

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

American Indian Studies: Toward an Indigenous Model

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/09z3k9mm>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 11(3)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Jaimes, M. Annette

**Publication Date**

1987-06-01

**DOI**

10.17953

**Copyright Information**

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

# American Indian Studies: Toward an Indigenous Model

M. ANNETTE JAIMES

---

---

In 1980, during his keynote address to the UCLA American Indian Studies Conference, Russell Thornton observed that "the future for American Indian Studies is open . . . [either to] blend into other disciplines . . . or become mere components . . . or it could emerge as a discipline, unique and distinct in higher education" [emphasis added].<sup>1</sup> It is this distinctly contradictory set of options which Jose Berriero has termed "the dilemma" that has frustrated the potential of university-level American Indian education from its outset.<sup>2</sup>

Today, however, both the material and the intellectual foundations exist through which American Indian Studies can come into its own, transcending the constraints of Euro-American colonial indoctrination which have been imposed upon it and creating a matrix of knowledge for Native America which Ron LaFrance has called its "symbolology of development."<sup>3</sup> The seeds planted during the 1960s, despite all odds, have sprouted and grown, and may well be preparing to bear fruit.

This brief survey of the state of affairs within American Indian Studies will endeavor to sketch both problems confronted by the discipline and possible solutions. As with any study of this sort, it does not—in fact, cannot—purport to offer a comprehensive analysis of its subject matter. Rather, it is intended to provide a capsule orientation to the complexity of issues and dynamics involved, and to open the door to further consideration and discussion of the topics raised. And it is intended to extend a

---

M. Annette Jaimes is Associate Director of the Educational Development Program at the University of Colorado at Boulder.

definition of American Indian Studies as a fully interdisciplinary academic field which is a viable conceptual alternative to the Eurocentrism inherent in the present intellectual *status quo*.

### Background

The emergence of American Indian Studies (AIS) over the past twenty years has heralded a sense of optimism among many observers concerning a supposed "multi-cultural pluralism" of contemporary higher education in the United States. Yet, while there have been numerous noteworthy achievements on the part of AIS practitioners during this period, it seems questionable that the discipline has ever managed (or been allowed) to live up to its potential. Vine Deloria Jr. has observed that "no one ever believed that racial minorities might have their own point of view. [As a result], the first Indian Studies Programs were involved in student relations [and] academic content was shoved into the background."<sup>4</sup> Further:

[AIS was] created more or less as a loose configuration of existing disciplines (particularly American anthropology, history and law), of Indian cultures (especially Indian languages, music and art), and of the contemporary issues and problems of Indian people.<sup>5</sup>

One is drawn to Thronton's 1981 reflection that AIS historically has been a reactive discipline in that "it criticized existing bodies of knowledge . . . particularly those of anthropology and history . . . [rather than] develop its own positive, unique directions."<sup>6</sup> It is difficult to avoid sharing his conclusion that the problems and needs of AIS as a discipline *in its own right* must be faced "if [it] is to grow and develop."<sup>7</sup> Indeed, we find this precise sentiment echoed in the 1980s in the joint call by Vine Deloria, Jr. and Clifford M. Lytle for American Indian intellectuals to focus their energies on autonomous "cultural renewal."<sup>8</sup>

Many of the conceptual difficulties now confronting AIS seem bound up in the nature of its origins and historical setting within a number of private land-grant colleges and universities on the East Coast: Harvard, Dartmouth, William and Mary, and Princeton, among others. It was the self-defined role of these institutions to "civilize" the Indian, inculcating the perspectives of European tradition at the expense of an indigenous worldview; thus, Indian graduates were generally trained to become "mental

non-Indians."<sup>9</sup> As Thornton describes it, this colonial indoctrination process established a tendency within AIS which may be summed up as little more than "a concentration on teaching and service activities, not on scholarly functions characteristic of other disciplines. Consequently, [AIS] is really only a quasi-discipline, and its existence as a separate area within academics is therefore problematic."<sup>10</sup>

Thornton's notion of AIS as typically constituting a "glorified vo-tech" through which students pass, "punching curriculum tickets," *en route* to meeting social service career requirements is not without merit.<sup>11</sup> It is substantially validated by the fact that many of the best and brightest of today's Indian students shy away from engaging in AIS expressly because of its "lack of substance" and "the stigma attached," while non-Indians (both students and faculty) flesh out the rosters.<sup>12</sup> Many of the non-Indian AIS students enroll specifically to fulfill credentialing requirements for entry into one of the government agencies which provide services to Native Americans. Service delivery by these agencies has failed spectacularly during the 1980s—often due to the insensitivity of white AIS graduates to the realities of Indian life and a marked tendency to view Indians as "just another minority," rather than as the distinct and *separate* nation implied by their treaty relationships with the U.S. government.<sup>13</sup> The past performance of such graduates is an obviously sorry testament to the effectiveness of AIS heretofore.

Thornton's view receives further reinforcement from the experience of the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) efforts undertaken during the late 1960s and throughout the '70s—the veritable heyday of ethnic studies program creation—and designed to facilitate greater "minority" access to/retention in higher education. Under a broad definition of their mission, the EOPs had the potential to serve as natural allies, consolidators of the academic gains achieved by the more formally described (but embryonic) minority academic departments such as AIS. In short, the EOPs might have served to absorb the student service functions foisted off on many ethnic studies efforts, while simultaneously providing a much-needed impetus toward an increasing expansion of minority-focused academic development in campus life.

Such possibilities were, however, blunted or negated by administrative constraints very early on. As Ward Churchill has noted in this connection. "The campus role of the EOPs . . .

gravitated to that of providing [*only*] non-academic services, such as counseling. Top level institutional support for the creation of full-scale academic units within the minority context has never been evident."<sup>14</sup> The upshot of this has been that EOPs have in many cases been maintained *in lieu of* formal minority academic units or, in a sort of reverse scenario, academic ethnic studies units have been maintained at the expense of EOP efforts, and have found *themselves* saddled with student support service responsibilities. In the worst case, the EOPs and ethnic studies have come to be seen as essentially interchangeable parts.

To a certain extent, this has been due to a fuzziness on the part of AIS practitioners themselves. A recent example may be found in a major 1985 study undertaken by Susan Guyette and Charlotte Heth which repeats the 1979 confusion of Churchill and Norbert S. Hill, Jr. in treating support service delivery and academics as not only linked, but virtually synonymous.<sup>15</sup> So long as this basic confusion remains, it is unlikely that the positive steps recommended by Guyette and Heth—such as increasing direct interaction between AIS programs and Indian communities—will themselves be anything other than muddled.

In 1988, then, AIS appears to exist largely as a structurally and conceptually rudderless discipline, generally isolated both within the academic environment and from its own cultural roots, and functioning all too often as a career ladder for those who wish to "work with Indians," rather than as an intellectual enterprise for Indians themselves. Insofar as this is true, AIS must be viewed as essentially cooptive of Indian interests, rather than as a discipline designed and intended to meet Indian needs. And, while the structural questions at issue might be resolved simply by insisting upon a clear demarcation between Indian student support services and AIS, the conceptual problems seem a much tougher nut to crack.

### **Conceptual Difficulties**

The central dilemma of AIS today was summed up neatly by Marlys Duchene when she observed that the designers of standard academic curriculum were (and still are) Euro-Americans. "This resulted in academic curricula that embodied beliefs and routines that were strictly Euro-American, the basis of which provided the 'object' for self-reflection . . . being western Euro-

pean heritage, not American tribal heritage."<sup>16</sup> Elsewhere, Duchene states that, as a result, "No textbook treats the history and culture of tribal people as part of the total history of the races of man," a matter which relegates indigenous people such as American Indians to the dimension of "second-hand experiences."<sup>17</sup> In the same vein, Vine Deloria, Jr. has noted with reference to AIS that "the process of developing these programs took a traditional Anglo-American mode . . . which produced an objectification of [Indian] cultures, and they thus became the consumers of their own products."<sup>18</sup> This situation has prompted this Indian educator to proclaim the existence of a "myth of Indian education in the American educational system."<sup>19</sup>

The problem was perhaps most graphically described by Ward Churchill when he articulated the nature of the "educational imperialism" inherent in the contemporary functioning of academe (a condition he terms "white studies"). Within Churchill's schema, the "linear conceptual mode" marking European culture dominates modern U.S. academic life, demanding conformity to its structure and conclusions as the price of intellectual legitimacy. American Indian intellectualism, which he defines as being structured in a "circilinear" fashion and belonging to the tradition of "the relational indigenous worldview," is thus excluded virtually by institutional mandate.<sup>20</sup> As he puts it:

As currently established, the university system in the United States offers little more than "white studies" to students, minority and mainstream alike. This is to say that curriculum is very nearly monolithic in its focus upon European conceptual modes as being the "natural" formation of knowledge/means of perceiving reality. In the vast bulk of curriculum content, Europe is not only the subject (conceptual mode; process of learning to think), but the object (subject matter) of investigation as well.<sup>21</sup>

Deloria concurs with Churchill's assessment that the price of AIS existence usually has been its intellectual subordination to, and often incorporation into, the academic "mother country" of Europe-derived processes and "standards." He therefore concludes that "in the past two decades we have witnessed a classic and profound misunderstanding that requires a certain degree of sophistication to recognize, and finds its roots in the historic

relationship between Indians and western Europeans that originates in their divergent philosophical views of the world . . . [a situation] based upon the link between education and imperialism."<sup>22</sup>

Churchill describes the predominant "European conceptual mode" as follows:

. . . "knowledge" is divided into discrete content areas arranged in linear structure. This division is permanent and culturally enforced . . . In the cases of science and religion (as two examples), the mutual opposition of these two discrete entities has given rise to a third, which may be termed "speculative philosophy" which is informed by both science and religion (as theology) and, in turn, informs them. Speculative philosophy, in this sense at least, may be viewed purely as the mechanism through which the linearly isolated components, science and religion, communicate and "progress." Speculative philosophy is not, in itself, intended to apprehend reality, but to create an abstract reality in its place. Both religion and science, according to their individuality as discrete dynamics informed by the philosophical abstract, are intended to allow the concrete apprehension of and action upon/within reality . . . Such compartmentalization within the conceptual structure itself is echoed in the compartmentalization/departmentalization of the European educational and curriculum structures. Sociology, philosophy, theology, biology—the whole vast proliferation of "ologies" and "isms"—are necessarily viewed as separate, or at least separable (i.e., discrete) areas of inquiry. The social structure itself is popularly construed in this fragmentary fashion: church, state, military, government, business, family, education, and art, or worse, "culture."<sup>23</sup>

It is difficult to imagine a way of looking at and relating to the world more antithetical to the holistic totalism marking the indigenous worldviews than what Churchill delineates. And yet it is even more difficult to deny that it is precisely this sort of outlook to which AIS has been subordinated, and by which its quality, integrity and legitimacy have been measured since its inception. Put another way, in order for AIS to be evaluated (by

its supposed "peers" in mainstream academia) as a success, it must conform to sets of conceptual "standards" and "methods" which are patently in opposition to *Native American* realities and which are allegedly its *raison d'être*. In a very real sense, then, it is fair to say that AIS literally has been set up to fail.

Clearly, the concept of an "intellectual hegemony of Eurocentrism" prevailing in modern academia offers a significant key to understanding both the scope and the scale of constraints hindering (or barring) much of the potential range of accomplishments promised by AIS to date. It also affords strong reinforcement to Russell Thornton's description of the discipline as fundamentally "endogenous."<sup>24</sup> At first glance, such barriers to success no doubt appear so entrenched and all-powerful as to be insurmountable. However, the fact that a steadily growing number of AIS practitioners have begun to come to grips with such central conceptual problems gives rise to the hope that ultimately they may be overcome. Thus, despite a large number of missed directions and false starts since 1965, AIS *can* eventually come into its own as an autonomous *Indian* tradition of scholarship and intellectualism.

### **Basis for Development**

Much of the basis for the future development of AIS lies, of course, in the programs and practitioners currently in place. By the mid-1980s, seventeen states—Arizona, California, Illinois, Minnesota, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, Montana, Idaho and Oregon—as well as the U.S. territory of Puerto Rico had joined the previously mentioned private institutions in offering university-level AIS programs<sup>25</sup> According to an AIS directory published by the University of New Mexico during the same period, nine American universities field programs of sufficient scope and depth were designated "American Indian Studies Research Centers," albeit most tend to focus on American Indian languages and issues of bilingualism.<sup>26</sup> Such orientation, to be sure, fits well within the "teaching and service" framework both Thornton and Churchill decry, a negative circumstance compounded by the fact that the programs in question tend to be assimilative and draw their students into job sectors away from reservation communities upon graduation.<sup>27</sup>

On a more positive note, the AIS program at the University of



Arizona (U of A) has established something of a working model for replication at other institutions. Initially created during the late '70s around the Policy Studies activities of Vine Deloria, Jr., the U of A effort has now expanded to include concentrations in literature (via N. Scott Momaday and Leslie Marmon Silko, and a most recent addition, Joy Harjo), anthropology (under Robert K. Thomas) and history (through Tom Holm). The most striking feature of the U of A program has been the success of its participants in breaking with the "shoestring" profile of AIS at most institutions, assembling an impressive roster of senior-level Indian faculty members able to hold their own in interchanges with their mainstream colleagues.

Despite the preponderance of talent and credentials evident at the U of A, however, it has proven no more successful than its less well-endowed counterparts in establishing a graduate degree program in AIS. To the contrary, at present the University of California at Berkeley (UC Berkeley) comes closest, with the availability of a more generalized Ph.D. in Ethnic Studies under which an AIS concentration is possible. At the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), post-doctoral fellowships in AIS are also offered. As Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz, former AIS director at the University of New Mexico, has pointed out, the few AIS graduate programs offered nationally are of exceeding importance not only because of the implications of scholarly credibility for the discipline at present, but also because of the need for AIS to control the advanced education of "academic professionals," upon which its future development depends.<sup>28</sup>

Another very important sign in this connection has been the emergence of several reputable and scholarly journals covering AIS as their exclusive subject matter. These include *Northeast Indian Studies* at Cornell University, *American Indian Quarterly* at UC Berkeley, *Wicazo Sa Review* at Eastern Washington University, and the *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* at UCLA. They combine with certain somewhat more broadly-focused periodicals—such as *The Journal of Ethnic Studies* at Western Washington University and *Cultural Survival Quarterly* in Cambridge, MA—to establish a relatively new forum for American Indian academic writing, which offsets to some extent the ideologically-motivated suppression of much seminal AIS material.<sup>29</sup> Unfortunately, to date there has been no corresponding development within the realm of book publishing; despite the best efforts of

the AIS Centers at UCLA and UNM, this dimension has remained firmly in the grip of such staid presses as those of the Universities of Oklahoma, Nebraska and Minnesota (which uniformly devote their resources to the traditional mainstream preoccupations with "approved" anthropology, history, and the like).<sup>30</sup>

All in all, it is accurate to observe that, despite severe constraints and the sorts of problems noted above, the tangible resource-base of AIS has expanded considerably since 1970. Perhaps the most promising factor within any AIS prospectus, however, is the number and quality of scholars that have entered the discipline during the same period. In this sense, AIS may be said to have matured into its second (or possibly third) generation. Members of the first generation of the 1960s—comprised of such notables as Vine Deloria, Jr., N. Scott Momaday, Alphonso Ortiz, Robert K. Thomas, Jeanette Henry Costo, Russell Thornton and Roger Buffalohead—generally remain active and quite productive. Such "senior statesmen" of the field were joined in the 1970s by others of considerable accomplishment—Leslie Marmon Silko, Simon J. Ortiz, John Mohawk, Maurice Kenny, James Welch, and Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz among them. The 1980s have continued this trend, as a number of others have emerged; Ward Churchill, Winona LaDuke, Jose Barriero, Glenn Morris, Katsi Cook, Jim Anaya, Joy Harjo, and Wendy Rose might be counted among this group.

### **An Alternative Vision**

At this juncture, it would appear that those who pioneered the emergence of AIS during the 1960s should be viewed as largely having succeeded in this project. This is true both in terms of the number of AIS programs and related endeavors now in existence and by virtue of the proliferation of AIS scholars which has been evident over the past two decades. What now seems necessary to carry AIS forward is the consolidation of a disciplinary vision which will serve to anchor the field firmly upon its own conceptual foundations, in sync with the traditions, values and perspectives of its own indigenous constituency rather than "the attitudinal syndrome of ruling class officials."<sup>31</sup>

Along this line, Jose Barriero has suggested that "there appears to be surfacing an agreement among informed observers of

American Indian education that a strong identity—that is, the fullest possible knowledge of one's own language, culture, cosmology and history—is a necessary prerequisite for any successful venture into the non-Indian world."<sup>32</sup> It follows that there have been calls for the actualization of "concrete examples of . . . Native American conceptual structures . . . integrated within mainstream curriculum components."<sup>33</sup> In essence, there have been demands that, for example, American Indian philosophy be considered philosophy in its *own* right, and not merely by its juxtaposition to the thought of Plato or Hegel. Similarly, the demand has been that AIS content be assessed according to its own internal standards and criteria (just like any other discipline) rather than by the evaluative methods of mainstream fields.

At base, such arguments are grounded (both in formulation and in spirit) in the principles of psychic/intellectual decolonization long espoused by such theorists as Frantz Fanon,<sup>34</sup> and the more recently emerging perspective of "indigenism" elaborated by writer/activists such as Guillermo Bonfil Batalla.<sup>35</sup> To quote Vine Deloria, Jr., on the subject:

Indian Studies programs should . . . define their goals as encompassing all the relevant knowledge and information concerning the relationship between American Indians and the rest of the world, be it the federal government, other religions, the world of arts and music, or international and domestic economies.<sup>36</sup>

The most appropriate (and probably constructive) way of approaching this task would be through the deployment of the "Native American Conceptual Mode" itself. As Ward Churchill has sketched it:

Within such a conceptual structure . . . there is really no compartmentalization of "spheres of knowledge." All components or categories (by European definition) tend to be mutually and perpetually informing. All tend to concretize human existence within reality (nature) while all are simultaneously informed by that reality. This is the "Hoop" or the "Wheel" or "Circle" of life referred to within the (continuing) oral traditions

of so many indigenous peoples. Reality is not something "above," but an integral part of the living/knowing process itself.<sup>37</sup>

From a pedagogical standpoint, what both Deloria and Churchill are calling for is not merely the inclusion of Indians and Indian programs in academia (although both certainly demand these), but a fully interdisciplinary approach to AIS as a discipline. Both maintain that it is impossible to arrive at a coherently *Indian* understanding of law or political science without a firm grasp of the spiritual principles governing Indian life, and that these in turn can be apprehended only via a grounding in the Indian relationship to the environment. Indian philosophy cannot be approached without a solid appreciation of *all* these elements.

Pursuit of such a comprehensive curricular structure, of course, represents a nearly monumental task. However, it also offers a fundamental linkage between AIS conceptualizations, on the one hand, and the relational worldview of indigenous societies, on the other. Simultaneously, it affords both the basis for a continuing, autonomous evolution of American Indian knowledge *per se* and the footing necessary to offer constructive critiques of Eurocentric intellectual practice. Hence, such an approach would seem to be the "wave of the future" if AIS is to survive and develop in its own right rather than as an appendage of the mainstream.

### Future Directions

In many ways, AIS has come to a crossroads. It is possible that, by the mid-1990s at the latest, it will have been more or less fully assimilated into the academic mainstream, reduced to a pseudo-intellectual vehicle maintained for purposes of providing the appearance of "ethnic diversity" on campus and to extend "Indian validation" to the supposed insights and conclusions of Euroamerican academia. All that would be required for this to become reality would be for the majority of AIS practitioners to play it safe, accepting orthodox canons (while claiming to write from the "Indian perspective"), becoming comfortable with that form from which they were once excluded and against which many

of them once rebelled. Thus is tenure often acquired and, conversely, thus are those with the most to offer by way of *bona fide* AIS content typically excluded from the academic process.

Fortunately, the stage is set for another scenario to be followed. This involves practical follow-up to the vision articulated by Churchill and Deloria in the preceding section. Probably the most important thrust in this direction over the past few years has come from certain AIS scholars consciously and deliberately linking their theoretical work to the efforts by legal and political organizations representing the interests of various Native American constituencies—the Indian Law Resource Center, the National Indian Youth Council, the World Council of Indigenous Peoples and the International Indian Treaty Council—to acquire international forums. Direct participation in the United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Populations, the Inter-American Indian Congress and the Russell Tribunal on the Treatment of the Indians of the Americas (among other processes) has done much to broaden the horizons of those involved, deepening their collective sophistication concerning how the modern political world really works. At the same time, it has made them much more fully aware of the global dimension of indigenous existence and experience.

This awareness has led to the emergence of a concept that there is an indigenous "Fourth" or "Host" World on the planet, composed of a multitude of distinct peoples ranging from the Indians of North and South America to the Innuits and Samis of the Arctic Circle, the Maori of New Zealand and Koori of Australia, the Karins and Katchins of Burma, the Kurds of Persia, the Bedouins of the Sahara and onward, the Zulus and Bantus of southern Africa, and *many* others. Even in contemporary Europe, peoples such as the Basques of Spain and the Gaels of the Scottish Highland region may be viewed as indigenous nations. According to this notion, the modern, industrialized (or industrializing) States of the First, Second, and Third Worlds are seen as sitting squarely atop the Host World.<sup>38</sup>

Such a global perspective has led to certain conclusions. Perhaps most important has been that, for all their obvious differences, indigenous peoples have certain things in common. In essence, these boil down to 1) ways of relating to the habitat which are non-disruptive, at least to the extent that they allow for the perpetual coexistence of humans and other organic life (a mat-

ter radically different from the environmental *pathos* of the other three worlds), and 2) the fact that virtually all of the peoples in question have been conquered, colonized and ultimately encapsulated within one or another modern nation-state. In short, the historical experiences of indigenous peoples the world over during the past five centuries show in many ways an almost overwhelming commonality.

These conclusions have, in turn, led to others. For the AIS practitioners concerned, the first has been that the experience of American Indians might be understood best not in a national, continental, or even hemispheric sense, but within the fully global context of indigenous experience everywhere. From this vantage point, they argue, patterns are more readily apparent and comprehensible, meanings more appropriately assigned. Second, these thinkers have gone beyond the arguments by AIS scholars such as Deloria concerning the inherent *rights* of each American Indian tribe to enjoy the status of sovereign nations, contending that *all* indigenous peoples hold such rights. This perspective, and the analytical methodology it engenders, has come to be termed "indigenism" by proponents and opponents alike.<sup>39</sup>

The indigenist approach to subject matter is both comprehensive (in terms of its field of inquiry) and dialectically interactive. Thus it affords a sound basis for the reinterpretation of events. A salient example is George M. Frederickson's thesis, compellingly presented, that it is impossible to understand the creation of Bantustans in South Africa without first studying the process by which American Indian reservations were established in the U.S.; by the same token, it is impossible to confront the meaning of the U.S. reservation system other than in the context of the Bantustans.<sup>40</sup> Other recent examples include Glenn Morris' and Ward Churchill's analysis of the situation of the Miskito Indians of Nicaragua in view of the experience of the Hmong people of Laos a decade earlier<sup>41</sup> and Bernard Nietschmann's critique of conventional politico-military conflict theory through the lens of "wars for national independence waged by Fourth World peoples against their forced incorporation or absorption into various States."<sup>42</sup>

This dialectical methodology also allows for—indeed, demands—the revitalized exploration of everything from traditional indigenous economies to architecture, agriculture, social structure, kinship systems, governmental forms, historiography, and

spiritual traditions. In sum, indigenism exerts precisely the sort of impetus required to move AIS toward being a valid and *autonomous* discipline, rather than a mere rubber stamp of others.

Currently, there are a number of indicators that the idea is taking hold. Among them, the journal *Cultural Survival Quarterly* is probably the major vehicle for the scholarly articulation of indigenist concepts, although another title, *The Fourth World Journal*, has more recently begun to appear. Indigenist articulations are also a staple for the popular bi-monthly tabloid, *Akwesasne Notes*. Increasingly, other publications such as *The Journal of Ethnic Studies* have become interested in publishing indigenist material, while academic and quasi-academic organizations ranging from the Anthropology Resource Center to the Seventh Generation Fund have joined with political action groups like the American Indian Movement and *Anishinabe Akeeng* in adopting the perspective. An independent Fourth World Documentation Center has also come into existence.

Within AIS itself, the idea that American Indian Studies might be framed more appropriately and fruitfully in terms of "indigenous studies" has also shown signs of life. At the University of Colorado at Denver, for example, Glenn Morris has established a Center for Fourth World Studies which presents AIS content in a global context. Similarly, at the newly established Center for Studies of Ethnicity and Race in America at the University of Colorado at Boulder (where Churchill is AIS coordinator) the same approach is being taken. Interest in such efforts has been widely expressed by other programs and campuses around the nation, and it appears that those efforts may see considerable replication over the coming few years.

Clearly, the possibility exists for AIS to live up to the potential it has displayed since its inception. The 1990s will be a 'critical time' either this potential finally will be realized, or AIS will decay into relative meaninglessness. The choice, and the responsibility, lies with all of us who are now involved. And we cannot afford to fail.

#### NOTES

1. Russell Thornton, "American Indian Studies: A Revisit," *American Indian Issues in Higher Education*, American Indian Studies Center, UCLA, 1981, 9; Thornton's remarks were first delivered as a keynote address at the 4th Annual Conference on American Indian Issues at UCLA in 1980.

2. Jose Barriero, "The Dilemma of American Indian Education," *Indian Studies* 1, no. 1 (1984): 4-5.
3. Ron LaFrance, "The Symbology of Development: Some Iroquoian Thoughts," *Indian Studies* 2, no. 1 (1985): 20-23.
4. Vine Deloria, Jr., "Indian Studies—The Orphan of Academia," *Wicazo Sa Review* 2, no. 2 (1986): 1.
5. Thornton, 5.
6. *Ibid.*, 6.
7. *Ibid.*, 7.
8. Vine Deloria, Jr., and Clifford M. Lytle, *The Nations Within: The Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984) 250-254.
9. Russell Thornton "American Indian Studies as an Academic Discipline," *The American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 2, nos. 3-4.
10. *Ibid.*
11. The somewhat colorful language in this passage derives from a speech delivered by Russell Means during American Indian Awareness Week activities at the University of Colorado at Boulder, April 1980. Tape on file.
12. This information comes from an independent survey conducted in 1979-80 by the National Tribal Chairman's Fund while Patricia Locke was director. The data revealed that, among responding programs, upwards of one third of all students enrolled in AIS identified themselves as "Caucasian," while nearly 20% more were from other non-Indian ethnic groups; the great bulk of these also identified themselves as being either education or social science/social work majors. Additionally, more than two thirds of all AIS-rostered faculty were identified as being Caucasian.
13. This conclusion is derived from an unpublished study of Indian Service employment patterns conducted by ACKO, Inc., Boulder, CO, during the late 1970s and updated throughout the early '80s.
14. Ward Churchill, "National Patterns in Contemporary Indian Studies Programs," *Multicultural Education and the American Indian* (1979), 59.
15. Susan Guyette and Charlotte Heth, *Issues for the Future of American Indian Studies: A Needs Assessment and Program Guide* (Los Angeles: American Indian Studies Program, UCLA, 1984); Ward Churchill and Norbert S. Hill, Jr., "Indian Education at the University Level: An Historical Survey," *The Journal of Ethnic Studies* 7, no. 3 (1979).
16. Marlys Duchene, "Problems in Curriculum Development in Indian Community Schools," unpublished paper presented at the Western Social Science Association Annual Conference, Albuquerque, 1980, 3.
17. Marlys Duchene, "The Relevancy of Indian Studies in Higher Education," *American Indian Issues in Higher Education*, *ibid.*, 15.
18. Vine Deloria, Jr., "The Rise and Fall of Ethnic Studies," *Cultural Pluralism in Education: A Mandate for Change* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973), 132-36.
19. M. A. Jaimes, "The Myth of Indian Education in the American Educational System," *Action in Teacher Education: The Journal of the Association of Teachers* 5, no. 3 (1983): 15-19.
20. Ward Churchill, "White Studies: The Intellectual Imperialism of Contemporary U.S. Education," *Integrateducation* 19, nos. 1-2, (1982): 51-57.
21. *Ibid.*, 51.



22. Vine Deloria, Jr., "Education and Imperialism," *Integrateducation* 58.
23. Churchill, 1982, 54.
24. Thornton, 1978, 11.
25. *College Blue Book* (New York: MacMillan Publishers, 1983).
26. *Directory of American Indian Higher Education Programs* (Albuquerque, NM: American Indian Studies Center, University of New Mexico, 1980).
27. Jaimes, 1983, 17.
28. Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz, "Developing Indian Academic Professionals," *Integrateducation* 41.
29. This situation is clearly analyzed in Ward Churchill, "Implications of Publishing *The Roots of Resistance*," *The Journal of Ethnic Studies* 9, no. 3 (1981); also see Ward Churchill, "A Critique of Vine Deloria's *The Metaphysics of Modern Existence*," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 5, no. 3 (1981).
30. Churchill, 1980, 61.
31. Duchene, 1981, 16.
32. Barriero, 1984, 4-5.
33. Churchill, 1982, 56.
34. Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967).
35. Guillermo Bonfil Batalla, *Utopia y Revolución: El Pensamiento Politico Contemporaneo de los Indios en America Latina* (Mexico City: Editorial Nueva Imagen, SA, 1981).
36. Deloria, 1986, 6-7.
37. Churchill, 1982, 54.
38. The World Council of Indigenous Peoples was one of the first entities in North America to start using this terminology with regularity. See, for example, J. R. Diabo, "The Emergence of Fourth World Politics in the International Arena," unpublished paper presented at the Western Social Science Annual Conference, San Diego, 1984.
39. Ward Churchill was perhaps the first to employ this term with consistency in the U.S. For example, see his "The New Genocide: An Indigenist Perspective on Native American Environments," *Akwesasne Notes* 18, no. 6 (1986).
40. George M. Frederickson, *White Supremacy: A Comparative Study of American and South African History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981).
41. Glenn T. Morris and Ward Churchill, "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Left-Wing Revolution, Right-Wing Reaction and the Destruction of Indigenous Peoples," *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 11, no. 2 (1987): 17-24.
42. Bernard Nietschmann, "Militarization and Indigenous Peoples: The Third World War," *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, 1-15.