

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Ethics and Writing Native American History: A Commentary about People of the Sacred Mountain

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0tt0d8n7>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 11(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Campbell, Gregory

Publication Date

1987

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

Commentary and Debate

Ethics and Writing Native American History: A Commentary about *People of the Sacred Mountain*

GREGORY CAMPBELL

In volume 7, number 1 (1983) of this journal there appeared three reviews of *People of the Sacred Mountain*, a book by Father Peter J. Powell. The reviews raised a number of controversial questions. For a student of Cheyenne culture and history, these reviews point to at least three important issues that warrant commentary. First, there is the question of what constitutes supereminent Native American historical scholarship. Second, there is the question of ethics associated with the collection and dissemination of ethnographic data about Native American communities. And last, there remains a related issue surrounding the ethics of reviewing books. That is, should the reviewers extend their analysis of a book to address personal questions about the author's relationship with the Indian community and the world of publishing?

All too often, controversial issues that are brought forth in a scholarly context are either ignored or, if debated, reduced to a personal diatribe.¹ In either instance, critical questions are never adequately addressed. It is in this context that this commentary

Gregory Campbell is a post-doctoral fellow in the American Indian Studies Program at University of California at Los Angeles.

is written, with the hope that the more significant issues brought forth in these reviews will be generally productive for Native American scholarship.

Putting aside the non-substantive criticisms that the reviewers make about the book's bulk, clumsy note usage, and exorbitant price, the two paramount questions the reviews address are what constitutes noteworthy Native American historical scholarship and what are the ethical considerations associated with the collection and dissemination for public consumption of ethnographic data about Native American communities.² Of these issues, the question of what constitutes noteworthy Native American history will be considered first.

PEOPLE OF THE SACRED MOUNTAIN: THE DEBATE BETWEEN PARTICULARISTIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY

Since the establishment of the Indian Claims Commission, Native American history has burgeoned into one of the most vital areas of historical inquiry. As legal consultants for the Claims Commission, anthropologists were forced from their synchronic ethnographic methods into the historical archives in order to grapple adequately with questions concerning Native American land tenure diachronically. What emerged from these inquiries was an interdisciplinary methodology referred to as ethnohistory.³ The hallmark of the ethnohistorical method is its unique blending of methods and theories derived from history and anthropology. Through this methodological intermarriage, Native Americanists labored to reinterpret past events ". . . as far as possible, through the eyes of the participants."⁴ One of the explicit goals of ethnohistory is to reconcile the observational biases inherent in the historical record in order to arrive at an interpretation of historical events within their proper cultural context.

Concomitant with allowing a more culturally appropriate interpretation, ethnohistory also attempts to develop comparative criteria for the comprehension of cultural dynamics and change. As Valentine suggested over two decades ago, the ethnohistorical method:

. . . provides an unique combination of resources for discovering events, chronological sequences and particular cultural context of history. At the same time, this

sort of approach also offers a sound empirical basis for scientific inferences or generalizations about cultural change.⁵

Through detailed cultural descriptions and analyses of past events, ethnohistorians, whether initially trained as anthropologists or as historians, strive to yield an understanding of the processes of cultural change and "portray native peoples in their own right, acting for their own reasons in light of their own cultural norms and values."⁶ This movement of Indian people center stage in the historical arena of American history was christened by Berkhofer as the "New Indian History."⁷ The ultimate goal, as I see it, of this "New Indian History" is not only to understand history from various tribal perspectives, but also to create a history which focuses on social processes and collectivities, rather than on particular individuals and events. Such a historical method can organize research around larger sociological questions and generate testable models. From this brief sketch of ethnohistory's goals, the criticisms leveled against *People of the Sacred Mountain* and its author become more comprehensible, I believe.

Motivations for authoring a book are both abstract and highly personal. Reasons for publication range from the advancement of science or a felt responsibility to colleagues or to the host community to personal prestige and profit. According to Powell, the publication of *People of the Sacred Mountain* represents the completion of a sacred obligation bequeathed to him by the late John Stands in Timber.⁸ Certainly, if we take the author at his word, this is a legitimate motivation for writing a book, especially if the Northern Cheyennes in some way supported the endeavor. And it is evident from reading the book that the work was a labor of love. I mention this because the personal impetus for authoring this particular work is intimately bound to the book's relevance as a piece of historical scholarship, and consequently, to the criticisms leveled against the work by the reviewers.

Consistent with one of the major precepts of ethnohistory previously discussed, Father Powell sought to interpret Northern Cheyenne history from an "insider's" perspective.⁹ Wherever possible, the author attempted to use the Cheyenne interpretation of historical events by drawing upon the rich oral tradition of the Northern Cheyennes to interpret the historical documents. Although Hoebel and Moore do not take issue with

his intention, they do believe that Powell has identified himself so strongly with the Northern Cheyenne perspective on historical events that his rendering of their history is distorted and ethnocentric.¹⁰ According to these reviewers, the confounding variable of Powell's apparent ethnocentrism derives from his intense interpersonal involvement with Cheyenne religious doctrine and his being a white Catholic priest. They argue that these two personal factors color his interpretation of Northern Cheyenne culture and history, especially Northern Cheyenne ceremonialism, in which he himself has been an active participant.

No one can fully ascertain the subtle influences or biases that interject themselves into anyone's scholarship, but for analytical purposes, the question can be posed: does the author interpret Northern Cheyenne religious belief in terms of his own Judeo-Christian convictions? To assess this question properly, it is worth quoting Powell's own perspective on this issue:

I write of these Cheyenne sacred ways as an Anglo-Catholic priest who possesses profound respect for history and ethnology. One of the fundamental precepts of the individual Catholic Church is that Christ came as the Perfector, the Fulfiller, of all the world's cultures and traditions. The Church holds that the finest in the pre-Christian religious reflected the eternal truth and beauty of God. Thus, these religions were, in their way, preparation for God's revelation of Himself in human flesh as Jesus Christ.¹¹

The quote explicitly illustrates that the author's interpretation of Northern Cheyenne religious life is from a Judeo-Christian frame of reference. The point where his particular interpretation becomes most apparent is in the author's cross-cultural analogies between Judeo-Christian and Northern Cheyenne ceremonialism. In his previous work, *Sweet Medicine: The Continuing Role of the Sacred Arrows, the Sun Dance, and Sacred Buffalo Hat in Northern Cheyenne History*, Father Powell draws parallels between the flesh sacrifices conducted at the Sun Dance and the Eucharist:

These Cheyenne and Sioux concepts may be construed as the closest analogies to the great central fact of the Church's life and worship . . . Both the Eucharist and the Sun Dance possess in common the belief that new

life begins with the sacrifice of one man. Thus, the pledging of the Sun Dance may be viewed as the earlier form of sacred revelation to the Cheyennes and Tetons, and the self-oblation of Jesus Christ on the Cross as the perfecting of that sacrifice which is still offered in the medicine lodge.¹²

The two quotes cited above indicate that Father Powell does perceive Cheyenne religious belief and ceremonialism as an "imperfect," earlier form of Christianity. This personal bias has been referred to by Fischer as ethnomorphism, or the "conceptualization of characteristics of another group in terms of one's own."¹³ Given this ethnomorphic bias, the question remains however, as to whether this particular conceptualization of Cheyenne religion in any way contributes to a larger ethnocentric interpretation of Northern Cheyenne history.

After examining the available evidence, no student of Cheyenne culture or history would deny the prominent role the Sacred Arrows and the Sacred Buffalo Hat play in the history of the Northern Cheyenne nation. These sacred objects were, and still are, a powerful force in the lives of many Northern Cheyennes.¹⁴ Father Powell acknowledges their influence by choosing to interpret all significant events in Cheyenne history as having supernatural causation.¹⁵ Two pivotal periods in Cheyenne history, for example, were the capturing of the Sacred Arrows and the mutilation of the Sacred Hat. According to Powell, these two events sealed the Cheyenne's fate. It was their destiny to fall victim to Sweet Medicine's prophecy that light-skinned strangers would come among them and they would eventually lose their tribal ways.¹⁶

Such a perspective leads to a model based on a single cause and effect by reducing Cheyenne history to a continual series of predetermined metaphysical events dependent upon the waning fortunes of their sacred objects. Thus, according to this interpretation from an "insider's" perspective, the Cheyenne become passive actors in their own history, incapable of influencing or resisting the forces which so profoundly transformed their lives. In this respect, Father Powell's view of Northern Cheyenne history is ethnocentric, in that he has interpreted Northern Cheyenne history against the background of the Cheyenne sacred ceremonies. This is a bias that Powell makes explicit in a number of publications.¹⁷

A related issue to be considered is one reviewer's accusation that Powell embellishes the narrative with speculation where historical documentation is lacking or contradictory.¹⁸ More specifically, it is charged that Powell used literary license to mask or fill in the narrative.¹⁹ Dramatic presentation does not make the history any less accurate. Falseness derives from inadequate or inaccurate information, faulty research, neglected resources, or misleading implications. These faults can afflict the more scientifically written expository as often as they afflict dramatic historical narrative.²⁰ On reading this work, I found no major errors of fact due to neglected resources, especially since most of the events have been previously written about by Grinnell, Liberty and Stands in Timber and George Bent.²¹ However, Father Powell does take considerable literary license in describing the role of individual Cheyenne warriors, holy men, and chiefs, filling their actions with emotion.²² Thus, the narrative is not embellished with conjecture to cover up historical voids or contradictions, but does fictionalize emotion, personal outlook and moral judgment which reflect how the sacred objects worked through prominent Northern Cheyenne individuals. For Powell, history is not a science, but a branch of literature—a factual story filled with colorful people and dramatic events.²³

So what type of history is *People of the Sacred Mountain*? The book is narrowly focused and does contain an explicit bias throughout. Powell's view of Cheyenne history as sacred history interprets the role of Cheyenne military societies and prominent individuals within a particularistic perspective. Both Hoebel and Moore correctly point out that the book is not a social history; nor can it be considered ethnohistory.²⁴ But in my opinion, it is not a valueless endeavor. Although Powell's work is particularistic, idiographic and metaphysical, it is a valuable data source from which larger sociological questions can be generated. Powell, for example, noted the deterioration of Council Chief's authority and the emergence of political power by the various military societies' headsmen among the Northern Cheyenne under the impact of American expansionism. Moore noted the same shift of political power from the Council Chiefs to the Military Society headsmen among the Southern Cheyenne for approximately the same time period.²⁵ So what is lacking from Powell's text is not the data, but a processual interpretation of the data.

There is still an implicit "Turnerian thesis" in much of Native

American history. Too often, Indian people are treated as hapless victims or an obstacle to advancing Christian civilization, ignoring the many ways Native American nations shaped our history as active participants.²⁶ Unfortunately, Powell's perspective about Northern Cheyenne history precludes the analysis of a whole range of Northern Cheyenne behavior which "includes a fuller spectrum of Indian opinion and action."²⁷

In sum, the controversy surrounding *People of the Sacred Mountain* points to a larger debate that is just beginning to emerge in Native American historiography. Over the past decade, there has developed a schism in Native American history. On the one hand, there are a number of Native Americanists who insist that history should remain qualitative and humanistically oriented and should concern itself with particular individuals and events. While they hold to the more traditional approach, a number of these scholars are struggling to develop a new paradigm based on the articulation of human existence with Nature within another philosophy of time.²⁸ Their goal is to write Native American history within the framework of Native American concepts of space and time. At the other end of the spectrum, scholars such as Wolf, Dobyns, and for that matter Moore argue that if Native American history is going to be more than a mere literary exercise, it must become a social science.²⁹ As a social science, history concentrates on the analysis of events as processes which can be replicated and compared within a larger temporal-spatial framework.³⁰ Implicit in the epistemology of history of these scholars is the assumption that non-European events can be objectively measured within the European conception of time. It is to Moore's credit that he recognized that *People of the Sacred Mountain* points to this larger developing debate.³¹ Within this context, more substantive questions about our assumptions surrounding the writing of Native American history can be analyzed.

What will result from this exploration of these two modes of historical analyses is a deconstruction of the tribal history as an obsolete paradigm, and the emergence of a Native American history which will "be the delineation of cultures, the location of these in historical time through the study of events which affect and transform structures, and the explanation of the consequences of these transformations. This will not yield a 'scientific' theory of social change, . . . but rather a history of change."³²

ETHICS AND FIELD WORK

The second critical issue is the ethics of field work and the dissemination of information once it has been obtained from the host community. None of the substantive criticisms about this book can compare to the questioning of someone's field ethics.³³ The collection of ethnographic information, that is, oral tradition, the foundation upon which social anthropology traditionally has been based, is replete with ethical nuances which affect both the researcher and the Native American community.³⁴

While Straus hailed *People of the Sacred Mountain* as a culturally sensitive treatment—written for and about the Northern Cheyenne people—Straus did question Powell's decision to include detailed descriptions of two Cheyenne ceremonies conducted on Bear Butte. Straus's concern was directed at the photographs published by Powell of sacred items which Cheyenne women are traditionally forbidden to view.³⁵ At first glance, this comment may seem trivial, but the criticism brings to the forefront the ethical responsibilities associated with collecting ethnographic data and publishing the results.³⁶

An ethical dilemma faced by Father Powell and those of us who have conducted field work involves the dissemination of data beyond the host community where the information is obtained. Most ethnographers who enter a Native American community are eventually incorporated into the community's moral structure. They are invited to participate, to the extent it is possible, in the community's social and religious life. Once that level of acceptance is achieved, the ethnographer is expected to abide by the moral precepts of the host community. This level of social and moral integration demands a degree of ethical responsibility to the living community.

As the researcher participates in the community in which he or she lives and works, the collection of more culturally sensitive data becomes possible. That is, as an incorporated member of the community, the researcher has the opportunity to observe activities which would normally be withheld from observation. Many times the researcher has been so accepted by community members, and finds himself/herself in a position to collect information under a covert role. Community members because of trust or acclimatization, become unaware that the field worker may be never "off duty." For such inside researchers, the use of data

gathered in this manner raises issues of confidentiality, consent, and privacy.³⁷ Thus, access to such data demands an increased ethical responsibility to the host community. The acquisition of culturally sensitive data, however discreetly collected, places the field researcher in a compromised position. At one end of the spectrum, the researcher is ethically bound to the host community's social and moral codes. At the other end, field workers are compelled by various motives to publish the results of their research.

A publication that knowingly uses culturally sensitive material, whether collected under a covert role or gathered with permission of the community members, could potentially cause harm. Such a publication will not only affect the status of the current researcher, but will also engender animosity toward future research endeavors. But more important, the irresponsible decision to publish such information is one of the worst forms of exploitation. Therefore, the publication of all ethnographic data should be as much an ethical decision as conducting field work. The researcher has the responsibility "to reflect on foreseeable repercussions" of their publications.³⁸

Anthropology's development as a science of humankind was intimately bound to the expansion of Europe in what some historians labeled the "Age of Discovery." As Europe incorporated non-western peoples into their colonial spheres of influence, anthropology ironically served the interests of the colonial system. Since then, anthropology has had to struggle with this colonial past and grapple with the ethical dilemma of studying various non-European communities.³⁹ Arising from this introspection, and paralleling the resurgence of self-determination among many colonized communities (including Native Americans), a number of codified ethical guidelines have been proposed. The two most publicized Codes of Ethics are the guidelines set forth by the National Endowment for the Humanities and the professional ethics established by the American Anthropological Association.⁴⁰ The Codes do have inherent weaknesses, but they also facilitate the resolution of misunderstandings surrounding the rights of tribes and tribal members working cooperatively with scholars and outline the responsibilities scholars have to the tribe and its members.⁴¹

As Michael Agar has pointed out, ethical considerations are still emerging and usually generate more "heat" than "light" among

field workers.⁴² But as a general guide, there are at least five precepts that should be utilized by all researchers in an ethnographic setting:

1. Recognition of the rights of people being studied . . .
2. Contribution by field workers to the interests of the community . . . so as to maximize the return to the community for cooperation in field work;
3. Recognition of the continuing obligations to a community after completion of field work . . .
4. Maximum involvement of indigenous scholars, students, and members of the community in research; . . .
5. Recognition of obligations to make a return visit to the host community.⁴³

For anyone conducting research among Native American people, whether an academic or a serious amateur, Indian or non-Indian, ethical considerations must loom large throughout all phases of the research—from research design to publishing the results. Even when researchers are armed with ethical guidelines and have obtained community compliance, circumstances will always arise that necessitate altering previously held ethical precepts. Therefore, researchers must maintain an awareness of the host community's moral standards and of the implications of their research and the ultimate impact upon the host community. In short, researchers must constantly be cognizant of the ramifications of their work. This is not easily accomplished.

There is no touchstone for individuals working in Native American communities. Despite the established codes of ethics, collection and publication of data remain largely a matter of personal choice. As most social scientists realize, sound intentions do not always produce desired results. And since scholarly ethics remain a matter of personal interpretation, views among scholars as to what constitutes ethical intentions and results will also be a matter of personal interpretation. Simply stated, "ethical" and "unethical" field work behavior are not discrete categories:

The issues surrounding the protection of human subjects and research ethics for ethnographers are complicated and still emergent. There are sometimes problems in the discussion of these issues. They occasionally generate more heat than light, and sometimes

seem to reflect a megalomaniacal concept of the ethnographer's impact on the people studied . . . ⁴⁴

Nevertheless, the criticisms leveled against Powell's field procedures and the publication of that information should be addressed, and the above ethical guidelines can serve as a framework for discussion.

ETHICS OF BOOK REVIEWING

The final issue which deserves attention is the ethics of book reviewing. Reviewers carry responsibility of representing a work fairly and fully. To accomplish this task, the reviewer must make " . . . no unfair, irrelevant, personal, or unsupportable criticisms."⁴⁵ Review authors should strive to analyze the work's scope and usefulness and provide an overall opinion of the book. These are the standard scholarly criteria, which most reviewers ideally strive to meet.

If the above criteria are used to evaluate the reviews of *People of the Sacred Mountain*, the reviews by Hoebel and Straus fall within standard review parameters. Their comments and criticisms are tenable and address substantive issues. By sharp contrast, Moore has transcended the boundaries of what most scholars would consider an acceptable review by making personal allegations about Powell's relations with the Cheyennes and his reason for writing the book.⁴⁶ Specifically, Moore charges that Father Powell wrote this book and his previous work, *Sweet Medicine*, for no other reason than to satiate a curious audience longing to learn so-called Native American religious "secrets." Such books, Moore contends, fall into the category of "Big Indian Books," which only serve to accumulate profits for the author and the publisher. He argues that the book had to be placed into this larger, yet more personal, context in order to evaluate properly the book's scope and intent.⁴⁷

Certainly this point deserves serious consideration, and the burden of explaining the motivations behind the publication of this work or any other book should be left to the author. My concern here is whether Moore's review is in some way prejudiced. We must question whether Moore had some other motivation for

making these allegations. Moore admits that on at least two occasions while conducting field work (ethnographic research among the Southern Cheyennes of Oklahoma and the Northern Cheyennes of Montana), he encountered hostility purportedly engendered by Father Powell.⁴⁸ Therefore, it is probably safe to assume that a degree of personal antipathy colors Moore's review. Although Moore may have used the review to "settle a score," I assume that he has said nothing he cannot stand by if challenged. On a more productive note, if several scholars such as Moore and Powell work among the same people:

. . . the differences in their biases will generate contradictions in their reports. Contradictions, rather than being viewed as threatening, should be seen as the beginning of a better question, a significant pointing to a more sensitive understanding. Too many potentially rich contradictions get lost in the politeness of academic rhetoric.⁴⁹

The appearance of multiple reviews of *People of the Sacred Mountain* is testimony to the controversial nature of these reviews and the work. The reader derives a good sense not only of the book's content, but also of the reviewer's theoretical and personal relationship to the author. Controversial book reviews are sometimes warranted, as long as they do not sacrifice responsibility to the author(s) and readers. I believe reviewers should step beyond the acceptable normative standards of reviewing a book, especially if by doing so, they make the book's relevance to the field more comprehensible. It is the reviewer's duty to do so for the potential reading audience, colleagues, and most importantly, the Native American community which the book is written about.

While many of the personal and ethical criticisms leveled against Father Powell and *People of the Sacred Mountain* can be addressed only by Powell himself, the rebuttal, if any is forthcoming, should be formulated around the larger issues raised in this commentary. A personal diatribe between Powell and Moore would be a disservice to Native American scholarship and future relations between Native Americans and researchers. Issues about the nature of Native American history and ethics surrounding the collection and publication of data are too important to be ignored. In the final analysis, if we are to understand the complexity and dynamic nature of Native American societies, such

questions must be posed and answered, however painful it may be for those of us who are called upon to address these important issues.

NOTES

1. Michael Agar, *The Professional Stranger: An Informal Introduction to Ethnography* (New York: Academic Press, 1980), 187.

2. E. Adamson Hoebel, "People of the Sacred Mountain: A History of the Northern Cheyenne Chiefs and Warrior Societies, 1830-1879; With an Epilogue, 1964-1974," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 7(1983):107; John H. Moore, "People of the Sacred Mountain: A History of the Northern Cheyenne Chiefs and Warrior Societies, 1830-1879; With an Epilogue, 1964-1974," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 7(1983):117.

3. For a discussion of the goals and methods of ethnohistory see John W. Adams, "Consensus, Community, and Exoticism," *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* XII(1981):253-266; David A. Baeris, "The Ethnographic Approach and Archaeology," *Ethnohistory* 8(1961):49-77; Robert Carmack, "Ethnohistory: A Review of its Development, Definitions, Methods, and Aims," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 3(1972): 227-246; Bernard S. Cohn, "History and Anthropology: The State of Play," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* XXII(1980):198-221; "Toward a Rapprochement," *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* XII(1981):227-252; Natalie Z. Davis, "The Possibilities of the Past," *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* XII(1981):267-276; Richard M. Dorson, "Ethnohistory and Ethnic Folklore," *Ethnohistory* 8(1961):12-30; William Fenton, "Ethnohistory and its Problems," *Ethnohistory* 9(1962):1-23; "Field Work, Museum Studies, and Ethnohistorical Research," *Ethnohistory* 13 (1966):71-85; "Huronian: An Essay in Proper Ethnohistory," *American Anthropologist* 80(1978):923-935; Carlo Ginzburg, "Anthropology and History in the 1980s: A Comment," *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* XII(1981):277-278; Francis Jennings, "Anthropological Foundations for American Indian History," *Reviews in American History* 7(1979): 486-493; "A Growing Partnership: Historians, Anthropologists and American Indian History," *Ethnohistory* 29(1982):21-34; Nancy O. Lurie, "Ethnohistory: A Ethnological Point of View," *Ethnohistory* 8(1961):78-92; James C. Olson, "Some Reflections on the Historical Method and Indian History," *Ethnohistory* 5(1958):49-59; Karl H. Scherwin, "The Future of Ethnohistory," *Ethnohistory* 23(1976):323-341; William C. Sturtevant, "Anthropology, History, and Ethnohistory," *Ethnohistory* 13(1966):1-51; Bruce G. Trigger, "Ethnohistory: Problems and Prospects," *Ethnohistory* 29 (1982):1-19; Charles A. Valentine, "Symposium on the Concept of Ethnohistory—Comment," *Ethnohistory* 8(1961):271-279; and Wilcomb Washburn, "Ethnohistory: History 'In the Round,'" *Ethnohistory* (1961):31-48.

4. Fredrica de Laguna, *The Story of a Tlingit Community: A Problem in the Relationships Between Archaeological, Ethnological and Historical Methods*, Bulletin 172, Bureau of American Ethnology (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960).

5. Valentine, "Symposium on the Concept of Ethnohistory," 275.

6. Robert F. Berkhofer Jr., "Cultural Pluralism Versus Ethnocentrism in the New Indian History," in *The American Indian and the Problem of History*, ed. Calvin Martin (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 36.

7. *Ibid.*, 36.

8. Father Peter J. Powell, *The Cheyennes, Ma?heo?o's People: A Critical Bibliography* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980), vii-viii.

9. Father Peter J. Powell, *People of the Sacred Mountain: A History of the Northern Cheyenne Chief and Warrior Societies, 1830-1879; With an Epilogue 1964-1974*, volume 1 (New York: Harper and Row, 1981), xix.

10. Hoebel, "People of the Sacred Mountain," 108-113; Moore, "People of the Sacred Mountain," 122.

11. Father Peter J. Powell, *Sweet Medicine: The Continuing Role of the Sacred Arrows, the Sun Dance, and Sacred Buffalo Hat in Northern Cheyenne History*, volume 1 (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969), xiii-xxiv.

12. *Ibid.*, xxv.

13. David H. Fischer, *Historians' Fallacies; Toward a Logic of Historical Thought* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), 224-230.

14. See Gregory R. Campbell, "Northern Cheyenne Ethnicity, Religion, and Coal Energy Development," *Plains Anthropologist* 32(1987):378-388; Henrietta Whiteman, "White Buffalo Woman," in *The American Indian and the Problem of History*, ed. Calvin Martin (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 169.

15. Powell, *Sweet Medicine . . . ; The Cheyennes, Ma?heo?o's People . . .* xxi; "The Sacred Way," in *The Great Sioux Nation: Sitting in Judgement on America*, ed. Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz (New York: The American Treaty Council Information Center, 1977), 62-66; *People of the Sacred Mountain . . .*

16. Thomas J. Turpin, *The Cheyenne World View as Reflected in the Stories of Their Culture Heroes, Erect Horns and Sweet Medicine* (Unpublished Ph.D. Diss., University of Southern California), 137-141.

17. Father Peter J. Powell, *Sweet Medicine . . . ; "The Sacred Way,"* 62-66; *The Cheyennes, Ma?heo?o's People . . . ; People of the Sacred Mountain . . .*

18. Hoebel, "People of the Sacred Mountain," 106. Moore, "People of the Sacred Mountain," 116.

19. *Ibid.*, 116.

20. Wallace Stagner, "On the Writing of History," *The American West* II(1965):6-13; "History, Myth and the Western Writer," *The American West* IV(1967):61-62, 76-79.

21. George Bird Grinnell, *The Fighting Cheyennes* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1956); George Hyde, *Life of George Bent: Written from His Letters* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1968); Margot Liberty and John Stands in Timber, *Cheyenne Memories* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1972).

22. Father Peter John Powell, *People of the Sacred Mountain . . .*

23. Stagner, "On the Writing of History," 7-10.

24. Hoebel, "People of the Sacred Mountain," 106; Moore, "People of the Sacred Mountain," 116.

25. John H. Moore, "Cheyenne Political History, 1820-1894," *Ethnohistory* 21(1974):329-359.

26. Many concepts which are utilized by anthropologists and historians in their analyses conceal the dynamics of Native American life. One such concept has been the notion of the tribe, which has tended to treat the social complexity

of change among Native Americans, especially in colonial situations, as an integrated, functioning unit. The focus on the tribe as an integrated body ignores the internal struggle over change and resistance. For a discussion of conceptual problems in Native American history see: Rober F. Berkhofer, "The Political Context of a New Indian History," *Pacific Historical Review* XL(1971):357-382; James Clifton, "The Tribal History: An Obsolete Paradigm," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 3(1979):81-100; Calvin Martin (ed.), *The American Indian and the Problem of History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); Alfonso Ortiz, "Some Concerns Central to the Writing of Indian History," *The Indian Historian* X(1977): 17-22.

27. Berkhofer, "The Political Context of a New Indian History," 282.

28. Calvin Martin, "Epilogue, Time and the American Indian," in *The American Indian and the Problem of History*, ed. Calvin Martin (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 192-220.

29. Henry Dobyns, "Demographics of Native American History," in *The American and the Problem of History*, ed. Calvin Martin (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 67-74; John Moore, "Evolution and Historical Reductionism," *Plains Anthropologist* 26(1981):261-269; Eric Wolf, *Europe and the People Without History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982).

30. The contrasting perspectives of these two modes of historical inquiry are succinctly outlined by Robert W. Fogel and G. R. Elton, *Which Road to the Past? Two Views of History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983). On the potential use and limitations of these two historical methodological approaches see: Samuel P. Hays, "Scientific versus Traditional History: The Limitations of the Current Debate," *Historical Methods*, 17(1984):75-78; Eric H. Monkkonen, "The Challenge of Quantitative History," *Historical Methods*, 17(1984):86-94.

31. Moore, "People of the Sacred Mountain," 118; See also Fredrick E. Hoxie (ed.), *Towards A Quantitative Approach To American Indian History*, Occasional Papers Series, no. 8 (Chicago: The Newberry Library, 1987) and Calvin Martin (ed.), *The American Indian and the Problem of History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987) for examples of the two major methodological and theoretical directions that are emerging in Native American history.

32. Cohn, "Toward a Rapprochement," 252.

33. Moore, "People of the Sacred Mountain," 114-115.

34. See James P. Spradley, *The Ethnographic Interview* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979); *Participant Observation* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980); Oswald Werner and G. Mark Schoepfle, *Systematic Fieldwork*, 2 vols. (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1987) for a comprehensive analysis of the methodology and theory in conducting ethnographic fieldwork.

35. Terry Straus, "People of the Sacred Mountain: A History of the Northern Cheyenne Chiefs and Warrior Societies, 1830-1879; With an Epilogue, 1964-1974," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 7(1983):126.

36. For a brief review of the ethical considerations in conducting field work see Joan Cassell, "Risk and Benefit to Subjects of Fieldwork," *The American Sociologist*, 13 (1978):134-143; "Ethical Principles for Conducting Fieldwork," *American Anthropologist* 82(1980):28-41; Murray L. Wax and Joan Cassell, "Fieldwork, Ethics, and Politics: The Wider Context," in *Federal Regulations: Ethical Issues and Social Research*, eds. Murray L. Wax and Joan Cassell, (Boulder: Westview Press, 1979), 85-102.

37. Ann V. Akeroyd, "Ethics in relation to informants, the profession and

governments" in *Ethnographic Research: A Guide to General Conduct*, ed. R. F. Ellen (London: Academic Press, 1984), 145.

38. American Anthropological Association, *Professional Ethics: Statements and Procedures of the American Anthropological Association* (Washington D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1983), 1.

39. Talad Asad (ed.), *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter* (London: Ithaca Press, 1973).

40. American Anthropological Association, *Professional Ethics,; National Endowment for the Humanities, Code of Ethics*, (Washington D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1980).

41. William Oandasan, "Critique of NEH Code of Ethics," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 5(1981):42.

42. Agar, *The Professional Stranger*, 187.

43. Akeroyod, "Ethics in relation to informants, the profession and governments," 137.

44. Agar, *The Professional Stranger*, 187.

45. Richard B. Woodbury, "On Book Reviewing," *American Anthropologist*, 79(1977):551-554.

46. Moore, "People of the Sacred Mountain," 114.

47. Ibid, 113.

48. Ibid, 114-115.

49. Agar, *The Professional Stranger*, 49.