UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
Discrimination and Indigenous Identity in Chicago's Native Community

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1rb2x117

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 22(4)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Fenelon, James V.

Publication Date
1998-09-01

DOI
10.17953

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

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

AMERICAN INDIAN CULTURE AND RESEARCH JOURNAL 22:4 (1998) 273-303

Discrimination and Indigenous Identity in Chicago's Native Community

JAMES V. FENELON

INTRODUCTION

Off-reservation and urban Native Americans[1] experience complex, sociopolitical identity problems, especially within the framework of minority ethnic groups.[2] These identity problems stem from racial discrimination; indigenous identity issues; tribal or reservation cultural affiliation; organizational involvement; extreme minority representation; and a general lack of economic, educational, or political support systems.[3] Nearly all such problems and social conflicts are historically based, either present in actual governmental policies or in the perceptions of tribal members living in urban areas. This study finds that in the Chicago metropolitan area, these are further linked to social problems experienced by the other racial minority groups living in the area, exacerbating "minority of minorities" interactional fields with little demographic presence or political power.

Chicago is an excellent location to study these complex, overlaid problems, which include identity construction and

James V. Fenelon, an enrolled member of the Standing Rock (Sioux) Nation, joined the sociology faculty at John Carroll University after receiving his Ph.D. from Northwestern University. His book, *Culturicide, Resistance and Survival of the Lakota Sioux Nation*, was published by Garland (New York) this year.

structural discrimination.[4] Although the city is proximal to many Native nations and Indian lands in other states, Illinois does not have federally recognized Indian tribes or reservations. Chicago was a major relocation program city, amplifying the Native American population, traffic, and intertribal networks, even as support systems have waxed and waned over the years. Still, the city has hosted at least two nationally important conferences, with many programs run through local colleges, universities, and social service agencies, that have served as political fulcrums. In tandem with an ongoing reservation-to-city movement and cross-reservation mobility, Chicago has maintained a rich and diverse Native American population.

Previous studies have underscored the complexity of tribal and urban issues in Chicago, just as works sponsored by the Native American Educational Services of Chicago have established much of the historical linkage, in addition to singular research with a narrow disciplinary focus.[5] Contemporary scholarship also has added to that work, including Nagel's "ethnic renewal" and Cornell's "political resurgence" or the National Research Council's "demography and public health," showing the interrelationships among ethnic identity, changing political circumstances, poverty, discrimination, demographics, and health issues.[6]

This study proposes to bring all of these analytical approaches to bear on the Chicago case, through methodology mixed with qualitative techniques that include interviewing, some surveys, and participant observation. Interviews, the primary source, were conducted to focus on perceptions of Indian people themselves, to reduce distortions that allegedly arose from earlier studies relating to a preoccupation with stereotypical shamanism and victimized minorities commonly associated with American Indian peoples and cultures,[7] whether in urban or reservation settings. A focus on Native American organizations in Chicago, especially on one representative economic development group,[8] establishes the interconnected strands of urban life that include discrimination and development described more fully in the community profile description in this paper.

The guided interviews and participant observation with local Native Americans and their organizations use four basic sociological, or ethnographic, questions: (1) Who are urban Indians? (2) What issues and struggles do Native Americans face in urban Chicago? (3) What community resolution systems

exist within social change networks? and (4) How are discrimination and social movements collectively defined in Native American organizations and by individual members?

Methodology

The above questions require qualitative exploration buttressed by survey data and other forms of evidence collected from individuals, organizations, and other collectivities associated with American Indian life in Chicago. Therefore, in terms of the ethnographic data collection and survey-oriented descriptions of important issues and organizations, the rest of this paper will focus on three major sections: (1) Indian interviews on identity and discrimination; (2) Native American community profiles, including organizations; and (3) issues and social change in relation to individual and group identities. Thus, we can build on qualitative cases to demonstrate the ethnographic and social conflict effects of these issues on identity and discrimination.[9]

Earlier works considering the American Indian population issues of the Chicago area[10] generally fail to identify the pressures from cultural domination and minority group oppression, and their effects on the formation of indigenous identities and internalized conflicts. Therefore, this work employs self-identification from Native peoples. Applied and critical works that focus on urban issues from indigenous perspectives[11] often overgeneralize because of their vested interests in representing groups. This multidimensionality of urban Indians creates more complex identification, with opposing sociopolitical positions: (1) whether they are recognized members of an American Indian tribe/nation, inclusive of enrollment issues and federal policy, or whether they identify as urban minority groups; and (2) to what extent they have cultural involvement or knowledge, as American Indian, pan-ethnic Indian, or Indian Nation (i.e., Lakota) terms suggest.

Some urban Indians are either uninformed about their cultural heritage, or feel distant from those social underpinnings. In considering some ecological variables of the 1990 census, Liebler[12] finds that of those not reporting a tribe, the large majority are from metropolitan areas, residing in "non-Indian states" including Chicago, Illinois. After controlling for the small effect from non-American Indians reporting, Liebler

found that on a household level the great majority of those not reporting a tribe reside among other American Indians also not naming a tribe. Therefore, this study requires extensive knowledge of the Native American social demographics, and indigenous identity claims, of American Indians in the Chicago study.

The author has had extensive connections and involvement with the Native American community in Chicago. The research basis for conducting ethnographic interviews in cities, reaching from Whyte's extension of "streetcorner society" to Ogbu's "oppositional consciousness" among racial minorities, is supported through data collection among the group membership,[13] often engaged in Scott's "resistance ideologies." Wax calls these researchers "crypto-insiders," which, combined with a need for knowledge of tribal/cultural diversity of urban American Indians, becomes an asset to research and analysis.[14] The qualitative research interviews were selected, or framed, to obtain a divergent cross-section of the community, including age, tribal background, gender, community roles, cultural knowledge, activity, and sociopolitical orientation. Forty interviews were collected, with sixteen used to project a population triad of four to six in each of three areas: Native leader, Indian community person, and non-Native administrator. These Native American respondents reflect the cultural breadth of traditional orientation, local experience, organizational experience, education, and urban tribal diversity that will support the analysis in this paper.

Before proceeding with a discussion of the interviews, we need a basic understanding of the Chicago Native American community as urban Indians and of the issues connected to their ethnicity, social problems, and organizations as further developed in the community profile section.

The Native American population in Chicago is estimated to be around ten thousand (1990 census), with another three to five thousand in surrounding communities. This means that American Indians are a "minority among minorities" in Chicago, a fact well represented in the absence of political presence in city issues, economic structures, or elections.[15] Also complicating the picture are three structural factors unique to Native Americans: tribal background and degree of Indian blood by quantum, along with enrollment and educational programs linked to income and jobs. Any of these factors acting in conjunction with the issues below and local politics can be divisive both in terms of collective action and in attempts to

describe the community. A listing of issues compiled by Indian organizations and leaders demonstrates these complexities, again with some unique elements as well as those common to impoverished racial urban groups: health, housing, employment, education (language, culture, and history), seniors/elders, social services, political issues (social and resource mobilization), youth, cultural/spiritual issues, and drugs/alcohol.[16]

The American Indian Economic Development Association (AIEDA), as one organization identifying the issues, had ancillary functions to conduct an outreach survey to determine issue priorities of Native Americans. The author contributed to the development and collection of the survey instrument,[17] and the larger survey of 124 respondents was collected, with relevant findings reported to community organizations, funders, and the local government. The later survey specifically addressed questions and experiences of discrimination as perceived by the Native American respondents, demonstrating the need for further research.[18]

The combined surveys, one from a powwow and another collected from organizations and service groups, share a "prioritizing of issues" category, demonstrating a meaningful source for critique of the qualitative interviews and strong linkage between the three sources of data.

Interviews and Indian Identities

The qualitative portion of the study includes sixteen interviews culled from more than forty, with the interviewees coming from three groups: (1) Native Americans in leadership or professional roles; (2) American Indians strongly identified with the Chicago Indian community of the Uptown area and the Indian Center, and (3) non-Indians working closely with the Native American community.[19] The approach was developed as a form of Lightfoot's ethnographic portraiture and triangulation developed for researching culture with qualitative methods.[20] The triangulated population of the interviews—Indian leaders, Amerindian community members, and non-Indian professionals—reinforces methodological triangulation: interviews, issues/surveys, organizations and change.[21]

Interviewees are all from the Chicago area, and are either Native American or deeply involved with American Indian

organizations and community life. Since the primary thrust of this paper is on Indian identity, six representative indigenous interviews were selected from the forty completed, and will remain throughout the paper as the "cultural consultants" on indigenous identity issues. They are analyzed and coded below, including the following descriptors and pseudonyms:

(1) Frank Yonder (FY), an artist and a traditional Lakota man who recently moved to the Chicago area from a reservation in the Dakotas, is well-educated and experienced.
(2) Patricia Darjeeling (PD), a traditional-minded Arikara woman (elder) who relocated to Chicago during termination in the 1950s, is very active in the Uptown Indian community life.
(3) Jane Blue Weather (JB), a Lakota woman teacher (semi-traditional) in the Chicago school system on and off for many years, is educated and tribally oriented.
(4) Yolanda Mustang (YM), an urban Ojibwa woman professional with an Indian organization, has lived and worked most of her life in the Chicago area, and is educated and experienced.
(5) Ernie Three-Road (ET), an urban Anishinaabe man with a long history in Chicago and other native environs, is an artist and agitator with significant presence in the area and nationally.
(6) Dejay Locano (DL), a Menominee woman teacher, who knows traditional ways, has tribal contacts and a connected history to the Native community in Chicago and the region.

These Native American respondents reflect the cultural breadth of traditional orientation, local experience, organizational experience, education, and urban tribal diversity that will support the analysis in this paper. They have differing perspectives on the personalities and organizations of the Indian community, and willingly provided their time and views. Much of what they have to share acts as counterpoint to the non-Indians interviews, survey issues, and organizations.

An interview guide was used for all respondents:

(1) Describe yourself as a Native American person.
(2) Who are Chicago's Native Americans?
(3) What issues face the Indian community?
(4) Is there discrimination against the Indian community?

(5) What can Indian people do about such issues?
(6) Are there groups which try to change the Indian community?
(7) Do you have an individual response, or hopes, to share?

The questions are intended to take the interview through a cross-cultural flow from self-identification of ethnicity issues to thornier topics of discrimination and social change responses. Issues such as personal experiences of discrimination can be difficult to elicit, requiring trust and some amount of intercultural comfort or ethnic similarity between the interviewer-ethnographer and the respondent. In addition, complex realities of most urban Indians, such as traditionalism and tribal identification, complicate analysis of minority ethnic relations and require background knowledge and sensitivity on the part of the interviewer. Thus both knowledge and sensitivity cross many cultural boundaries—racial, urban, tribal, organizational, class, and gender.[22]

The cultural mobility, ambiguity, and diverse self-identification present in urban Indian communities is readily apparent in the responses to the first question. For example, FY responded by calling himself a "pipe-carrier"[23] who is deeply concerned with following his people's (Lakota) "traditional ways." PD also called herself a "traditional person" who "got relocated to Chicago" and is now cross-identified with an urban population and reservation people. JB identified as a "full-blood" who was "strong because of (her) activism," as noted by others, Native and non-Indians.[24] YM called herself an "urban Indian" who still felt this compelling need "to maintain connection" to being Native American as well as to her home community nearby in Canada.[25] ET said he could be "a city scoundrel," an old "dog soldier," or an "urban Indian artist."

In these responses, making a good initial cross-section, we observe tensions in identifying with a home monocultural community as a reservation, an Indian nation, or a historical people, and in experiencing daily identification as an Indian in general among other Indians in an urban setting with minorities. As the following examples demonstrate, tribal identification remains a strong influence on some community activities, and yet is problematic in others.

Identity and community are interrelated. As Green noted, American Indian identity on the individual level is a complex, interrelated phenomenon which includes reservation, tribal,

supratribal, locative, community, and even personal systems of cultural and ethnic orientation. Individuals may or may not have knowledge of their Native American cultures or reservations, and these ethnic orientations may cause considerable ambiguity in terms of how the dominant culture or society identifies such people, their families, and the nature of their minority status. This is clearly evidenced in most responses to the first two questions posed during the interviews. For instance:

> FY: I am from (a particular) Sioux reservation—I don't like that word Sioux, but for means of identification I suppose it's okay. ... that's what I consider home, although I'm living out here, I guess I feel expatriated.

Sioux is not a traditional word for this fluent speaker of the language, but was imposed by the BIA as a tribal identity, which has been further divided by artificial agency boundaries. The use of "home" demonstrates the strong cultural linkage, as does the sociopolitical term "expatriated." The other interviews produced similar identity ambiguities. PD discussed "mother earth" before relating her and her husband's relocation to Chicago, "so that's where we stayed ever since, some forty years ago." And although YM identifies as an "urban Indian" she first brought up her childhood summers and yearly adult visits to her mother's reservation as a way to touch base with home, distant geographically and experientially as it is.

This sense of home being somewhere else than Chicago is a source of tension found throughout the interviews when discussing the Native American population. FY discusses location as "a real basic thing anybody needs to know," and for the Lakota people it is having a "spiritual denominator." PD focuses on the "Indians (who) came to Chicago" during relocation as experiencing poverty and prejudicial behavior, and their situation as "really pathetic (for) some of the cases of Indians that (had) never left the reservation." JB describes the transition from traditional elders to younger urban Indians "more susceptible to white influence" and the lack of any land base or reservations in the state as influential issues on leadership. ET talks about direct links with "the people" both as community in Chicago and as "the island" Anishinaabe from "up north." DL shifts home back and forth in her own discourse, with her roots winning out in the end, returning to work and living on the Menominee reservation. ID always reverts to "not us Lakota" or "not among the people," meaning

on the Rosebud and other "Sioux" reservations.[26] PD, YM, JB, and ID developed some ambiguity about enrollment issues, each being full-blood but also politically aware of issues for various mixed-bloods, sometimes their own descendants.

And YM identifies the "government's policy of . . . blood quantum" proofs for enrollments as a "way of eliminating Indian problems" by reducing eligibility through numbers, especially because of a preponderance of mixed-tribe families in Chicago and intermingling, contributing to "eliminating people's eligibility." This has classic features of the termination period—reducing federal responsibilities by limiting and complicating individuated blood quantum enrollments and tribal recognition, treating American Indians as another minority group.

Policy issues are thereby linked to discrimination. FY distinguishes between those issues "outside of us" and those "more of a personal nature" in terms of their "conditioned responses," such as the policemen's union's use of a "bigoted racial stereotype of Mayor Daley" as an Indian.[27] He notes it as an everyday part of life and a "dysfunction" for Native Americans no matter where they are. For urban Indian children, this takes on particular cultural connotations.

JB: Prevention and education (are important) because a lot of Indian children are facing these (issues). . . . In terms of culture, there are powwows at the Indian Center, but they kind of operate from a sort of pan-Indian kind of culture. The children want to learn more about where they come from, their native language.

In addition, PD points out that Native Americans are the last ones in housing programs, and YM sees a changing job market to more service-oriented and specific skills. ID discusses housing for the "really poor, that's a Native" issue, and one she thinks puts them in competition with the blacks and Mexicans for public funds. ET sees most of these problems as related to the street and the people from the community, including numerous times he's had to fight both whites and his "other brothers" to defend his name and territory. So the issues are well-defined, even by these few interviews. At the core of the responses appears to be the treatment of Native Americans in negative stereotypical ways which fail to respect cultural differences and histories. This leads us to a discussion of how discrimination is experienced by our interviewees.

Both FY and YM identify discrimination on the individual and institutional levels. FY believes that Native Americans "are an easy target because we are not monolithic," and that contributes to the few who do speak out as being "so ineffectual." YM discusses many examples in banking, housing, and business programs, with discriminatory practices directed against people of color, and with perceptions of people of color and Native Americans as alcoholics, unable to conduct their affairs. PD traces discriminatory experiences from her early history during relocation as she "was passing for Mexican" on through today as she says, "we are the people most discriminated against . . . always against the Indians (who) in history are no good."

Sometimes relative levels of forms of discrimination are most obvious when individuals move between different social systems yet meet with similar experiences:

> JB: When I first came to Chicago I thought "Good I can relax here" because I had come from South Dakota where you can cut discrimination with a knife it's so thick. But that's not true. Here you find discrimination when trying to get some of our needs met with the city and state systems, because the Indian community doesn't have group strength.

She goes on to observe that current dysfunctions of the Native American community are due to historical forms of discrimination that she calls a "holocaust, the European invasion (causing) us to hold grudges" and keeping people from working together because of "these old grievances." Here we can observe the interface of two historical legacies of racial and cultural discrimination, the conquest of America by destruction of Indian nations one at a time, and the strategy of causing one nation (or tribe) to war against another, weakening both with lasting animosities. According to JB, an educator in the city, the schools that urban Indian children attend extend out these injustices by teaching history that shows tribes as warlike, savage, and out of control, contrasted with the United States government as benign, with a "Great White Father" authority. The interviews collected herein show many levels of perceived discrimination against Native Americans in Chicago —personal, institutional, cultural, systemic, historical, racial, and internalized dysfunctions from the dominant society. The next questions address perceptions about what can be done and what is being done.

Social change is linked to organizations. Using an example of institutional discrimination, FY describes how one woman confronted an instructor in an Indian program who often made racist comments, but "the system protected him" until he retired. He goes on to ask, "How can we begin to dialogue with others when we can't (dialogue) with ourselves" as a form of instilled cultural dysfunction. JB discusses her experience of being labeled a radical for speaking out, identifying lack of education credentials as a cause of Indian people feeling "intimidated," the importance of having self-empowerment training, and the power of negative stereotypes "attacking the spirit of our children." This is further exemplified by:

PD: . . . a lot of discrimination (over the years) makes people say, "I've had enough," like that Indian woman the other night, she had a lot of hate when she said, "What did God do for Native Americans?", so why should she believe in Indian traditions? They've come a long way, and been mistreated. So have I, but that didn't make me give up. I had a lot of hate at one time, I did. But I realized my traditional and Christian ways, through teachers, you have to have love in your heart if you are going to live in today's society.

Social change for dismantling systems of discrimination exist on individual and community levels. YM notes that "community organizing is one way these issues can be brought to the table of city, state, and even federal government." But she also shows her own orientation as an urban Indian, saying that Indian people have "an almost passive approach to problems; that has its basis in culture." She goes on to note how different today's society is from traditional ways and that Indian people who grow up without "reference to . . . the worldviews of the reservation . . . adapt the dominant culture's values as their own." She is speaking for herself in this regard, in contrast to PD's earlier statement about today's modern society even as she identifies as a traditional person. This is indicative of the complex ethnic milieu in which Native individuals, Indian organizations, and the various service groups must and do operate.

Traditional culture—however maligned, misrepresented, or weak the ties to tribe or nation—divides non-Indians from both Native American interview groups. While Indians were concerned with cultural or tribal issues, non-Indians working with organizations stressed social indicators or program devel-

opment. Non-Indians also shied away from making tribe-specific statements.

Another category of responses to questions about social change, particularly as it relates to discrimination, is really dependent on both the values and the social focus of the individual Native American respondent. Observe the differing orientations in these responses to a question about groups attempting to change the Indian community:

FY: Grass roots organizing is going on all over the country—people who have returned have taken a spiritual path.

PD: There are all different kinds of Indians here—boarding schools, got hate . . . urban Indians looking for something, because they are different than traditionals.

JB: Groups are working with South American Indians, but they are living in deep denial here by not looking at their own issues—it's easy to go outside the United States, even as this country was founded on Indian land, and slavery.

YM: Attain education, get job skills, buy a home—sure there are groups. (But) Indian people resist change, and taking a risk.... Tribal affiliations, even weak ones ... affect leadership.

These statements represent a cultural continuum on which most Native Americans exist, from traditional and tribal, to adaptive in an urban existence with differing values and concepts. FY believes in supporting Native traditions and spirituality, as PD identifies the tensions between urban and traditional, with JB seeing a denial by both government and civic groups of these issues, and YM wanting Indian people to change even at the expense of tribal affiliations and traditions. Social change, and the organizations which support and guide it, is dependent on the orientation of the leadership and membership as well as community participants, non-Indian and Native alike. In the Chicago American Indian community, this involves dialectical tension between differing orientations—spiritual or modern, urban or traditional, local or international, progressive or cultural maintenance—as evidenced in the above statements.

Profile of the Community

The profile of the community is in three parts: a focus on urban Indians and supratribalism, demographic projections and trends, and a description of some Indian organizational activities. Relationships between so-called urban Indians and supratribalism are important in this analysis. The misnomer *Indians* harkens back five hundred years ago to Columbus mistakenly identifying Native peoples on Hispaniola as "Los Indios" and as tribes. To this day, Native Americans and nations are generally grouped under these terms.[28] However, even among recognized American Indian tribes there exists considerable diversity. Snipp identifies more than 120 tribal heritages in the 1980 national census, while some scholars find more than five hundred. In the Chicago area regional tribal identification is also diverse. In the first survey of sixty-five respondents, more than twenty tribes were represented, more than forty in the second. Therefore, in coding analysis we must differentiate between the strength and locus of tribal orientation of the Chicago urban Indian population.

Cornell identifies the political and ethnic forms of Indian consciousness stated above, beyond or independent of any tribal affiliation, as "supra-tribalism." This classification is an improvement over the term *pan-Indian* used previously, but includes much more than relocated urban Indian populations, such as the political and social movement groups working within reservations. In this paper, *supratribalism* will be used to reference social forces of Native American peoples, while *urban Indians* will be used to refer to the tribal diversity of Native American populations found in cities like Chicago. Besides the more positive and reinforcing connections among urban Indians, there are considerable problems in cultural relations between these groups. One interview described some young "Indian boys" going back to visit the reservation, and getting "run off" by the local Indians. I have experienced similar conflicts myself, resolved only when I identified my own relatives from the community. In most traditional circles on reservations today, the first question put to an unknown person is, "who are your grandmother's people?"

Therefore, concepts like supratribal are not truly indicative of identity, but are analytical categories which describe the ethnic minority group called Indian that can be categorically denied in the intense tribal environment of a reservation or cul-

tural home community. While portions of the two distinct populations may overlap, significant numbers of Native Americans living in urban areas maintain only an Indian identity that is less supratribal than generic ethnic minority.

A better analytical model would allow for urban Indians to be identified on a continuum, one that employs the terms *tribal* and *traditional* as opposed to the often derisively used *assimilated*—and another that designates the base for the individual or family, with reservation-based opposed to fully urbanized. While most urbanized Indians are acculturated or assimilated, they can be tribal or traditional, just as a reservation-based Indian may be highly assimilated, as in figure 1.

FIGURE 1: AMERICAN INDIAN URBAN ASSIMILATION CONTINUUM

Tribal[29] Traditional Bicultural Adjusting Acculturated **Assimilated**

< — — — — — — — — — — — — — – >

Reservation-based Community-based Fully **Urbanized**

While this model certainly has its limitations, it allows for flexibility with identification. One respondent, while participating in an intense organizational meeting, accused the traditional people of being too concerned "with all that Sun Dance stuff!" that he maintained didn't matter, such as prayers or burning sage before a meeting. Born in Chicago with three different bloodlines, he followed no particular cultural practices, was not enrolled in an Indian nation, yet participated in organizations and social activities to the extent of board membership with the Indian Center. He married a Native woman, wore "shades and braids" when he could, and felt that urban Indians were a distinct group in Chicago, even from "all those reservation Indians" at the meetings.[30]

Census and other statistical information provide us only with surface analysis, considering that many urban Indians may exemplify more "shades and braids" than "all that Sun Dance stuff." Estimates of the Chicago area's American Indian population range from sixteen to twenty thousand to under ten thousand, using U.S. census figures. Three factors should be taken into account with these figures: geographical area count-

ed, potential undercount, and the census ethnic identification procedures. The Chicago metropolitan area American Indian population is greater than Cook County alone. The census often experiences undercounts of people near or below the poverty line and of various ethnic minorities.[31]

Racial/ethnic identification is a single-choice item on the U.S. census, whereas an overwhelming majority of Native Americans have various degrees of mixed bloodlines, a situation that is aggravated when mixed with other racial minorities. Self-identification has probably increased as well, both because of a growing acceptance of Native Americans and more options on the census. For this study, the city of Chicago's estimate of around ten thousand Indians, compared to the U.S. 1990 Census figure of over seven thousand, is the most useful, while conservatively estimating surrounding areas as another three thousand, with a total between twelve and thirteen thousand. An AIEDA study (1992) demonstrates that mobility of Native Americans within and around the Chicago area is high, and further contributes to the difficulties of any final count. But the greatest obstacle, and one that makes an exact count less relevant at any rate, is that racialized policies in the United States create an indeterminate accounting of bloodlines, or even of race itself.

Other U.S. census issues include decentralization of the Chicago American Indian population, the extremely high ratio of those renting in the traditional communities of Uptown and Lake View (90 percent plus), the number of households headed by women in those areas (58 percent) and overall (24 percent), and the relative youth of most American Indians in contrast to the white population (30 percent to 18 percent). These demographics are replicas of the other minority groups and Natives living in urban areas. While a dispersal of middle-class wage-earners and educated young professionals may indicate progress in sheer numbers, the "suburban effect" for many Natives, especially more educated and lighter mixed-bloods, is producing class differentiation that is mediated by residential location, suburb or city. Moreover, this destabilizes support for community neighborhood-based groups, such as the Chicago Indian Center, and develops new sources of tensions between those "yuppie" Indians serving on boards and other groups with high profiles and professional agendas, and the historically more impoverished and closely networked people of Uptown Chicago neighborhoods. These dynamics are seen in changes of Indian organization structures and short-term objectives.[32]

A few years ago an attempt was made to form broad-based city coalitions (CAICOC) for metropolitan needs analysis, which met with limited success and, just as important, little resistance. A credit union was set up, which floundered and closed down, out of those efforts, which also dissipated. Recent attempts to improve networking and representation were initiated by AIEDA with mixed results, including a community outreach project survey, business minority set-aside discrimination studies funded by the United Way, and a political action group focusing on the city of Chicago. Each of these programs has become politicized in turn, with common disparities of representation and service between so-called community members, usually lower income and reservation-based, and the more educated and fully employed Native Americans, usually well-situated in the city area, whether as business people, professionals, or simply urban dwellers of Indian descent.

The past, present, and future relationships between the varied groups that were interviewed, organizations that grow and often erode or fractionate, and issues of identity and social change thereby become critical to understanding discrimination against the urban Indians of Chicago.

Issues and Identities

The Community Outreach Survey first conducted by AIEDA during January of 1992 was developed in conjunction with most of the Indian organizations listed above. Preselected categories were identified by the various agencies, along with particular concerns associated with those categories as groupings. From that information, ten major issues categories were identified as having an importance for the American Indian community—health, housing, employment, education, senior citizens, social services, youth issues, cultural-spiritual concerns, political (representation), and drugs/alcohol. In addition, subsets of each major category were identified and listed. The agencies and managing individuals decided to have respondents prioritize the subsets and major categories to determine which issues were most important. The result was a series of entries to be prioritized, according to their generalized importance and the ten major categories ranked one to ten. Being a group organizational effort, both the listings and the responses represented political, sociocultural, and programmatic issues. The results

included both a prioritizing of the major organization issues and priorities of those subset issues for each major category.

All the respondents were Native American Indians who attended the Chicago Indian Center Powwow in November of 1992 or who regularly participated in organizations. They represented a great diversity in tribal background and ethnic orientation. Moreover, as evidenced by diversity in tribal background, blood-degree, and ethnic experience of the respondents, the only shared characteristics were being Native American and attending a powwow or meeting, and being willing to answer questions. The surveys share a "prioritizing of issues" category and demonstrate a meaningful source for an issues critique of the qualitative interviews. First analysis of the second survey showed that nearly 75 percent found discrimination a major problem, with some 65 percent having firsthand experience.[33]

Survey respondent results for the first survey demonstrate the complexity of urban Indian lifestyles. Household income for the respondents was relatively even across four income categories, which have intervals of seven thousand dollars, the last group of 21,000 dollars plus. Survey designers considered the 7,000 dollars group below the poverty line. Mean and median were well below the average white household incomes reported for Chicago. The distribution is representative of the urban Indian population as a whole, but is too high for the average Indian community on the north side, where poverty is much more evident. In terms of respondents' family income, the results appear to be valid. The employment category was a high priority by first choice, so if a greater number of lower-income respondents were added, it is safe to assume it would remain the same or even be raised higher. Similar analysis can be made for the other categories, especially education, where the attainment levels differed markedly from the more affluent white population of Chicago. Better collection from community members would in all probability increase these inequality gaps, although we can only speculate on how the cultural issues would be affected.

The age groupings are not representative of the population, with almost the entire sample made up of the two working adult groups, aged nineteen to thirty-nine and forty to sixty. There are at least two explanations for this: the data collection sources and cultural orientations. The first collection point was the community outreach meeting intended for adult partici-

pants, and other responses were collected at organizations intended for adult services. Native Americans tend to participate as families at most functions, so all age groups were represented at the outreach session. Elders often received the survey as something given to them, since there is no culturally appropriate way to ask them—that may be condescending—or to insist that they return it, which is disrespectful.[34] Small children and adolescents would almost always let any adults provide information requested. Therefore, results from prioritizing the seniors and youth categories may be less valid, as the subgroupings are the perspective of working-age adults.[35]

Family size responses appear to indicate many small nuclear families, but this is misleading for at least two reasons. One is the number of female-headed households based on census data. Another is the wording of the question, "persons in your family household," which could imply not including other attached relatives living elsewhere, family features common to Indians.

At least one-fourth of the respondents reported growing up on or near their reservation, while more than half grew up in the Chicago environs and another quarter in other cities and towns. This means that three-quarters of the respondents were urban Indians "born and bred," and fully half were Chicago natives. This sample is probably quite representative of the population when taking into consideration the mobility of Native Americans. These observations underscore differences between the Chicago urban Indians' issues and the reservation-based urban Indians' issues, difference that required further analysis, and that may perhaps uncover class interests as well.

The tribal diversity reported by respondents is both indicative of Native American populations in general and urban Indians in particular. About one-quarter of the respondents identified as related to Sioux (Lakota, Dakota, etc.) and another quarter as Chippewa (Ojibwa, etc.). One-fifth were from tribes in the Great Lakes region (Oneida, Potawatomi, Menominee, etc.), another sixth from somewhere in the Great Plains (Comanche, Osage, Kiowa, etc.), and a fifth from more distant tribes (Navajo, Colville, Choctaw, etc.). Two patterns emerge from this data: larger tribes/nations in the region are well-represented, and those are geographically closer to Chicago. This is as expected. The presence of more distant tribes is probably due to mobility and relocation, reflecting further

complications in analyzing cultural identities and alienation.

The survey results reporting the prioritized importance of the ten major categories shows that employment and education are the highest priority categories, as first and second choices. Youth was nearly on the same level, interesting to note when considering the all-adult respondents. Even so, first choices alone were greater in the cultural/spiritual and drug/alcohol concern areas. Housing and health were on about the same level as cultural and drug categories with two choices. Seniors and social services were clearly lower priority categories. Especially interesting was the extremely low ranking of political issues, since it all originated as a community outreach survey. This stands out in contrast to the responses to the bonus question, an open-ended one about wishes. Nearly half of the responses related to coordinating community activities, organizations, and people of differing tribes and included words like *unity*, *working together*, or *cooperation*. This was replicated in the second survey with direct questions, as many respondents wanted more culture-specific programs and services. These tensions provide the backdrop to internal divisions even with similar goals for urban Indians. In figure 2, we observe those results with "tribalists" designated separately as a group with strong ties to a home reservation or tribal culture.

Figure 2: Results of Issues Surveys by Categories [36]

1st & 2nd Choice	1st Choice only	Tribalists
Employment / Education	Employment	Education
Youth	Cultural-Spiritual / Drugs-Alcohol	Cultural Spiritual / Youth
Drugs-Alcohol / Cultural-Spiritual	Youth / Education	Drugs-Alcohol / Seniors
Housing / Health	Social Services / Health	Employment / Housing
Seniors / Social Services	Housing / Seniors	Social Services / Health
Political	Political	Political

Subgroups within categories also provided insights into the respondents' prioritization. These are reported with the first three choices. The education category shows independent school and culture education highest, with similar levels for parent participation and academic preparation. Employment has clear priority on government jobs, with interest in training, reducing stereotypes, and counseling. Youth issues include drug/alcohol and education issues as a high priority, with concern about gangs and meeting places. Cultural-spiritual issues are evenly ranked, with elder traditional teachers, powwows, and sweat lodges having priority. Housing was led by the family, and then homeless and seniors. Interestingly, there was no significant ranking for housing discrimination. Drugs-alcohol were ranked fairly even, with prevention and education having the highest priority. Health education, insurance, and AIDS/STDs were evenly high. With seniors the priority lay with medical assistance and housing. Social services were fairly even, with support groups in the lead. The low-ranked political category was also evenly prioritized, with a slightly higher level for city and state representation.

Social Change in Chicago

We have observed that social change issues are linked to urban Indian identities, especially related to levels of traditionalism and tribal affiliation, and that both of these are further linked with historical issues and social movements, such as the panethnic American Indian Movement, resistance to federal relocation and termination policies, and to some degree with racial justice issues in city environs. Concerns with gangs, having traditional Native teachers, and political representation are quite different, overall, between an urban minority and a reservation Indian.

Social movements and structural change elements have been explored mostly through: (1) contrasting urban to reservation Indian peoples in various political contexts; and (2) using tribal case studies to illustrate specific concepts as in highly applicable ethnic reorganization.[37] However, urban Indian populations demonstrate varying levels of traditional and modern group orientations. In terms of how social change networks and movements occur among urban Indians, these differing orientations need to be considered.

Most basic to the inclusion of Native American perspectives, is the theme of culture. Macro-sociological and micro-situational issues need to be considered through the rubric of "frames" and "collective identity" analysis.[38] Both of these concepts are applied quite differently to Native Americans, in that tribal affiliation and traditional practices can play a large part in how these may be enacted in different settings. Consciousness and identity are at best complex ideas, and must be considered through cross-cultural perspectives. Hegemony needs to be inspected from within a sociopolitical framework. For instance, a difficult and costly internecine civil war broke out on Pine Ridge Reservation over political issues resulting from a struggle between the American Indian Movement aligned with traditionals and a U.S.-sponsored Oglala Sioux tribe government.[39] This division had some roots in urban-based AIM and in an Indian Youth Council held in Chicago.

Domination through systemic and pervasive hegemonic consciousness is a key feature that is experienced through educational systems. And any critical discussion of Native Americans must include a historical analysis of indigenous struggles for cultural survival, an area that sociological theory has tended to avoid.[40] The challenge in adopting applied theory for Native American social movements in urban areas centers on ascertaining what resources are and were available. When traditional structures contrast with the imposed tribal governments, the result is incompatibility of two distinct institutional traditions. Urban Indian movements experience a lack of compatibility, and thus conflict over political resources along two or more lines of conflict—with dominant social systems and often with the tribal social systems as well. Their locus of activity or power is neither situated in tribal institutions nor in American social institutions, but rather in identity constructions as ethnic minorities with oppositional consciousness. Survey issues and interviews indicate these unresolved tensions.

Therefore, the grounding points for this discussion have to include culture, frames of analysis including the dominant cultural codes, and group identities of Natives in supratribal contexts and as oppressed groups.[41] Further, collective belief systems are transformed before urban Indians can mobilize any form of consensus, and are defined culturally within the groups.[42] The dominant and hegemonic cultural frames are important to note in that a tyranny of the group experiencing

success can, rather than liberate, result in new and subtle forms of oppression.[43]

In Native American circles, urban and reservation alike, the question of tribal affiliation and/or membership, once synonymous with tribal identity, has become a distinct legal, as opposed to cultural or conceptual, category. Indian identity developed during the reservation years became supratribal in social interaction, acting as "focal points in emergent intertribal networks" which continued to promote an "Indian identity that one day would be mobilized into politics." However, as this study indicates, in cultural practices "tribal" has not been subsumed into "supra" except for those urban Indians without strong, reservation-based tribal traditions.[44]

Social change in Chicago's various Indian movements and organizations, discussed above, does not fit neatly into three levels of tribalism as many social analysists and scholars would have us believe. Macro-micro issues of tribalism, existing organizations, intra- and intercity networks, and social objectives are intertwined and convoluted, in that they can become divisive rather than consolidating forces. This is particularly evident with newer, high-growth organizations that grew out of the CAICOC alignments discussed earlier. In spurts of funding growth, followed by various community involvements, groups began to build on a less partisan membership, with various tribes, urban-reservation representatives, and those with varying degrees of blood both on their boards and a a part of the constituent membership.

Affiliations with funding agencies and professional bodies increased the representational strength of one organization, including three-year strategic plans that revolved around developing cultural centers and coalitions of Indian activities geared for development. As the organization grew, it caught the attention of city government and Native leaders, so that related issues boiling under the surface were conjoined with new United Way funded projects to analyze and report on discrimination on the part of agencies, chief among them the city's minority business set-asides.

An embattled collective identity could and did easily coalesce to attack the common problem of racial discrimination. Press conferences were called for newspapers, television stations, and other media. In 1992, the Indian community became involved in press hearings to charge the city government with overt discrimination against Native Americans. However,

inside deals and appointments to commissions caused the primary leadership to change. No direct conflict ensued. Instead, the organization became increasingly adept at getting grants and maintaining a presence in city government. Changes on the board of directors were called for, preferencing larger numbers of lighter, mixed-blood, suburban Indians who had business objectives. In classic conflict mode, the identity of the leadership began to move from various oppressed groups and sociopolitical challenges toward hegemonic control of Native people in Chicago, envincing more of a professional nature reflecting dominant cultural codes and mainstream American values. Community members and tribal people began to pull away, but to the different political realities. The city could now deal with the new organization and not the old guard originally from the Indian Center and other agencies. Board meetings became contentious, and sometimes physically aggressive, with the traditional and tribal members aligned against professional and modern members.

Social change processes in the broader community also reflected these internal divisions.[45] American Indian Movement activities were resurrected and immediately divided into three camps, each with its own focus and membership: one mostly on inner-city urban Indians, another hosting a more suburban group, and one working on external political issues with many non-Indians as its core membership. Participant observation underscores that the quality and types of issues for these groups are quite different and instructive of how tribal issues are linked to culture, Indian minority issues are linked to poverty or crime, and supratribal Native injustice issues are linked to national politics. These three frames are indicated by the methodologies employed in this research: tribal urban Indians identifying with a Native nation or with reservation culture, urban minority Indians struggling with city environments, and supratribal Indians working on political identities.

Conclusions

This research paper has three major objectives—to profile the Chicago American Indian community issues of identity and discrimination, to review relevant organizations and collective responses to issues of group oppression, and to provide a voice for urban Indian people through quasi-ethnographic studies

that focus on everyday forms of discrimination—and outlines responses to those oppressive systems.

Analytical findings are based on survey responses and interviews as the main sources of data collection. The following issues are of primary concern to Native Americans in the Chicago area: employment for adults and education for youth, cultural-spiritual maintenance and some practice, and greater unity and coordination for Indian groups and organizations. The interviews, and to an extent the surveys, demonstrate a need to analyze social change from multidimensional fields that include frameworks of culture, tribal and traditional networks, educational systems in relation to dominant (Anglo) interests, and ongoing systems of oppression and inequality. Interviews homed in on the presence of discrimination on individual, institutional, and social levels, evidenced by the pervasiveness of negative stereotyping and prejudicial treatment.

Tensions exist in addressing issues of discrimination and in unification strategies because of the differing orientations and grievances of traditional tribal Natives and urban Indians without significant reservation experience. The interviewees traced these problems to government-driven divisions historically rooted in relocation during the termination period, and efforts to reduce American Indians' federal eligibility and Indian organizational abilities. Individuals also see Indians participating in their own oppression and perpetuating dysfunctions from the dominant society. This social change is complex and difficult to address in today's multiethnic urban Indian world.

Organizations and social change revolve around identity issues arising from the problems stated above, and have been addressed by various existing Native American organizations working on the micro level or on specific objectives with some amount of support from the community. However, when issues of power become intertwined with those of representation, the oppressed become less and less connected to organizations. In Chicago's case, sociopolitical coalitions empowered and subsequently divided by local quincentennial demonstrations and an obviously discriminatory government, gave rise to an organization that quickly shifted its organizational make-up to conduct city negotiations on its own, ostensibly representing the Native community's interests. Since then, the Indian Center has had its doors closed, and other organizations have experienced more competitive funding and representation problems.

At least two major conflicts between board members and community interests occurred at the organization. Perhaps related, a renewed Chicago American Indian Movement appeared. In less than six months, this movement experienced precisely the same problems of representation, although it was urban versus suburban. Indian oppositional consciousness was divided by ideological tribal (racial) and residential (class) issues. In fact, Chicago AIM divisions mirror the larger divisions within the Indian community.

While the differences between urban Indians and those more detached from reservation life compared with reservation-based tribal traditionals can be useful for analyzing some political perspectives, most urban Indians' strong persistence in cultural practices and ties to reservations do not allow for definition of ethnicity along these lines. Poverty and discrimination issues are shared by both groups, although the contextual expression is very different from urban to reservation experiences. Further distance with supratribal groups in urban areas, now reorganizing to reflect special interests as a Native city ethnic group, complicate analysis. Rather than a simple trajectory of increasingly organized pan-Indian movements, tribal and supratribal and urban Indian ethnicity has emerged in complicated forms that are more dependent on orientations of individual backgrounds than on traditional Native issues.

One Dakota elder, a full-blood who grew up on her distant reservation and an early organizer in the city, including the first American Indian Center, presents a view of the dark side of urban Indian groups, their issues and some of the internecine tensions:

> We're nothing but a welfare state; after relocation, we've done little or nothing . . . (you know) they have FAS tendencies, (they're all) kids from alcoholic families. . . . We've become just what the government wanted, we are dependent—(and those organizations?).... It's just a bunch of Indians who have lost their way, and now they feed on each other.

Although overstated, this Native elder has identified the intersection of federal-state-city policies with Indians as an urban ethnic group, and the myriad problems associated with that existence, including a personal loss of identity with tribe and home. Research methodology must take these cross-cutting

issues into account, utilizing multiple sources and allowing for levels of assimilation to be separated from reservation versus urban orientations. We must refrain from letting analytically induced categories, such as supratribal, from blinding scholarship to the very real tribal or Native nation cultural survival issues that simultaneously bind and divide diverse peoples that we are calling urban Indians. We must observe that social change and assimilation take place within the organizations that are charged with representing urban Native Americans. In considering the strong and nearly universal call for greater Indian unity as found in this study, we are forced to return to individual Native American responses to paint a more precise and concluding picture on the canvas we have laid out.

Hopes and thoughts of urban Indian people indicate that they are neither hopelessly divided nor working collectively together. Issues identified in interviews include a focus on traditional culture, Indian ethnicity, historical orientation to urban Indians, relationships of differing income, tribal and employment backgrounds, education in schools on cultural history, organizational endeavors, local politics, general racism against people of color, attempts at unity, dysfunctionalism related to support groups, and social change movements. We have identified organizational complications, along with patterns of resistance, domination, and hegemony by a dominant culture, as intertwined issues of complex ethnic origins.

Just as with the open-ended "bonus" question at the end of the survey, the final interview guide response dealt with what the individuals felt was important or uncovered, and their hopes and wishes for the Indian community. As instructed by my own traditional elders, I would like for this final section of the paper to be in their own words:

FY: Through traditional ceremonies, spirituality, people are realizing a lot about themselves—that they are good, worthwhile people—which is all in contradiction to the effects of discrimination, racism—***all the things that tell us that we are less than....***

PD: You have to have love in your heart, you have to give yourself. When I speak, trying to explain what it's like protesting that Columbus, five hundred years ago.... We can't protest and hate all our lives, ***we have to live a good example***, let them see who we are, show them.

YM: That we will eventually be able to work with city, state, and federal government and establish a land base for American Indians in the Chicago or Illinois are—***a land base would help us to establish and identify ourselves*** as we become less transient in a contemporary culture.

JB: If those people who want to improve their personal and professional lives become more aware, if (they) could find the time ***to form a solid support group to help those in need,*** that would be a real good start. We need to get at inner needs. Once you do that, the rest starts growing.

Although these individuals are, and have been, at odds because of personal, tribal, organizational, and philosophical differences, all have also found good feelings in their heart. These are the messages from Native Americans for the urban Indian people in Chicago:

(1) to honor and practice our traditional cultures and spirituality (when possible);
(2) to live good examples in love and hope (as role models and for self-esteem);
(3) to establish collective identity and common objectives with a land base (in the city);
(4) to form support groups to help those Indian people in need, thereby building a stronger, more cohesive Native American community.

The historical legacy of the destruction of Indian nations in the United States of America; the genocide-like collapse of the population; programs such as termination and urban relocation; and ongoing discrimination at individual, organizational, institutional, and social systemic levels are all realized in the Native American community in Chicago. In the face of these problems, American Indian people still have a hopeful eye to the future. And yet those negative and sometimes destructive forces often contribute to a downfall of collective efforts of urban Indians living in Chicago areas. As the struggles continue, in the face of oppression, historical injustices, intergroup tyranny, and continued dominance over indigenous people of diverse tribal background and differing bloodlines in the cities of America, I am reminded to say: [46]*Midakuye Oyasin* (Lakota for "We are all related . . .").

NOTES

1. The terms *Native Americans*, *American Indians*, *Natives*, *indigenous people*, and *Indians* are used interchangeably throughout this paper.

2. Stephen Cornell and Douglas Hartmann, *Ethnicity and Race, Making Identities in a Changing World* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 1998).

3. Russell Thornton, Gary Sandefur, and H. Grasmick, *The Urbanization of American Indians* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982).

4. Christopher Doob, *Racism, an American Cauldron* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996).

5. Terry Strauss, ed., *Indians of the Chicago Area,* 2nd ed. (Chicago: NAES College Press, 1990); Janusz Mucha, "From Prairie to the City: Transformation of Chicago's American Indian Community," *Urban Anthropology* 12 (Fall/Winter 1983): 337-71.

6. Joane Nagel, *American Indian Ethnic Renewal, Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); Stephen Cornell, *The Return of the Native: American Indian Political Resurgence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988); National Research Council, *Changing Numbers, Changing Needs: American Indian Demography and Public Health* (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1996).

7. Wendy Rose, "The Great Pretenders: Further Reflections on Whiteshamanism," in *The State of Native America—Genocide, Colonization and Resistance*, ed. M. Annette Jaimes (Boston: South End Press, 1992).

8. David Beck, *The Chicago American Indian Community, 1893-1988, Annotated Bibliography and Guide to Sources in Chicago* (Chicago: Native American Education Services College Press, 1988).

9. Pertti Alasuutari, *Researching Culture, Qualitative Method and Cultural Studies* (London: Sage Publications, 1995); Charles Ragin and Howard Becker, *What Is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

10. Donald Fixico, *Termination and Relocation, Federal Indian Policy 1945-1960* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1986).

11. Gwen Carr, "Urban Indians: The Invisible Minority," *Newsletter of the Poverty & Race Research Action Council* (Washington, DC, 1996).

12. Carolyn Liebler, "Changes in American Indian Ethnic Identity: A View from the 1990 Census," paper presented at the American Sociological Association annual meetings in New York, 1996.

13. William F. Whyte, *Street Corner Society,* 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955); John Ogbu, *Minority Education and Caste* (New York: Academic Press, 1978); James Scott, "Voice Under Domination: The Arts of Political Disguise," in *Domination and the Arts of Resistance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

14. Murray L. Wax, *Indian Americans, Unity and Diversity* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971).

15. In the nation as a whole, American Indians comprise about 1 percent of

the population, compared with 12 percent African American, 9 percent Hispanic-Latino, and roughly 3 percent Asian descent (U.S. Census, 1997). In greater Chicago, Cook County minority representation is heightened, with African descent near 26 percent, Asian about 4 percent, Hispanic near 14 percent, and American Indians a mere .2 percent, much less than the national statistics, while other groups are actually much higher (U.S. Census, 1990).

16. Charles Willie, *Race, Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status, a Theoretical Analysis of Their Interrelationship* (New York: General Hall, Inc., 1983).

17. The first survey was distributed and collected in January 1992, at the Chicago American Indian Center (AIC). General issues and personal information were included in a second survey during the Chicago 1992 Powwow, in October, with about 120 respondents.

18. The October 1992 survey found that 94.4 percent agreed that the community "needs unity," while 74.2 percent agreed that "discrimination is a problem in Chicago," and 65.3 percent "personally experienced discrimination." Further research should explore relationships between the ideas of unity and discrimination.

19. Treatment by and of non-Indians seems critically different from that on most reservations where tribal councils or other Indian governments have sway over much decision making.

20. Sara Lawrence Lightfoot, *The Good High School: Portraits of Character and Culture* (New York: Basic Books, 1983).

21. For application to triangulation, see Yvonna Lincoln and Egon Guba, *Naturalistic Inquiry* (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1985), 305-307. For methodology, see Norman Denzin, *Sociological Methods* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978).

22. Howard Gardner, *Frames of Mind, Theory of Multiple Intelligences* (New York: HarperCollins, 1983); Larry Brendtro, Martin Brokenleg, and Steve Bockern, *Reclaiming Youth at Risk* (Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service, 1990).

23. A "pipe-carrier" refers to one having the responsibilities and the rights to perform the sacred pipe ceremony and to live one's life for "the people" in an honorable and truthful way.

24. "Full-blood" refers to a complicated and legally important ethnic differentiation for American Indians—blood quantum, tribal (BIA) enrollment, and cultural identification.

25. For some urban Indians, the connection to an original home community is tenuous or nonexistent, strengthening self-identification to the urban Indian ethnicity and forms of "supratribal" identities.

26. ID (Isis Denmother, pseudonym) is a full-blood Lakota woman traditionalist from Rosebud in South Dakota who experienced relocation first through Minneapolis and then on to Chicago.

27. FY is responding to the incident in which the Chicago police drew and distributed a flyer depicting Mayor Daley with a headband and feather, arms crossed, with the large caption, "CHIEF BROKEN PROMISES," noting a contract betrayal. James Fenelon, "Indian Icons in the World Series of Racism," in

Political Economy of Race and Ethinicity: Global Perspectives, ed. Pinar Batur-Vanderlippe and Joe Feagin (Stamford, CT: JAI Press, 1999).

28. *Bartolome' de Las Casas,* quoted in Brian Dippie, *The Vanishing American, White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1982); Robert F. Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian* (New York: Random House, 1978).

29. *Tribal* is a pan-Indian (supratribal) definition of ethnicity (Cornell, *Return of the Native*, 1988). John Trudell, ex-AIM director, described himself as "tribal" at the University of Nebraska, February 1994.

30. Visible markers of minority group acceptance differ for groups in meaning and orientation.

31. Robert Blauner, *Racial Oppression in America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972).

32. Some of the organizations undergoing this change include NAES College, INAD at Truman College, UIC, schools (Little Big Horn, Goudy, and Audobon), and to some extent the D'Arcy McNickle Center at Newberry Library, ANAWIM and St. Augustine's support centers, and the JTPA government-funded programs.

33. Standard survey format: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree.

34. One elder man in particular took the survey as a gift or information, and when we discussed it simply nodded his head saying "Ah-Ho" in approval, but not filling it out.

35. The senior/handicapped subgroup was prioritized high, even though there were only two respondents over the age of sixty. Would Anglo-American respondents share a similarly high concern for their elders?

36. The category scores of "1st & 2nd Choice" include the combined two first priorities; 1st Choice is simply the single priority first selected. "Tribalists" represents those indicating an affiliation with and/or strong knowledge of an Indian nation or tribal culture.

37. Matthew Snipp and Joan Nagel, *The Reorganization of American Indian Ethnicity*, unpublished manuscript presented at the University of Wisconsin's Race and Ethnicity Colloquium, November 30, 1992.

38. See William Gamson, *The Strategy of Social Protest*, 2nd ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1975, 1992).

39. Severt Young Bear and Ronnie Theisz, *Standing in the Light, a Lakota Way of Seeing* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994).

40. Aldon Morris, "Centuries of Black Protest: Its Significance for America and the World," in *Race in America: The Struggle for Equality*, ed. Herbert Hill and James E. Jones (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, 1993).

41. Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren, *Critical Pedagogy, the State and Cultural Struggle* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989); Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1970).

42. Cedric Herring and Aldon Morris, "Theory and Research in Social Movements: A Critical Review," *Annual Review of Political Science,* Vol. II (New Jersey: Ablex Publishing, 1987).

43. Bert Klandermans, "The Social Construction of Protest and Multi-Organizational Fields," in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory,* ed. Aldon Morris and Carol Mueller (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991).

44. Cornell, *Return of the Native,* refers to "supratribalism" as a generalized Indian identity with a tendency to organize on the basis of that identity as opposed to particular tribal entities.

45. "First we had AIM, the original American Indian Movement that I ride with, then the non-Indians came to make the Chicago American Indian Movement (CAIM), and the yuppies came to make the same for suburbs with the suburban American Indian Movement (SAIM)," interview with Eddie Two Rivers, July 1995.

46. Original research began with support from the Sociology Department at Northwestern University and later with Northwestern's Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research in the Chicago area. Earlier versions were presented at the Midwest Sociological Society meetings in Chicago, and for the minority support programs at Ohio State University. I thank scholars with these institutions, anonymous reviewers with the *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, Susan Lobo, and especially Kurt Peters.