important was the concept of an all-powerful God who protects his children from evil of whatever kind, because Indians recognized their frailty as human beings and were aware of evil forces in the world that could strike them at any time in a great variety of ways.

There is much in Christ's teachings that found more fertile soil in the hearts and minds of Indians than it ever found in the hearts and minds of the white people who came among the Indians professing to be Christians. The history and the experience of the different classes of western Europeans who migrated into the lands of the Indians, and the values they had developed over hundreds of years, were at wide variance with the history, experience, and values of the Indians and the latter's orientation to life and the world in which they lived. The Indians were ill-equipped to deal with the cunning, aggressiveness, exploitativeness, and acquisitiveness of the white man.

Indians were constantly confused by the behavior of the white man–by the wide variance between his profession of being a Christian and his most un-Christian behavior. They admired his superior technology and sometimes thought this must somehow be a result of his ability to pray to God. They were not sophisticated enough to wonder whether this technology was perhaps, in some way, the white man's God. The white

man's ability to separate his religious life from the rest of his life was a further confusion–his going to church and praising God on Sunday and devoting the rest of the week to almost slavish pursuit of the accumulation of material things, forgetting Christ's admonition, "Take no heed for what ye shall eat or what ye shall put on . . . ."

It is little wonder that as Indians still in the church become more sophisticated they are saying more and more, "We need our own people as our priests. We want to make the church our church. Perhaps the time has come when Indian Christians need to evangelize their white brothers."

Resisting the white man's encroachments and fighting to save their land and way of life, Indians found the white man to be cruel, greedy, unscrupulous, and conceited about his own endowments. Their least harsh judgment was that he was crazy and unable to see the folly of his own ways. The white man's view of the Indians was that the Indian was savage, cruel, and treacherous.

Later, when the battles were over and the Indians were confined to their reservations, with their traditional ways of sustaining themselves largely destroyed, the white man viewed the Indian as lazy, stupid, irresponsible, improvident and, if no longer savage, at least completely lacking in civilization. The white man's least harsh judgment of the Indian was that the Indian was simple and childlike, lacking in the qualities that a man must have to succeed in the white man's world. These two attitudes–the Indian's judgment of the white man and the white man's judgment of the Indian–have formed the framework within which Indian white relationships have been immobilized through most of their experience with each other.

THE INDIAN IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

While Indians felt great bitterness towards the white man as a result of his having dispossessed them of their lands and their traditional ways of making a living, they probably welcomed the respite from long years of warfare and the chance the reservations afforded them to move themselves out of the white man's path and away from contact with him. So, in some ways, Indians welcomed the isolation the reservations brought. And the westward-moving settlers welcomed the isolation of the threat the Indians had formerly posed to their takeover of the Indians' lands.

But this isolation of the Indian from the rest of American society was not the final solution to his problem. And, as the years passed, its adequacy as a solution for the white man in his relationships with the Indian was increasingly questioned. It did not fit the role the United States proclaimed for itself as the "melting pot" of the world, where all people–at least white western Europeans–could come and become part of a great new society. As the economic situation of the Indians on their reservations worsened and stories began to reach the American public of the increasing deprivations Indians were suffering, increasing demands were made that the federal government "do something to help the Indians."

Since the general assumption was that the Indians were unable to provide for themselves because they were uncivilized and resistant to hard work, aggressiveness, acquisitiveness, and the accumulation of material goods, these values must be instilled in them. The government and the churches began to build schools, often far removed from the reservations, where children could be trained free from the influence of the "uncivilized" ways of their own families.

Failure of these efforts called repeatedly for examination of factors in the Indian's situation that stood in the way of the efforts to civilize him. And one by one his remaining strengths or assets–his communal

organization, local leadership, native religion and, finally, communal ownership of reservation lands–were sought out and efforts made to destroy them.

With the rationale that Indians would develop a sense of individual responsibility if each adult were given a piece of land to farm or on which to raise livestock, many of the reservations were broken up into individual land allotments. The surplus of the reservation lands, after these allotments were made, was opened to white settlement. Many Indians received their land allotments in fee simple title and soon lost these lands, if they were valuable, to land-hungry white settlers.

This policy was a disaster for those tribes whose reservations were allotted. They lost hundreds of thousands of acres of land in a relatively short period of time. Few of their members became farmers or livestock raisers.

Federal government officials seldom asked Indians the reasons for their steadily worsening situation, or what ways would be appropriate for dealing with their problems. The assumption was that Indians were not equal to evaluating their own problems or suggesting workable solutions. Also, they tended to resist whatever policy was adopted because they had learned through long bitter experience that the white man was foolish and not to be trusted.

As the United States expanded westward and white settlements surrounded Indian communities on all sides, the isolation became more severe. It was no longer just geographic isolation. It became isolation from all the major forces at work in American society–government, business and industry, trade, transportation, rural electrification, public schools, and the rest of the country's rapidly growing public services framework, and the social, cultural, and religious life of the larger community of which the reservation should have been but was not a part.

The federal government's Bureau of Indian Affairs was the only provider of services. Up until the 1940's it struggled with grossly inadequate appropriations to try to do something about the "Indian problem." Congress was generally averse to appropriating funds "to maintain large numbers of Indians in idleness." Many people thought all Indians received some kind of monthly pension check from the government and were hopelessly lazy. This was never true. Indians have always had to make their own way. Even today, the Bureau of Indian Affairs frankly admits that it has never been able and is not now able to

meet the needs of large numbers of Indians clearly eligible for general assistance.

Indians were declared by Act of Congress in 1924 to be citizens of the United States. As citizens of the United States they automatically became citizens of the states where they had legal residence and, at the same time, they became eligible for whatever public services the state and its local units of government were providing to the general public.

But the states with large Indian populations have consistently opposed providing services to Indians unless the federal government pays the bill. The states have argued that Indians are "wards" of the federal government, that responsibility for services to Indians rests with the federal government; and that, since Indian lands are not on state tax rolls and yield no revenues for the support of public services, Indians are not entitled to these services.

The irony of this position is that the federal government made a gift of the former Indian lands to those states admitted to the Union after the federal government was formed. Neither the states nor the people who came to settle in the states ever paid the Indians anything for the lands that became the base of the states' economies. And the compensation, when there was any, which the federal government paid the Indian tribes was, in practically every instance, niggardly consideration for the lands taken and the destruction of the Indians' traditional economy. Indians on the east coast, who were not removed by the federal government to lands in the west, have been in an even more anomalous position since they lost their lands to the colonies before the United States was formed. The original states have never been able to charge that their obligations with respect to their Indian constituents are the obligations of the federal government.

But neither of these arguments—that the Indians are "wards" of the federal government, or that since the lands remaining in Indian hands do not contribute tax revenues for the support of public services, Indians are not entitled to these services—will stand serious examination.

The citizenship of Indians has been established by Act of Congress, which erased their former vague status of "wards" of the federal government. Every state with an Indian population counts its Indians when applying for federal grants-in-aid for a wide variety of programs where population is a factor in determining the state's allocation of federal funds. Further, most Indian lands, if placed on the state tax

rolls, would yield much less in the way of revenue than the federal government already spends in the state providing services to the Indian people. And Indians are subject to all other state taxes—sales taxes, state income taxes, and federal and state gasoline taxes, all of which are used to support public services.

This syndrome of the Indian as a federal responsibility is repeated in the Episcopal Church, where dioceses, with a few significant exceptions, tend to look to the national church to fund the church's activities in Indian communities, rather than recognizing these Indian communities as significant parts of what should be total diocesan concerns.

The most significant missing factor in federal-state-Indian relationships and, within the church, in Executive Council-diocesan-Indian relationships, is the viable Indian community, together with its own articulate leadership. The federal government's, and the church's, principal efforts over the years have been directed at the individual Indian with the objective of "civilizing" him, acculturating him, giving him the skills to function in the larger American society, so that, finally, he can be integrated or assimilated into this society. While their successes have been many, Indians who have failed in this process outnumber those who have succeeded, and reservation Indian populations, which continue increasingly to become dependent, welfare populations, continue to grow.

Refusal to recognize the Indian community as a community in its own right, with its own history, its own future, and its own leadership, has been the blind spot in these relationships almost from the beginning. The federal government's establishment of the superintendency on the Indian reservation and its vesting in this office whatever power and resources were available in terms of facilities, staff, equipment and funds, have been paralleled by the church's movement among Indians. The bishop and/or the local priest have had the total decision-making authority with regard to use of church facilities and funds. The Indian community has not been consulted about the kind of superintendent or priest it might want. And the community has not been consulted about what the superintendent or priest should do with the resources at his command. Just as over the years there have been many able, sensitive men who have served as Indian agency superintendents, there have been many able, sensitive bishops and priests who have served the Indian people. But the organizations of which they have been a part have been structured not to work with Indian communities, but to work with individual Indians and individual Indian families. And, almost without

exception, neither the state nor the diocese has been challenged to play the part only it can play in helping the Indian community as a community to find its proper place in the larger community.

The federal government and the church have assisted generation after generation of the Indian community's potential leadership in moving away from their home communities, or have taken them into their own structures to work. And their peculiar blindness in doing this makes it possible still to ask why the Indian community is lacking leadership and spirit.

The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 was the federal government's attempt to fill the gap of the missing Indian community in federal-Indian relationships. This legislation provided the mechanics for Indian tribal organization, for the revitalization of long neglected tribal councils, and the organization of tribal governments where formal structures had long ceased to exist.

But the forms Indians were given to use in tribal organization were, once again, the white man's forms. They involved concepts outside Indian experience–charters, constitutions and bylaws, majority rule, and representative government. Representative government was especially difficult to apply among tribes that had never been organized politically on a tribal, or national, basis, and that were actually made up of many local communities.

As indicated earlier in this paper, most Indian tribes were organized politically on a band or small local community basis, the members of which were related by family or by clan. Decision-making was based on lengthy discussion by all adult members of the community and arrival at a consensus. Individuals elected as representatives of their respective communities to a central tribal council were, in most instances, reluctant initially to vote in the tribal council on any issue that had not been discussed and decided in their local communities. As the years have passed, however, members of tribal councils have surmounted their scruples in this respect and vote on issues on which they feel they know what the people they represent would want done.

The Indian Reorganization Act did represent a major turning point in the history of federal-Indian relationships. Vehicles for the expression of Indian opinion were provided by this legislation and, while some tribal governments are still lacking in effectiveness, most are playing increasingly important roles in charting the course of future reservation development.

The Indian Reorganization Act, however, did nothing to open the way for the Indian community to become an integral part of the larger state community. The relationship continued to be a federal (Bureau of Indian Affairs)-Indian one.

States have become involved gradually in services to individual Indians as a result of federal grants-in-aid for services to which Indians are legally entitled. But these services have remained almost frozen within the state's political and governmental framework. The states have not sought, much less wanted, official relationships with tribal governments or with local Indian communities. Development of such relationships is admittedly difficult because of lack of state civil and criminal jurisdiction over Indian reservations, which most Indians fear and are opposed to, and because lands held in trust by the federal government for Indians cannot be taxed by the state.

The church in its relationships with Indian people has yet to provide any device for recognizing the Indian community in any way

comparable to that provided by the federal government in the Indian Reorganization Act. This is partly due to the church's practice of equating the right to autonomy with financial self-support. Most Indian congregations have the status of missions and, as missions, they are the bishop's charges. Their priest, in each instance, is the bishop's vicar and, if the congregation has any organized leadership, it has status only as the Bishop's Committee.

How is an Indian mission to acquire status as a parish, with the right to have a voice in the selection of its pastor and the right to elect its own leadership with decision-making authority in important areas of the congregation's concern? It is a question without an answer in economically distressed areas, if a community's desire to live in accordance with Christ's teachings is measured principally by its financial ability to maintain outward evidence of a Christian community--church structures and full-time paid clergy who perform not only priestly functions, but also a wide variety of social (and sometimes not even social) service functions.

What forms, practices and attitudes Indian Christians look for as evidence of Christ at work in their lives can be determined only by the people themselves, looking at their own situation in the light of Christ's teaching, and deciding the directions in which Christ would have them move as a Christian community. Is the church ready finally to recognize its Indian communities? Are the bishops concerned, and are the priests who work in Indian communities ready? Are the other communities of the diocese ready to welcome the concerns of Indian communities as concerns of the total diocese, and to recognize the value of the contributions Indian communities have to offer to the total life of the diocese and of the church? Can the diocese set an example for the state in this important area?

RELATIONSHIP OF THE CHURCHES TO INDIANS AND ESKIMOS

For more than 100 years, religious organizations have demonstrated a concern for Indians and Eskimos. And during the years when churches were growing and were deeply committed to missionary activities among Indians, their influence was great. One hundred years ago, under the Grant Peace Policy, a number of Protestant denominations, without consulting the Indian people, in effect divided the Indian country among themselves to permit concentration of their respective missionary efforts. Even today, individual churches have areas where their work among Indians and Eskimos is still noticeably concentrated.

Since the Roman Catholic Church played no part in this arrangement, rivalry and competition developed in the winning of Indian converts. Over the years, other denominations, not parties to the original agreements, moved onto the reservations and in many places, unfortunately, have added to divisiveness within Indian communities and even divisiveness among related Indian families.

The suppression and decline of many Indian community institutions created a great vacuum into which some of the churches moved with vigor. It was inevitable in the early years of the isolation of Indians on reservations, beginning in the 1870's, that the churches would be dynamic institutions commanding strong loyalties among their converts.

While at first many Indians were confused by the rivalry and competition among different denominations, all of which professed to be Christian, they had to accept this confusion as another part of the behavior of the white man which was beyond the Indian's understanding. Since in most reservation communities, the church was the only institution showing a concern for the Indians' needs and problems, and the only institution with the resources to implement a program, many Indians joined various churches and demonstrated loyalty which continues among many families today.

While the outlook of many churches at the national level has broadened over the years, developments have been slower at the judicatory level and slowest of all at the parish level, particularly in rural areas, where narrow denominational loyalties are still strong and the call to ecumenism weak. Thus, churches continue to divide Indian people where unity is needed more than ever in meeting the problems all of them face.

THE BREAKDOWN OF INDIAN ISOLATION

The Indian Reorganization Act in 1934 brought Indian tribal governments back into the picture as legal entities with the right to participate in (but still not to direct) program planning on their reservations. The New Deal work programs in the 1930's put sizeable numbers of young men and adults to work for the first time in the history of most reservations, and Indian communities began to stir for the first time in 60–70 years.

World War II took thousands of Indian youth–both young men and young women–into military service, and equally large numbers of adults into war-related industries in Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit,

and the West Coast. For most of them, this was their first experience away from the reservation for extended periods of time. The reservations would never be the same after the great bulk of these people returned home. They had had their first real taste of the outside world; they had met and associated with white people who did not fit the stereotypes of white people most Indians had grown up with. A new, more articulate leadership began to assert itself on many reservations.

Dissatisfaction increased. Indians began to be more and more vocal in their criticisms of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Bureau's most frequent explanation of why conditions continued to worsen on the reservations was lack of funds to do the kind of job that had to be done. As appropriations increased for expanded services to the Indian people, state governments joined in the attacks on the Bureau, claiming they could do the job better if the appropriations came to them.

This mounting criticism of the Bureau finally culminated in the 1950's in a congressional joint resolution adopting as congressional policy termination of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and its special services to Indian people.

The few tribes whose special relationship with the federal government ended under the termination policy have fared so badly that most tribes are now firmly opposed to this policy. But the criticism of the Bureau of Indian Affairs continues as conditions on many reservations deteriorate despite massive additional inputs of federal funds.

The 1960's brought a wide range of new federal programs for the general public aimed at improved manpower training and development, regional economic development, improved elementary and secondary education, improved housing, broadened health and social services, and the elimination of poverty, all of which have had impact on Indian reservation communities.

Most important from the standpoint of impact has been the antipoverty program which, in its first few years, provided generous funding that went directly to Indian community action program organizations, bypassing the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The community action programs have been directed to local community development, to the needs of preschool children, to youth programs, to home improvement, to manpower training, and to legal aid services programs.

The greatest benefits in most places stemmed from the opportunities

these programs provided for Indians to move into responsible jobs. They have brought out much latent, previously unrecognized, leadership talent within the community and have given many Indians new self-respect and pride. Once more we can say neither the Indians nor the reservations will ever be the same.

THE SITUATION OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN TODAY

The social, political, economic, and cultural isolation of the Indian, both in the rural areas and in the cities, is one of the greatest anomalies in American society. It is at the base of many of the Indian's problems. The tendency of many to want to continue their identity as Indians, to maintain themselves as separate communities on the reservations, and to establish themselves as identifiable communities in the cities, adds to the puzzle.

The interpretation many Indians have of this isolation is that it is a continuing rejection of them, as individuals and as communities, by the larger society around them. At the same time, large segments of the dominant society have a sense of guilt about the isolation of the Indian from American society and the social and economic ills he suffers in this isolation. And confusion continues over what can be done to break through this isolation without wreaking further damage upon the Indian people.

It is becoming increasingly apparent to many Indian people that while the old Indian practice of accommodating to a difficult situation rather than trying to change it, and the old Indian value of enduring hardship through periods of adversity, may have served them well in the physical world, it does not work in dealing with the white man or with the strange society with which he has surrounded them on every side. This new awareness is greater among those Indians who have moved into the cities and who have to cope on a daily basis with the white man and the white man's ways. It is still only vaguely felt by the populations remaining in the rural areas who, from the isolation of their reservation havens, continue to hold themselves aloof from the white man's world in the hope that the white man will die out or go away, as other misfortunes always have.

But 100 years is a long time to persevere, and the reservation havens are crumbling. Increasing numbers of Indian young people on the reservations find themselves getting closer and closer in their views to those of their militant cousins in the cities. And communication between Indian youth on the reservations and Indian youth in the cities is growing

THE RURAL INDIAN

The physical, economic, and social situations among Indians in the rural areas, both on federally administered reservations and in Indian populated rural areas along the East Coast (which have never been under federal supervision), have been documented with increasing frequency in recent years; there is no need to repeat here what is already fast becoming general public knowledge.

The seriousness of the rural Indian's plight can be pinpointed as follows:

- Continuing underdevelopment–lack of industry and jobs, lack of adequate water supplies, roads, public transportation, communication facilities.
- Grossly inadequate housing.
- Almost complete dependence on reservation bordertowns for shopping facilities–both for goods and for services.
- Unemployment ranging from 20% to 50% of the employable population.
- Average family income one half of that declared as the poverty level for the country at large four years ago.
- Infant mortality rate three times the national average.
- Average life span: 44 years, compared with national average of 64 years.

Indian people are outstanding examples of what can happen to people living in a welfare state. In an ordinary American community, the people have control over what government undertakes to do for them–electing local public officials, school boards, county commissioners, state legislatures and the Congress; a free press, civic clubs, professional associations, labor unions, civil rights organizations–all are free to criticize government for the way it handles the job. The effort to keep government agencies responsive to the people goes on continually.

It is almost impossible for the ordinary American to understand the absolute domination of the lives of Indians by government agencies over the past 100 years. What American community would stand for a government-sponsored school program that completely ignored American history, forbade its children to speak English, undertook to teach the children a completely foreign language and carried on all its instruction in this foreign language? This is similar to what is happening in many American Indian communities today.

What American community would stand for a state planning agency that did all of its planning in private–that decided where roads would

be built, where schools would be built, what would be taught in the schools, what funds should be spent for vocational training for its high school graduates, and what should be available for college training; that decided in its planning that since people had been hauling their drinking water five to 15 miles for many years, they could continue to do so—all of this, among other things, without asking the people for any opinion at all?

This is hard to believe, but this happened to Indian reservation populations for many, many years. There are still sizeable remnants of this practice in effect today, both in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and in other federal and state agencies, notably the public schools, which have moved into the field of service to the Indian people.

From the enactment of the Indian Reorganization Act in 1934 up to the late 1960's, when the antipoverty programs began offering Indians opportunities to plan and implement programs based on their assessment of their own situation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs rationalized that it was consulting with Indian people through their tribal councils. But this practice of working with tribal councils has seldom gotten down to involvement of the Indian people at the local community level. While tribal councils may endorse BIA program plans for the reservation, many times the people don't know what has been planned (or not planned) for them until they see it happening. Or they have a need—development of readily accessible water supplies, for example—that is not being met.

The most encouraging change evidenced in Bureau of Indian Affairs' practice in recent years has been its growing support on some reservations of the establishment of local school boards.

This bureaucratic domination over the lives of the Indian people for 100 years, has taken away opportunities for using their own judgment, assessing their situation, planning and implementing programs designed to meet their needs and problems. It has forced them into the role of unconsulted receivers of services that may or may not make sense to them, resulted in serious dependency, hopelessness, loss of pride, and what appears to be lack of responsibility and lack of ability to make decisions.

With all of these problems, there are already severe and rapidly growing health and social difficulties: alcoholism, broken families, high dropout rates in the school-age population, growing suicide rates, and increasing migration of the younger part of the population away from the reservation.

Tribal governments and tribal leaders are faced with an almost impossible task. One of the most serious defects in many tribal governments today is their lack of ways of involving local communities in overall tribal program planning. In the absence of other models, many tribal governments have copied Bureau of Indian Affairs' forms of organization, planning and operations, which were seriously defective to begin with in relation to the ways of the people they were trying to serve. It is no wonder that tribal governments and their leadership are either ignored or subjected to continuing criticism by various segments of the reservation population. The thing to be wondered at is that they have mastered the forms they were given to work with and that they are doing increasingly effective jobs.

Tribal governments are at a continuing disadvantage in their relationships with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. BIA continues to control the main tools for government on the reservation–technical staff, buildings to house their operations, equipment and funds for both program and operating expenses. Although the funds the BIA uses on any reservation are justified on the basis of needs, BIA looks for these funds to its own organizational headquarters in Washington and to Congress. It is under no obligation to get its program plans or its fund requests approved by the tribal government, and the Indian agency where this occurs is the exception.

The Bureau's headquarters has insisted more and more in recent years that agency superintendents involve the people more in program planning. So the practice has evolved of Bureau staff working with tribal councils and tribal government staffs, such as they are, to discuss the reservation's needs. But all this occurs within the framework of what existing Bureau programs can do. With this token involvement of the tribal leadership–if even this occurs–the program proposals may or may not be submitted to the tribal council for endorsement before they move into the cumbersome government budget planning process which will result in funds for the programs 18 months to two years later.

If at any point tribal leadership disagrees with the program proposals, or raises questions about a more realistic ordering of priorities, it will usually be told that budget submission deadline dates at various levels of the Bureau's budget planning process preclude any changes. And even when a reasonable degree of agreement has been arrived at, such agreement may be disregarded at the Bureau's area office or Washington office level. On the other hand, original program proposals may be discarded or drastically modified without any notice to the tribal leadership.

Tribal governments used to face this frustration only in their dealings with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In recent years, they have faced similar situations as other federal agencies and many state agencies have moved onto the reservation scene. And the same imbalance in power with respect to program planning--technical staff, equipment, and availability of funds for program and operating expenses--prevails. The powerful bureaucracies command all of these independently of the tribe, and the tribe, with very limited resources of its own, continues its dependence on the staffs of the bureaucracies. The result of this arrangement is the frequent assertion that the tribal council and tribal government are little more than arms of the bureaucracies, and there is continuing criticism of the tribal leadership by various segments of the tribal membership.

Attitudes of hostility towards Indians exist in varying degrees of intensity and openness in most of the communities surrounding the reservations. Many members of the neighboring communities look down on the Indians as dependent welfare populations, as irresponsible, dirty, lacking in motivation or any desire to improve themselves, and prone to spend even their welfare checks on liquor while their children go without food. Many people resent the funds that the federal government spends on the reservations even though government payrolls, wages paid to workers on construction projects, including wages paid to Indians employed in antipoverty programs, and even welfare checks, constitute an important undergirding of the economy of most reservation bordertowns. Some Indians make the observation that the biggest generator of business and income in the bordertowns is the continuing poverty of the Indian people.

A hidden, but most important, function of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and one that the more perceptive and sensitive members of the Bureau's staff would be glad to give up, is the Bureau's role as scapegoat for all that is wrong in the present situation of the Indian people. First of all, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has an impossible assignment. No federal agency can solve the problems of the Indian people. Neither can any combination of federal agencies, or federal and state agencies. This job can be done only by the Indian people themselves, using their own insights into their own problems, supported with funds to implement programs that make sense to them, with freedom to move and to negotiate in the larger community that surrounds them.

The Indian people and the Bureau of Indian Affairs share the criticisms of the neighboring non-Indian communities for the deplorable con-

ditions of the Indians. At times, they blame each other for lack of progress.

The existence of the Bureau, however, which supposedly has the job of saving the Indian from his difficult and steadily worsening situation, saves the communities which neighbor the reservations from looking searchingly at themselves or the role they are playing in keeping the Indian in his present untenable position. It diverts the attention of the general public, much of which tends to be sympathetic towards the Indian, from the basic causes of the Indian's plight—the isolation of the Indian reservation community from the larger social, economic, political, and cultural community of which it must be a part if it is ever to attain viability, and the unwillingness of this larger community to recognize the right of the Indian community to self-determination and a place of respect in the larger community.

The energies and pages of print, which go each year into damning the Bureau of Indian Affairs for its ineptitude and inability to do its impossible job, might be much more profitably invested in examination of the part the larger community which surrounds the reservation is playing in perpetuating the situation.

THE URBAN INDIAN

Reports persist that from one third to one half of the country's Indian population is now living in cities from New York, Baltimore and Washington in the east to Los Angeles, the San Francisco Bay area and Seattle in the west; from Minneapolis and Saint Paul in the north to Dallas and Forth Worth in the south; and in Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago and Denver.

While surprisingly little is known about these new urban Indians, they are being heard from more and more and are commanding an increasing amount of attention in the public press. Where Indians on the reservations have been studied and written about for years by non-Indians—anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists and other social scientists, and by congressional investigating committees—it appears that the urban Indians are already telling their own stories.

Urban Indians appear to fall roughly into four groups.

First, there is a sizeable group in flux, moving back and forth between their reservation homes and the cities.

Second is a stabilized population which has established itself in poorer parts of the city and at low levels on the economic scale.

These first two groups are in many respects like a reservation population transferred into an urban situation, with strong attitudes of dependency, feeling of inferiority as Indians, distrust and limiting of their associations with white people, with little know-how in finding housing or employment or in dealing with the police, public schools, welfare departments or other agencies that might be able to help them; coming together and organizing mainly for fellowship and mutual moral support and mutual financial support in emergency situations rather than for social action.

Third, there is a stabilized, well-adjusted population that came into the urban situation with a high school or better than high school education, a marketable job skill, greater self-assurance in associating with non-Indians. The size of this part of the population may be larger than is generally known. While it maintains relationships with its home community on the reservation, it generally lives in better residential areas, enjoys associations with non-Indians, does not identify with the Indian community in the city either because it chooses not to or is rejected by the poorer group.

The fourth faction is the militant, social action-oriented group which identifies with the poorer part of the Indian population, which regards the poorer part of the population as the "urban Indian community," and which aspires to and appears to be gaining leadership in this urban Indian community. This group is in frequent communication with similar groups in other cities and with militant young people on the reservations.

The poor urban Indian community is faced with a variety of serious economic and social problems, but is still more satisfied with its "Indian ways" than it would be in adopting the "white man's ways."

The staffs of public schools in the neighborhoods where these people settle have little or no understanding of the history, culture or experience of Indian people, or the kinds of backgrounds that Indian children come from. As a result, they do little to meet the peculiar needs of Indian children or Indian young people in the schools. Dropout rates among Indian children in public schools in the cities are reported to range from 50% up, with only a few completing high school.

Alcoholism, broken families, and juvenile delinquency are as high among urban Indians as they are in reservation populations. In large towns and cities not too far from the reservations, police harassment of members of the poor urban Indian community is frequent.

THE PROBLEMS OF INDIAN YOUTH

Indian children are blessed with the same amount of intelligence as children in any other ethnic group. Recent studies indicate that those who start school with ability to use English do as well as, and in a surprising number of instances, better than non-Indian children. But the great majority start out with major handicaps, and these handicaps increase in number and severity as they move from grade to grade.

In the reservation areas, large numbers start school with no knowledge at all of, or very limited exposure to, the English language. For many of them, their first year in school is devoted to acquiring some ability to use English and to learning how to function in a formal classroom setting, which is quite foreign to anything in their previous experience.

While those who start school in a federal boarding school have the difficult problem of adjusting to separation from their families, the staff in federal schools, through longer experience in working with Indian children, are generally more aware of the background that Indian children come from, and federal schools look upon the first year as a beginner's year rather than as first grade.

Those who start their schooling in public schools have equally difficult, if not more serious problems, beginning with long rides on school buses (sometimes as far as 50-60 miles one way) and immersion in a totally different environment than the one they come from. They are in competition in first grade subjects with children who have already had six years of learning the English language in their own homes, and in a program that was designed for children of the dominant society.

While some public schools on or near the reservations have been giving

increasing attention to the peculiar needs of the Indian children they serve, teachers in public schools have been trained to teach children from the dominant society. Those who are sensitive to the needs of the Indian students and take the time to learn something about the history, culture, and tribal background of their Indian students are still the exception.

The vast majority of Indian families, both on the reservations and in the cities, are poor. The parents and other adult members of the family have had limited formal education—many of them no formal education at all. So they are poorly equipped to help their children with what the children are struggling to learn at school. Their homes have little in the way of books, magazines or newspapers, and the things adults in these families talk about seldom relate to what the children are exposed to at school.

Since so many families are poor, many children who attend public school start their school day either with a nutritionally inadequate breakfast, or no breakfast at all. Many, too, are inadequately clothed. Many of them have neither an adequate place or light for doing their homework in the evening since many families live in one- or two-room dwellings, without electricity, without accessible domestic water, to say nothing of inside plumbing, or adequate heat in the winter months. For those children whose parents are struggling with drinking problems, the situation is even worse.

In view of all these disadvantages, the numbers who manage to get through the elementary grades and into high school are nothing short of amazing.

But high school brings even more difficult problems as social consciousness develops and sensitiveness about inadequate clothing and inadequate family background increases. Subject matter in school increases in difficulty, inadequate ability in the use of English becomes a greater handicap and competition with classmates becomes more severe. School programs that fail to take into account the kinds of problems many Indian young people have, and the almost complete absence of professionally qualified counselors in the high schools, both federal and public, all contribute to the high dropout rates among Indians and the reported increase in youthful suicides.

Indian high school graduates who come from the impoverished parts of reservation and urban areas must have most unusual abilities or high perseverance rates or a combination of both. The fact that over half of

the country's Indian population is under 25 years of age is of major importance in fixing priorities for the church's work among Indians and Eskimos.

But just as the struggle through high school requires great effort for most of them, so do their plans to pursue training beyond high school. Without adults in their families to advise them, and with little or no counseling in high school, a majority of Indian seniors are pretty much on their own. Even those who have defined an educational objective, and have learned the procedures to follow in applying for admission to college, still are faced with the problem of where to look for scholarship help, which most of them need.

Some tribes have established their own scholarship funds. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has an annual appropriation for scholarships. Most colleges have educational opportunity grant funds. But Indian high school graduates seldom can find full scholarships. These funds are, if anything, supplemental grants or loans. Thus, the student is forced to look wherever he can, first for a basic grant—tuition, fees, costs of books, costs of room and board—and then for supplemental grants from several other sources. Frequently, he enrolls in college without adequate funds.

It is not surprising that many who start college drop out during or at the end of the first year.

SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Not all is hopeless in the total situation of the Indian today. Large parts of the American public have always had an admiration for the American Indian and for his courage in fighting to save his lands and his dignity in defeat. They have respect for his closeness to and respect for nature and the forces of nature, for his independence in resisting the efforts of the dominant society to change him into something like a white man, for his ability to endure severe hardship and deprivation and still hold onto his pride, his self-respect, and his sense of humor.

As the social conscience of the nation has grown, the concerns of the American public have increased over the injustices to the Indian at the hands of the dominant society.

There is an abundant good will in the American public towards Indians that waits to be harnessed and directed to righting old wrongs and to clearing the way for Indians and Indian communities to find the place of respect they have been denied for so long in American society.

America is in an age of the deepest and most pervasive questioning of practically all its institutions. America is questioning the long-accepted ways these institutions have operated, many times in rank disregard of what is proclaimed as the ethos of the American people.

Forces which hold any part of American society in a disadvantaged position, that deny any part of the society its civil rights, its rights to share in opportunity and its rights to self-determination are seen increasingly as forces that must be challenged and eliminated, if America is to start moving forward once more to realization of its dream of a truly great and just society.

American youth is questioning the materialism of American society, its dedication to increasing technology and its overconsumption of the world's resources while whole populations overseas and at home are ill fed, ill clothed, and poorly housed. American youth is questioning America's assaults on nature and the forces of nature, its willful and unthinking pollution and destruction of the environment, and its reliance on physical force in settling disputes. And more and more adults are joining youth in questioning these values, and turning to the values the Indian people once had in their way of life, and to which many Indians still cling.

These values are worth repeating: accommodation to nature and the forces of nature: never taking more from nature's bounty than what one needs; sharing; disapproval of personal accumulation of material

wealth; respect for the individual and the individual's responsibility for making his own decisions; group action based on group consensus.

The demands for the right of self-determination are increasing. In every instance where Indian people have been given the opportunity for self-determination in recent years, there has been a healthy and beneficial response. Nothing less is expected from the church's offer to support Indian self-determination.

Indian leadership, both on the reservations and in the cities, is growing in sophistication and its ability to articulate what the people think and feel. Indian people are growing in their ability to chart their own future.

Opportunities must be afforded to them now to assess their own situation, to define the issues in this situation, and to determine how these issues are to be met.

And equally important in implementing the policy of Indian self-determination must be generosity in the allocation of federal, state, and local resources, including the church's resources, each in the area of its legitimate concerns, for funding the programs that Indian people devise for meeting their needs, solving their problems, exploiting their opportunities, and for making the contributions only they can make to the enrichment of the total American society.

APPENDIX:
GOALS FOR THE WORK OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH AMONG INDIANS AND ESKIMOS

PROPOSED FOR RECOMMENDATION TO GENERAL CONVENTION–OCTOBER 1970 BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON INDIAN WORK

GOALS	STRATEGIES
PRIORITY I	
1. *Indian/Eskimo self-determination.* Equip Indians and Eskimos with skills they need–community self-analysis, community organization, problem-solving, decision-making- to win their proper place of respect in American society; and provide and enlarge opportunities for them to exercise these skills	A. Establishment of National Committee on Indian Work on a continuing basis. B Organization and operation of elected mission boards at the local community level. C. Organization and operation of elected committees on Indian work at the diocesan level; or within state councils of churches and metropolitan church federations. D. Enlarge community development funds for community self-determination projects.
2. *Support ongoing work of the church* among Indians and Eskimos, with continuing evaluation of the relevance of such work to the current situation of Indians and Eskimos and development of appropriate program and budget recommendations by NCIW to Executive Council and General Convention.	A Program evaluation by elected local community mission boards, elected diocesan committees on Indian work, elected committees on Indian work within state councils of churches and metropolitan church federations, and by NCIW, each group at its appropriate level.

GOALS	STRATEGIES
PRIORITY II	
3 *Indian/Eskimo Scholarship Fund.* Establish and implement broad-based scholarship program for Indians and Eskimos in secondary schools, colleges, graduate and professional schools, and in leadership development and management training programs.	A. Seek recognition by responsible public agencies–federal, state and local–of needs for scholarships and counseling services that respond to the peculiar needs and backgrounds of Indian and Eskimo youth, and support legislation, programs and appropriations to adequately meet these needs. B. Pending accomplishment of A, establishment of ecumenically supported Indian/Eskimo scholarship funds at the diocesan or state level, with appropriate support by Executive Council grants on the basis of demonstrated need.
PRIORITY III	
4. *Native leadership development and training.* Support native leadership training and development for the church's work among Indians and Eskimos.	A. Regionally developed programs, including appropriate curriculum development, scholarships to meet special training needs, scholarships for seminary training, where appropriate, and maintenance of trainees in appropriate on-the-job training experiences, supported by Executive Council grants, coupled with other available scholarship resources. B. Support with Executive Council grants national and regional training centers offering programs adapted to the peculiar needs and backgrounds of Indians and Eskimos, e.g., Cook Christian Training School and its Indian Intern Training Program, which is directed to development of secular skills for men going into nonstipendiary priesthood.

GOALS	STRATEGIES
PRIORITY IV	
5. *Reconciliation* of reservation (rural) Indian and Eskimo communities with urban Indian and Eskimo communities, arresting and overcoming growing polarization between the two groups.	A. Develop and staff urban Indian and Eskimo ministries. B. Regional consultations and conferences, rural and urban communities, for sharing strategy planning for meeting the problems and needs of each group and the common needs and problems of both groups. C. Student and family exchange visits between rural and urban Indian and Eskimo communities.
PRIORITY V	
6. *Strengthen tribal governments* and enable them to become more effective in serving the people, in protecting tribal rights and in achieving a proper place of respect for the tribe in the larger community–the state, the region, and the nation.	A. Support tribal governments in seeking appropriations for employing their own legal and technical expertise, thereby relieving them of undue dependence on expertise of government agencies. B. Encourage studies at high school, college, and graduate levels of tribal government structures and effectiveness; structures of state governments; and what modifications may be needed in either or both to enable Indian communities to achieve integration into the larger community without loss of identity as Indian communities. C. Support federal and state legislation sought by tribal governments to achieve desired changes.
7. *Indian/Eskimo Children and Youth Development Fund.* Undergird Indian and Eskimo children and youth in meeting special needs related to their cultural background and social and economic position in their growth and development.	A. Seek recognition by responsible public agencies–federal, state, and local (including United Fund supported agencies in cities)–of special needs of Indian/Eskimo children and youth, and support legislation, programs and appropriations to adequately meet these needs.

GOALS	STRATEGIES
	B. Pending accomplishment of A. establishment of ecumenically supported Indian/Eskimo children and youth development funds at the diocesan or state level, with appropriate support by Executive Council grants on the basis of demonstrated need.
PRIORITY VI	
8. *Improve public services for reservation (rural) Indian/Eskimo communities* Support extension, upgrading and improved funding of public services provided by federal government for reservation (rural) Indians and Eskimos, including special services to meet their peculiar needs.	A. Support tribal governments in working towards this goal through: 1. Developing informed public opinion on problems and needs of reservation (rural) Indians and Eskimos which are not being adequately met. 2. Supporting legislation to remove barriers to participation by tribal governments and reservation populations in publicly supported economic development and public services programs.
PRIORITY VII	
9. *Meet the needs of urban Indian/Eskimo communities.* Support urban Indians in their efforts to develop organizations through which they may maintain their identity, as far as they wish to do so, within the urban community, in establishing their eligibility for and/or in learning to utilize local public services, and in establishing their claim for special federal funding of services (other than what are provided by local public agencies) to meet their special needs.	A. Support urban Indian/Eskimo organizations in working toward this objective through: 1. Developing informed public opinion on problems and needs of urban Indians and Eskimos which are not being met, on their eligibility for local public supported services, and on their special needs which must be met by special federal funds. B. Support legislation to establish the responsibility of the federal government for funding programs directed to meeting the special needs of urban Indians and Eskimos.

GOALS	STRATEGIES
10. *Ecumenicity in work of all churches among Indians and Eskimos.* Support ecumenicity in work of all churches among Indians and Eskimos at international, national, diocesan (judicatory) and parish levels	A. Develop and utilize conciliar style like JSAC (Joint Strategy and Action Committee) at mission/parish, diocesan and national levels.
PRIORITY VIII	
11. *American Indian and Eskimo cultural studies programs.*	A. Encourage establishment of regional American Indian and Eskimo studies programs in cooperation with Indian/Eskimo people and utilizing Indian/Eskimo talent. B. Seek inclusion of appropriate materials on American Indian and Eskimo histories and cultures in all federal and public school curricula.
PRIORITY IX	
12. *Develop greater understanding and communication between reservation (rural) Indian and Eskimo communities with neighboring non-Indian communities to arrest and overcome varying degrees of hostility between the two groups*	A. Encourage appropriate research by colleges and universities, federal and state agencies and private organizations in peculiar relationships between rural Indian and Eskimo communities and their non-Indian, non-Eskimo neighbors - isolation of Indian/Eskimo communities from economic, social and political life of the larger community; denial of the rights of Indians and Eskimos to local publicly supported services; stereotypes among non-Indians regarding Indians and Eskimos and stereotypes among Indians and Eskimos regarding non-Indians and non-Eskimos. B. Dissemination of facts about situation referred to in A through a carefully planned information program. C. Liaison with Congress, the national administration, and state governments to overcome built-in injustices in present situations.

WHERE TO FIND MORE BACKGROUND

ADULT BOOKS

Brandon, William. *American Heritage Book of the Indian.* Dell Publishing Co., N.Y., pap $.75

Brophy, William A. and Aberle, Sophie D.: *The Indian America's Unfinished Business* Univ. of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Okla., 236 pp, 1966, $5.95

Cahn, Edgar S *Our Brother's Keeper The Indians in White America.* World Publishing Co., 866 3rd Ave., N.Y. 10022, 193 pp, 1969, pap. $2.95

Curtis, Natalie: *The Indians' Book* - Songs and Legends of the American Indians. Dover Publishing Co., Inc, N.Y., 584 pp, 1968

Deloria, Vine Jr.: *Custer Died for Your Sins*–An Indian Manifesto Macmillan Co., 866 3rd Ave., N.Y. 10022, 279 pp, 1969, $5.95

Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska *Alaska Natives and Their Land* For sale by the Sup't of Documents, U.S. Gov't Printing Office, Washington, D.C 20402, 565 pp, Oct 1968, $16.00

Hendry, Charles E. *Beyond Traplines,* Towards an Assessment of the Work of the Anglican Church of Canada with Canada's Native Peoples. Anglican Book Center, 600 Jarvis St., Toronto 285, Ontario, 102 pp, $2.50

Josephy, Alvin M., Jr: *Nez Perce Indians and the Opening of the Northwest.* Yale University Press, 92a Yale Station, New Haven, Conn 06520, 1965, $15.00

Kelly, Lawrence C.: *Navajo Indians and Federal Indian Policy,* 1900-1935 University of Arizona Press, Box 3398, Tucson, Ariz 85700, 1968, $7.50

Klein, Bernard & Icolari, Daniel: *Reference Encyclopedia of the American Indian.* A complete and detailed reference work on the American Indian, introd by Robert L. Bennett, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, U.S Dept. of the Interior. B. Klein & Co., 536 pp, 1967, $15.00

Marriott, Alice L.: *First Comers Indians of America's Dawn* McKay, David, Co., Inc, 750 3rd Ave., N Y. 10017, 1960, $4.19

McNickle, D'Arcy. *Indian Tribes of the United States* - Ethnic and Cultural Survival Oxford University Press, Inc., 200 Madison Ave., N.Y. 10016, 1962, pap: $1.20

Mead, Margaret: *Changing Culture of an Indian Tribe.* G.P. Putnam's Sons, 200 Madison Ave., N.Y. 10016, 1966, pap: $2.25

Momaday, N. Scott: *House Made of Dawn.* Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 49 E 33rd St., N.Y. 10016, 224 pp, 1969, $4.95, pap: $.95

Moon, Sheila: *A Magic Dwells–A Poetic and Psychological Study of the Navajo Emergence Myth.* Wesleyan University Press, Middletown, Conn., 206 pp. 1970, $7.95

Parker, Arthur C.: *History of the Seneca Indians.* Friedman, Ira J., Inc., P.O. Box 270, Port Washington, N.Y. 11050, 162 pp, 1968, $6.50

Steiner, Stan: *The New Indians.* Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 49 E. 33rd St., N.Y. 10016, 1968, $7.95. Pap. Delta-Books, Dell Publ. Co., Inc., N.Y., 1969, $2.45

Stirling, Matthew W.: *Indians of the Americas.* National Geographic Society, 17 & M Sts., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, 423 pp, 1965, $7.50

Underhill, Ruth. *Red Man's America - A History of the Indians in the U.S.* University Press. 5750 Ellis Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60637, 350 pp, 1953, $7.50

Red Man's Religion University of Chicago Press, 350 pp, 1965, $7.95

Van Every, Dale: *Disinherited: The Lost Birthright of the American Indian.* Morrow, William & Co., Inc., 105 Madison Ave., N.Y 10016, 270 pp, 1966, $6.95

Wissler, Clark: *Indians of the United States* Four Centuries of their History and Culture. Doubleday & Co., Inc., 277 Park Ave., N.Y. 10017, 1966, $5.95, pap: $1.95.

CHILDREN'S BOOKS

For Children (6–8)

Baker, Betty: *Little Runner of the Longhouse*, Harper and Row, 1962
Clark, Ann Nolan: *Blue Canyon Horse*, Viking Press, 1954
Clark, Ann Nolan: *The Desert People*, Viking Press, 1962
Clark, Ann Nolan: *Little Indian Basket Maker*, Melmont Publishers, 1957
Clark, Ann Nolan: *Little Indian Pottery Maker*, Melmont Publishers, 1955
Clark, Ann Nolan: *This for That*, Golden Gate Junior Books, 1965
Harvey, Lois: *Toyanuki's Rabbit*, Melmont Publishers, 1964
James, Harry: *A Day in Oraibi: A Hopi Indian Village*, Melmont Publishers, 1959
Schweitzer, Byrd Baylor: *One Small Blue Bead*, Macmillan, 1965

For Children (8–10)

Bannon, Laura: *When the Moon Is New*, Albert Whiteman, 1953
Clark, Ann Nolan: *Little Navajo Bluebird*, Viking Press, 1943
Dobrin, Norma: *Delawares*, Melmont Publishers, 1963
Gratf, Stewart and Polly Anne: *Squanto, Indian Adventurer*, Garrard Publishers, 1965
Hofsinde, Robert: *Indian Music Makers*, Morrow, 1967
Kirk, Ruth: *David, Young Chief of the Quileutes*, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1967
Marriott, Alice. *Indians on Horseback*, Thomas Crowell, 1968
Meadowcroft, Enid: *Crazy Horse: Sioux Warrior*, Harper and Row, 1965

For Children (10–12)

Crowell, Ann: *A Hogan for the Bluebird*, Scribners, 196!
Hofsinde, Robert: *Indian Beadwork*, Morrow, 1958
Hofsinde, Robert: *Indian Games and Crafts*, Morrow, 1957
Hollmann, Clide: *Pontiac, King of the Great Lakes*, Hastings House, 1968
Molloy, Anne: *The Five Kidnapped Indians*, Hastings House, 1968
Sandoz, Mari: *These Were the Sioux*, Hastings House, 1968

For Children (12 and up)

Kroeber, Theodora: *Ishi, Last of His Tribe*, Parnassus Press, 1964
Roland, Albert: *Great Indian Chiefs*, Crowell, Collier, Macmillan, 1966
Sandoz, Mari: *The Horsecatcher*, Westminster Press, 1957
Sandoz, Mari: *The Story Catcher*, Westminster Press, 1963
Stephens, Peter John: *Towappu, Puritan Renegade*, Atheneum, 1966
Underhill, Ruth: *Here Come the Navajo!* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

PERIODICALS

American Indian Law Newsletter Univ. of New Mexico School of Law, 1915 Roma Ave., N.E., Albuquerque, N.M. 87106, bimonthly, $14.00 P/A ($5.00 P/A to Indians)

Tempo Vol 2, #10 (Mar 1, 1970), pp. 4 5. "The Indian American Revolutionary," by William Brandon

PAMPHLETS – LEAFLETS

Answers to Questions about the American Indian A pamphlet answering 75 questions. Sup't of Documents, U.S. Gov't Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. $ .25

Indians from Different Parts of the Continent (Gulf Coast, Lower Plateau, Northwest, etc.) Leaflets available at address above, $ .15

Native Alaska: Deadline for Justice - Pamphlet. Alaska Federation of Natives, 1689 C St., Anchorage, Alaska 99501

MAPS

Three Maps of Indian Country (1) Probable location of Indian tribes north of Mexico about 1500 A.D (2) Culture areas and approximate locations of American Indian tribes today (3) Indian reservations under federal jurisdiction (except Alaska) U.S Dep't of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D.C. 20240

Guide to Indian Reservation Areas Map and data on all U S. reservations Branch of Industrial Development, address above

Indians of the USA 34½ x 22½, color, captions History and present-day life of the major Indian tribes of the USA, their types of homes, methods of travel, economic means, arts and crafts, and the church's work among Indians National Council of Churches, 475 Riverside Dr., N.Y 10027

RECORDINGS

American Indian Dances–Folkways Records, 117 W. 46th St , N Y C. 10036, 12", $5 95

Eskimo Music of Alaska and the Hudson Bay- Folkways 12", $6.95

On the Warpath–Folkways, 12"

War Whoops and Medicine Songs–Folkways, 12", $6 95

Indian Songs of Today - Library of Congress Music Division, c/o Sup't of Documents, U.S. Gov't Printing Office, Washington, D C. 20402

Apache Library of Congress Music Div , c/o Sup't of Documents, U.S Gov't Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, $5.40

FILMS

Indian Circle 59 min , color, prod. by Kiva Films, Inc., distr. by All Indian Pueblo Council, P.O. Box 262, Bernalillo, N.M The film shows aspects of the "Indian Circle" program, both negative and positive, which can help Indian young people develop a pride in their heritage, and in themselves as Indians It includes discussion and presentation of tribal customs and ways, Indian dances, white people's distortions.

You Are On Indian Land–36 min., black and white, prod. by National Film Board of Canada, distr. by Contemporary Films/McGraw Hill, 330 W. 42nd St., N Y 10036. The blockade of the International Bridge between the U.S. and Canada by the Indians is a striking example of a non-violent protest over the issue of treaty rights, around which the American Indians are beginning to group

Apache Bootstraps I & II–30 min. ea., $10 rental fee, distr by American Broadcasting Co , 1330 Ave of the Americas, N.Y. 10019 These two color films tell a story of how the ministry of the Rev. Wendell Chino is leading his tribe of Indian Americans to economic self-support Using modern technology and moving from the traditional pulpit-parish ministry into the large ministry of leadership of his people.

Ballad of Crowfoot–10 min , black and white, $10 rental fee, prod by Nat'l Film Board of Canada, distr. by Contemporary Films/McGraw Hill, 330 W 42nd St , N.Y. 10036. Graphic history of the Canadian West created by a member of a film crew composed of Canadian Indians who wish to reflect the traditions, attitudes, and problems of their people

Home of the Brave– 3 min., color, $65 purchase, $10 rental fee, prod. & distr. by Pyramid Film Producers, P.O. Box 1048, Santa Monica, California 90406. A kinestatic experience depicting the American Indian's relationship to American history. It begins with the pre-conquest Indians and follows the degradation of the American Indian as he falls to the white man's westward expansion.

The Navajos 29 min., $6 50 rental fee, prod. by NET., distr. by Yeshiva University Film Library, 526 W. 187th St., N.Y. 10033. This picture features Dr. Ralph Patrick, a social anthropologist who goes to Arizona and interviews Navajo people. The answers he received are exceedingly illuminating in showing the schizophrenic nature of Indian people in the bi-cultural situation.