PART I: PAPERS PRESENTED

NATIVE AMERICAN STUDIES: ACADEMIC CONCERNS AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Clara Sue Kidwell

The appearance of Native American or American Indian Studies programs in colleges and universities is a relatively recent phenomenon. The rapid rise in the number of Native American college students since 1968 has been accompanied by a proliferation of special programs, ranging from one or two course offerings to full-fledged academic departments aimed at teaching about Native American history, culture, and current affairs. In 1968, statistics compiled by the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, showed a total of 14,361 students enrolled in institutions of higher education who identified themselves as American Indians. By 1974 this number had risen to 32,757. During the same period, the total number of scholarship recipients through the Bureau of Indian Affairs had increased from 2,660 (FY 1968) to 13,895 (FY 1974).[1] The statistics from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare must be viewed with some caution since they depend upon self-identification rather than objectively defined criteria. The increase between 1968 and 1974, however, is remarkable, even on the basis of self-identification.

In 1974 Patricia Locke conducted a survey of college and university programs for American Indians for the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. One Hundred institutions responded to a questionnaire about American Indian programs. Of those institutions, seventy-six offered Indian-related courses on their campuses, and eighty-three programs of special interest to Indians were identified (several colleges had more than one program identified as Indian related).[2] A current survey is under way but not yet completed. According to Patricia Locke, however, eighty-two responses have been received (questionnaires were mailed to 170 institutions) reporting Indian-related programs.[3]

If the trend in enrollments continues, there will certainly be sufficient numbers of Native American students in colleges and universities to justify a continued interest in the future development of currently existing Native American or American Indian Studies programs and perhaps implementation of new programs.

Native American Studies at the University of California at Berkeley has been in existence since 1969. Under pressure from students who went on strike against the University and barricaded the campus during the spring of 1969, the Academic Senate of the University passed a resolution in April of 1969 calling for the establishment of an Ethnic Studies Department. The strike arose originally from a demonstration spearheaded by Black students who felt that the University was not responding to their requests for Black studies courses. Native Americans, Asians, and Chicanos joined the protest movement, and the student strike was supported by a large number of students on campus who refused to cross picket lines to attend classes.

The Ethnic Studies Department that was finally established comprised the Afro-American Studies program, the Chicano Studies program, the Asian American Studies program, and the Native American Studies program. Budget allocations of sixteen full-time equivalent faculty positions were made for the program, and a chairman was appointed. However, the subsequent history of the Ethnic Studies Department at the University has been largely one of lack of direction from the University administration and internal instability. None of the original faculty are still with the program, and only within the last year have significant numbers of the courses offered in the programs gained permanent approval by the University's Committee on Courses. The programs have struggled for the past eight years to develop curricula to meet the needs of minority communities for research directed toward the solution of social problems, the needs of minority students for special courses within the University, and the demands of the University itself for programs of academic excellence.

Most new programs in any university grow out of the joint activities of groups of people who are already members of the faculty. Those persons create new programs generally within

the context of cooperative efforts among various departments and within the context of the academic policies and procedures of the institution. The Ethnic Studies Department at Berkeley grew out of forces from outside the University (the rising consciousness of minority groups in the country generally) and student confrontation with the University administration. And the University administration seems to have remained fearful of confrontation and suspicious of the academic legitimacy of the Department. In the beginning of the Department, the chairman was a black doctoral student in sociology who was unable to devote full-time effort to the program. Although faculty advisory councils were set up for each of the programs in the Department, those councils do not seem to have been especially active or concerned about the responsibility that was being thrust upon them. Although there were several minority group members on those councils, none of them offered classes in the new programs. In the search for persons to staff the programs, no major scholars were attracted to the campus, and the majority of the staff hired were people without advanced degrees who taught on a part-time basis. The coordinators of the programs were classified as educational specialists, rather than having full faculty status, and thus there was no representation of the programs in the Academic Senate of the University.

At the present time Native American Studies enjoys a much-improved status from the time of its beginnings. It now has a faculty of four full-time ladder-rank faculty (three assistant professors and one associate professor), two full-time lecturers, and three part-time lecturers. Its budget for 1976–77 was approximately $275,000, of which approximately 60 percent is permanent University allocation and 40 percent is from a special University fund allocated on a year-by-year basis. It has a counseling unit with a full-time counselor and full-time recruiter, and a library. Its degree plan is based on permanently approved courses, and its enrollments average approximately 300 students per quarter in the twelve to fifteen courses offered each quarter.

Not all Native American Studies or American Indian Studies programs in the country have grown out of the kind of confrontation that led to the establishment of Native American Studies at Berkeley.[4] In some ways the status of the program at Berkeley is uniquely dependent upon its past history and its position within a very academically prestigious and very academically conservative institution. In some ways it is similar to other Native American or American Indian Studies programs throughout the country whose aims and purposes are directly related to Indian students and Indian communities.

The nature of Native American Studies as an academic discipline is of serious concern for the future of programs that currently exist in major academic institutions. Academic programs usually grow within the confines of an institution from the interests and concerns of persons who are already faculty members in those institutions and who are also trained in some well-established academic discipline. Indeed, one model of a Native American Studies program is to have Native American faculty members who can qualify for appointment as members of established departments hired to teach both in the established department and to teach special courses in Indian history or anthropology of Native Americans or Indian literature and so on.[5] If it stands as a separate program or department with its own fully committed faculty or if it draws on the resources of faculty housed in several departments, the program still generally draws on the expertise of people who have been trained in various established disciplines, usually history or anthropology. But the rhetoric of Indian students and community leaders who have requested or demanded the establishment of programs has often stressed that the past research that has been done and the approaches of the established disciplines have been irrevocably biased.

Anthropologists have cast Indians as "primitive" peoples and studied them like bugs on pins. Historians have stressed the negative aspects of Indian culture, and in history books the Native American has been reduced to the level of a natural obstacle standing, along with raging rivers, primeval forests, and impassable mountains, as a barrier to the westward march of American civilization. The vanishing American conveniently vanishes from history books after 1890. Sociologists, psychologists, and anthropologists have written volumes about the Indian drinking problem in modern America, but little has been done to alleviate the poverty, racism, and social breakdown in Indian communities that have contributed to that problem.

If academic disciplines have worked from their own preconceptions of Native Americans,

can those disciplines have relevance for Native American students and communities today? Perhaps what is needed is the development of a new discipline that will address itself to the study of Indian communities and cultures. The danger in such a proposal, insofar as the traditional academic community is concerned, is that such a discipline, critical as it is of past perceptions and portrayals of Indian people, will take an advocacy position, will lose its academic objectivity, and will thus fail in its search for the pure and objective "truth" to which the academic world dedicates itself. A program that begins from a highly political stance (as Native American Studies at Berkeley did) is highly suspect in the eyes of the academic community.

In order to survive within a university setting, Native American studies programs must establish a sense of academic legitimacy within the University setting. To do this, programs can work to establish a new discipline whose body of subject matter is the Native American community in both its historical past and its present status in American society. The discipline must take a holistic view of that subject. For example, it is impossible to divorce a concern for contemporary social problems of poverty, inadequate education, or inadequate health care from the historical reality of Indian-Anglo contact. An understanding of the historical past is necessary as part of the framework of analysis of contemporary Indian life. At the same time, the present reality of Indian community life must be defined in relationship to the continuity of identity from historical past to the present and also to the changes in identity that have taken place through assimilation and acculturation of native communities to the dominant society.

In the same way that traditional Indian cultures are holistic in their world views, a discipline of Native American Studies must seek to evolve a holistic manner of studying Native American culture in both its past and present contexts. There is certainly precedent even within the recognized academic disciplines for the development of cross-disciplinary methodologies. Ethnographic sociology emerged at the University of Chicago in the 1930s. Urban anthropology verges toward sociology; psychohistory seeks to bridge the gap between historical action and personal motives. Ethnohistorians must master anthropological and historical methodology, and ethnoscience, ethnobotany, ethnozoology, and ethnoentomology can be found in anthropological journals.

The question must be considered whether Indian Studies programs are indeed multidisciplinary, bringing methods from many disciplines to bear on one body of subject matter, or whether Native American Studies is creating a new discipline, developing a new method, and a new conceptual framework to apply to an analysis of Native American culture, history, and contemporary concerns. If one cannot truly separate the impact of the historical past from contemporary social problems, can one then separate purely historical methods of study from pure analysis of contemporary social phenomena?

The field of ethnohistory has developed largely as a result of testimony before the Indian Claims Commission concerning the aboriginal rights of Indian tribes to certain territories. Evidence must be drawn from archaeology, ethnography, and history to determine aboriginal tribal boundaries. The statement of an anthropologist that the culture of the Puyallup tribe of Washington was dead was used by a county judge in Tacoma to rule that the Puyallups had no claim to fishing rights. That statement ignored the reality of tribally oriented social gatherings and ways of fishing that marked a strong sense of Puyallup (and other) tribal identity.[6] Perhaps an ethnohistorian would have been more perceptive of a tribal culture.

Within the academic community, evidence of oral traditions (folklore) explains the association of tribal peoples with certain land areas, and archaeology provides physical evidence for those associations as well. Present Native American life styles on those land areas (anthropology or sociology, depending upon whether the researcher defines his or her population as "primitive" or not) are influenced by contemporary conditions of the labor market and the availability of natural resources (economics, forestry, conservation of natural resources.

It will be impossible for single individuals to develop this multifaceted training and knowledge to apply a Native American methodology. The model that can develop is to have individuals with expertise in various specialized fields working closely together, perhaps even team teaching in a single class, to give a comprehensive view of the interrelationship of all the elements that have made up the Native American past and constitute the present. Degree programs can be structured to build a sequence of courses that combine historical analysis and contemporary anthropological and sociological

methods to unique Native American problems. Disciplines must be redefined. It is impossible to convey a sense of what history means in a true Indian sense unless one studies that discipline that the university defines as folklore. The oral traditions of tribal groups are the true repository of a sense of the historical past, and they constitute as important a source for tribal history (in a newly defined sense of history) as any written records that may have been kept by outsiders.

Native American Studies programs have often justified their existence in the university by stating that they offer a unique Native American perspective that is not available in the traditional disciplines (history, anthropology) that have studied Indians. That claim to a unique perspective has sometimes led to those charges of "lack of objectivity" that have undermined the academic standing of the programs. A member of an Academic Senate committee at Berkeley charged the Native American Studies program with "tendentiousness" for using the term "Native American Cultural Integrity" in defining an area of emphasis in the curriculum. Since Native American Studies programs generally grew out of movements involving student activism and demands for relevance in education and demands that the university commit itself to social change, a basic commitment of those programs remains to attempt, through education and research, to effect some social change in the lives of Native American people. The problem becomes how to combine a position that does advocate change in Native American life and living conditions with one that is consistent with the University's search for truth.

It is possible for Native American Studies programs to have an impact on community life, but it is highly unlikely that that change will come directly from the activities of Native American scholars directly confronting the power structure of the federal government. It will come rather through research conducted within a theoretical framework that attempts to place Native American communities within the overall context of American society and to determine how the structures and values of contemporary Native American communities are affected by the larger American society within which those communities exist. Many Indian people, directly involved with Indian groups, testifying before government committees about the terrible conditions of social breakdown and poverty on their reservations or in their urban communities, are concerned with immediate goals and money to solve immediate problems. But understanding of the root causes of those problems depends upon a knowledge of the interrelationship between those communities and the larger society. The formulation of theoretical concepts must be part of the emerging discipline of Native American Studies. In the area of economics and political theory some of these formulations have been made for Indian communities. Joseph Jorgensen's work with the Southern Utes postulates that Indian people have not been excluded from participation in the institutions of American life so much as they have been institutionalized at the lowest levels of American life and never allowed to rise above those levels.[7] Robert Thomas has used the model of colonialism and has referred to Indian reservations as internal colonies.[8] Such theoretical models become part of a methodology by which relationships between the United State government and Indian tribes can be examined.

During the spring of 1975, Sam Deloria, in a lecture at the University of California at Berkeley, suggested that the American Indian Policy Review Commission offered important opportunities for research on Indian history and contemporary social conditions. The Commission established a series of ten fact-finding task forces in areas such as law, education, federal-tribal relationships, and health. Each task force had a budget, and Deloria suggested that the task forces should commission major historical and social research papers. He compared the importance of this commission to that of the Meriam commission whose report in 1928 for the Institute of Government Research (under contract to the Department of the Interior) laid the basis for major policy changes within the Department and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The American Indian Policy Review Commission has attempted to conduct the first comprehensive survey of Indian affairs and Indian policy since 1928. It has attempted to do so within a two-year time limit and with a $2 million budget—resources inadequate to carry out its charge—and the opportunity to use the Commission as a basis for research has not been realized.[9] The raw data from the hearings and reports that the Commission has held and prepared can ,however, be a tremendous source of information for the development of models of government-tribal relations on which future policy directions could be based.

Native American Studies programs can offer

service to Native American communities by providing analyses of social problems within theoretical frameworks that relate those problems to larger issues within American society. The development of those frameworks and the emphasis on relationships with the larger society can do much to counter the charges of lack of objectivity or tendentiousness that programs have faced in the past. The question of Native American tribal sovereignty, for instance, cannot be raised without consideration of the historical background of tribal sovereignty, the nature of the treaty relationships that exist between Indian tribes and the federal government, and, finally, the implications of sovereignty for Indian control of resources and economic development on reservations. One must also consider the social implications of a policy that seems to many non-Indians to give Indians special rights and privileges above and beyond those of other Americans. There seems to be a growing white backlash of citizens groups—especially in Western states—that have organized to oppose special Indian hunting, fishing, and political rights in reservation areas. The future will bring the need to defend, not only in the law courts but in the Congress of the United States, which has passed the laws upon which special Indian status largely rests, those rights that have been won with such hard struggles and even the lives of Indian people. The capacity of Native American Studies programs to provide knowledge, expertise, and methods to formulate immediate, pragmatic needs of Native American Communities into long-range policy issues can be of great importance in the future development of those communities in the United States.

The capacity of Native American Studies programs to serve communities through research has not yet been tested. None of the programs have developed the kind of professionally oriented graduate training programs that would allow Indian people to come to the university to gain the professional expertise to apply to community projects. It is primarily by training at the graduate, professional level that Native American Studies programs can best offer service to Indian people and Indian communities. Existing Indian-oriented graduate programs, such as those in law, educational administration, or public health, take place within the confines of already existing graduate institutions whose curricula often do not have the flexibility to offer any significant courses specifically on Native American concerns. Such programs often serve primarily as sources of recruitment, financial aid, and supportive services. Native American faculty, teaching as they do exclusively or primarily undergraduate courses, do not have the time or the incentive to attempt to carry out research. And so a great deal of the potential of the programs is unrealized. It is entirely possible that Native American Studies programs could serve as contractors to do research studies among Indian people for federal agencies such as the Department of Health, Education and Welfare or Housing and Urban Development or even the Bureau of Indian Affairs. If those programs had graduate students, some of that research could be done in connection with master's theses under faculty supervision. There are significant possibilities for important and productive relationships among Native American Studies programs, tribal groups, and government agencies that can be developed. Native American Studies programs can contract with tribes to carry out the research studies necessary to lay the basis for economic development on reservations or to develop presentations to government agencies or private foundations for funding. The relationships can best develop where the program can offer service to the community, and the program can best offer service through a strong commitment to research and training carried out at the graduate level.

Native American Studies programs must maintain a careful balance between the purely academic concerns of the University and the purely pragmatic concerns of the community. In the academic realm most universities do not define their role as one of effecting social change and they look askance on programs that demand radical social change. In a pragmatic sense Native American Studies programs have arisen out of deep concerns by students and communities over the past injustices that have been done to Indian people and the present social conditions that have resulted, and the programs must look to the solution of social problems as a matter of importance. The formulation of solutions must, however, be firmly grounded in the scholarship which the university fosters. Only then will Native American Studies programs be able to continue their existence within the university context.

NOTES

1. Statistics are taken from "Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education, Fall, 1974" (Data Management Center, Computer Operations Division, Department of

Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1976); and *Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1972* (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, OCR-74-13); and from United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Indian Education Programs, *Fiscal Year 1974 Statistics Concerning Indian Education* (Lawrence, Kansas: Haskell Indian Junior College, Publications Service, 1974).

2. Patricia Locke, *A Survey of College and University Programs for American Indians* (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1974), pp. 169–75.
3. Personal telephone conversation with Patricia Locke, January 17, 1977.
4. See Frank C. Miller, "Involvement in an Urban University," in Jack O. Waddell and O. Michael Watson, eds., *The American Indian in Urban Society* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971) pp. 312–40, for a discussion of the development of the American Indian Studies Department at the University of Minnesota.
5. Wilcomb Washburn cites this model, as used at UCLA, as a more workable model of a program than the departmental model. See Wilcomb Washburn, "American Indian Studies: A Status Report," *American Quarterly 27*, no. 3 (August 1975):266.
6. *Uncommon Controversy: Fishing Rights of the Muckleshoot, Puyallup, and Nisqually Indians,* report prepared for the American Friends Service Committee (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1970), pp. 69–70.
7. Joseph G. Jorgensen, "Indians and the Metropolis," in Jack O. Waddell and O. Michael Watson, eds. *The American Indian in Urban Society* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971) pp. 63–113.
8. Robert K. Thomas, "Powerless Politics," *New University Thought,* 4, no. 4 (Winter 1966/67):44–53.
9. Sam Deloria, "Native American Research and Bibliography," speech delivered at University of California, Berkeley for Graduate School of Librarianship, Native American Studies program, and Graduate Minority Program, June 2, 1975.