

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

The Power of Story

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2c73h416>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 12(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Gill, Sam

Publication Date

1988-06-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

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

Peer reviewed

The Power of Story*

SAM GILL

There are issues worthy of discussion that arise from Ward Churchill's comments on *Mother Earth*. There is also the need to state clearly, where he did not, the concerns, perspectives, and conclusions of this study. Further, I have been contacted by several journals to respond to or comment on another version of Churchill's critique, which was published in *The Bloomsbury Review* (September, 1988) along with a review article about *Mother Earth* co-authored by M. Annette Jaimes and Jorge Noriega.

The research that led to *Mother Earth* was motivated by my awareness of a remarkable incongruity between scholars' descriptions of a figure they call Mother Earth and the ethnographic record. Many notable scholars have described a figure or goddess, usually a personification of the earth, they hold to be central to the beliefs of peoples all over North America since ancient times. The incongruity was all the more complex since I was aware that some contemporary Native Americans often describe similar figures. These claims are not substantiated in the extensive ethnographic records for hundreds of tribal cultures. When I examined the descriptions by scholars to determine their evidence and sources, I found that nearly all are based on the same two statements alleged to have been made by Indians. The descriptions also make an occasional reference to specific North American cultures, most commonly Zuni and Luiseño, where the Mother Earth goddess figures. I went to the historical documents to determine historicity and to the ethnographies searching for evidence of Mother Earth and earth-related concepts (the results of this search are summarized in a bibliographic supplement to

Sam Gill is a Professor in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Colorado, Boulder.

*(Editor's Note: Professor Gill was invited to respond to Mr. Churchill's comments, and the *Journal* received this reply.)

Mother Earth, 181–191). Remarkably, what emerged were several lines of narrative, several stories, that reveal much about *American* history, particularly about the encounter between Native Americans and Americans with European ancestry. These stories continue in this encounter with W. C.

With my study challenged by intentional misrepresentations made to support a personal cause, I think it best simply to begin my response by quoting rather extensively from the conclusion to *Mother Earth*. This direct quotation also will allay any concerns that I am revising my position in my response.

I do not disagree that there are many important goddess figures throughout the tribal cultures of North America and throughout human history. I do not disagree with the structural evaluations of the primacy of a goddess identified with the earth, as mother to the earth, or as mother to all of the fruits of the earth enjoyed by humankind. What I am arguing on the one hand is that it is unproductive to collapse the many goddesses and other figures of feminine identity into a single goddess and that, at least for native North America, it would seem to be historically and ethnographically in error to do so. On the other hand, I am arguing that though the structure of Mother Earth may be primordial and archetypal, historically this structure was not formally identified nor did it take on importance until recently, that is, within the last hundred years. However, when it did take on this importance, it soon became widespread and important for Europeans, for Americans of European ancestry, and finally for Native Americans, and pretty much in that order historically. . . .

While it is far from universal in North America, I believe that there is evidence of a relatively widespread practice among Native Americans to see and to relate to the world in personal, and often kinship, terms. Beyond Native Americans there is a marked human tendency to relate to the world in this way. The natural and physical world may be divided and identified in complex categorizations that include, among many other attributes, those of sex and kinship. . . . Still,

wanting evidence of the development of these personal categories in oral tradition, in ritual personification, or in other ways of indicating them as spiritual or theological entities, . . . there is no reason to conclude that they are spiritual or theological to any degree more than all other aspects of reality so designated. . . .

Suppose for the moment that one may find one or more Native American cultures where a figure exists precisely as scholars have described Mother Earth. Or even more dramatically let us suppose that such a figure exists among most or all Native American peoples as a secret belief yet undocumented and unknown by non-native peoples. Given the diversity of Native American cultures, I find either of these propositions to be highly unlikely. But for the sake of clarifying discussion, I am quite willing to suppose that such a figure may exist. From the perspective of the study of Mother Earth, in these supposed circumstances the existence of the figure could only be structurally or historically hypothesized (for little if any documentable evidence exists) or her existence in scores of cultures would have to be based on the evidence of a very few examples (scarcely adequate by any academic standards). What is most important is the need to comprehend the fact that a century of scholarship has made such claims, based on a small set of examples, inadequate to support such a hypothesis. At the very best, as I see it, every one of these alternatives produces an undocumented hypothetical construct, a construct generated by and necessary to certain theories of religion and culture. But, as I have shown, Mother Earth has never been considered either as hypothetical or as a construct. . . .

Simple reflection upon the richness, distinctiveness, and complexity of figures such as Sedna and Selu (Es-kimo), White Buffalo Calf Woman (Sioux), Changing Woman (Navajo and Apache), the many corn women, Spider Woman (various tribes), Thought Woman (Acoma and Laguna), the Woman-who-fell-from-the-sky (Iroquoian), Atakvish (Luiseño), among hundreds more, demonstrates the distinctiveness of traditions native to

North America. I believe that there is no more basis for assuming a commonality among Native American religious beliefs from tribe to tribe, from region to region, where as many as seven distinct language stocks exist, than can be assumed between Protestant and Catholic Christians in America; or between Christians, Jews, and Moslems in the Middle East; or between any of the Western religious traditions and any of the Eastern religious traditions. Language differences are commonly held to be key to cultural and historical differences. I have been told that the degree of relatedness between Navajo and Hopi languages, the languages of peoples living for at least half a millennium geographically contiguous, is no greater than that between English and Chinese.

My argument here is extraordinarily simple. In attempts to comprehend and understand Native American tribal traditions, if any weight is placed upon the descriptions of particular cultures and their religious traditions and practices, Mother Earth, as most have described her, will not be found, yet a rich variety of female figures whose stories and characters are often complex and sophisticated will be found. Some of these figures may be associated with fertility and growth, but many of them with evil and death; some of them are treated with reverence and respect, but many of them are not; some of them are associated with the earth or with the earth's life and productivity, but many of them are not. Some of these figures can be interrelated structurally, historically, or theologically, but it is our own views that will create these interrelations.

If, on the other hand, there is an interest in finding Mother Earth in North America, most of these many Native American female figures will be seen as manifestations of her, though but a very few common examples illustrate the distinctive character that has been assigned to her.

But all of this is the critical or negative side of the consideration of Mother Earth in North America. And above all I have wanted to place this negative side in the most productive and positive light, though I have

seen no way to gain new insight without first making clearer the historical background. . . . Since I believe so firmly in the creative power of telling stories, and since stories are almost always stimulating, I have sought to tell the story of Mother Earth in North America, but it is a story composed of other stories, stories that must be told from the perspectives of the Americans, the scholars, and the Indians.

First, I believe that Mother Earth is a central figure in that long saga in which Americans of European ancestry have attempted to define and to create themselves as Americans. They have needed to do so over against Europeans and European landscapes that most had left and they also needed to do so over against the native peoples who had occupied for so much longer the lands called America. There is a line of development leading to Mother Earth that began as early as 1575. There is much revealed in this history of American imagery. America, the nation, the land, depicted as a dark-skinned woman, as an Indian, as a mother, is rich and complex. The imagery embraces the expression of the potentiality, the fruition, the bounty, the productivity of the landscape and the people. It alludes to the mystery and enticing character of America. The imagery expresses the civilizing, building, transforming aspects of Americans. Yet it also permits expression of the male, conquering, destructive, defiling aspects of the American character.

For me, a peculiar aspect of this study has been the second story, the story of the scholars. This story, of all of them, has often irritated me (and for the obvious reason that I am by profession a part of this story as this book is part of it). Many have been the times that I have been unable to comprehend how so little hard evidence has satisfied scholars much by superior. While relatively unfounded constructions often occur in scholarship and are to some extent inevitable, I, for one, have not been able to accept, without fuller understanding, that this is simply part of the nature of scholarships. I value fiction as much as academic writing, and I believe that neither has a greater claim to the

truth or responsibility for telling the truth. I nonetheless believe that academic writers are distinguished from writers of fiction by their agreement to ground their writings, their stories, in certain kinds of evidence and to proceed toward their conclusions in terms of the conventions of academe. When I found this evidence wanting, and the conventions skewed, the distinction between academic writing and fiction was greatly blurred, and I believe that in some respects this has raised the questions most problematic for me. . . .

In terms of the story of the scholars and their studies of Mother Earth, the judgments they have made and the truths they have claimed make sense when placed within the parameters of a myth which they themselves have largely constructed. For the scholars, Mother Earth is not a hypothesis, she is a figure whose existence, whose structure, whose character is the basis on which many of the disparate and complexly diffuse cultures from throughout human history and geography cohere meaningfully. She is of their myth, she is primordial, and is therefore not subject to questions of truth. Thus the questions I have raised and considered herein are not just unacceptable, they are practically unthinkable. They are heretical.

We may see that while the scholars have themselves played a very creative role in the making of Mother Earth, she has in turn served metaphorically as mother to them, for their observations and conclusions (their stories) are based upon her existence. . . .

Finally, in the third story, Mother Earth is also mother to the Indians. This study has shown that she has become so only recently and then not without influence from Americans, with their thirst for land and their need to define themselves in terms of likeness and contrast with those they imagined to be "the Indians." These historical factors neither dilute nor denigrate Mother Earth or the Indians who believe in her. In times of enormous crisis, the very identity of the Indians has in some ways depended upon her, as much so as their existence once depended upon the physi-

cal land with which she is identified. . . . While Mother Earth has not become a very prominent subject of Native American story traditions, she has become a central figure in *the* Native American story. Native Americans have embraced her as mother, and she has returned their embrace by giving them identity, purpose, responsibility, and even a sense of superiority over very powerful adversaries.

These various tales have now all come together. The story of Mother Earth as told herein is an American story. It is a story in which for Americans, whatever their heritage, Mother Earth is the mother of us all.¹

I trust readers will consult the book for the analysis from which these conclusions are drawn. The Mother Earth study provides a valuable frame within which to examine a number of the remarks made by W. C. But before I pursue that analysis, I want to respond briefly to the only aspect of the study that W. C. considers specifically: the case of Tecumseh.

Virtually all scholars who have discussed Mother Earth (I examine Tylor, Bancroft, Lang, Dieterich, Grinnell, Alexander, Frazer, Eliade, and Hultkrantz, among others) cite predominantly, and often exclusively, two Native American examples: a statement attributed to Tecumseh (Shawnee) in 1810 and a statement attributed to Smohalla (Wanapum) *circa* 1885. In two chapters I examine the documentable historicity of these statements. Tecumseh's statement is interesting in that the first evidence cited for the statement is dated 1821, eight years after his death—at just that moment in American life when the image of Tecumseh was being converted into heroic proportions. I located and examined nearly thirty accounts of the statement and many related historical documents. My conclusion is based on a judgment of the adequacy of historical documentation in that it is simply impossible to know with any degree of accuracy or of confidence whether or not Tecumseh made the alleged statement. Even of the interesting 1889 newspaper story told by Felix Bouchie (that W. C. holds I concluded *must* have occurred) I wrote, "While it is not possible to determine the historical authenticity of the bench action Tecumseh is reported to have performed [i.e., in Bouchie's story], it appears at least consistent

with the concerns Tecumseh had." Then I went on, quite in contrast to W. C.'s presentation, to indicate the significance of this consideration of historical accuracy:

The extant evidence so far examined leaves us really no basis for holding that the statement attributed to Tecumseh is historically founded. There is no evidence to support this position and much to suggest that he did not make such a statement. But by this time in our investigation this issue of historicity is not really that important or that interesting. Two other issues, however, are. First, it is important to consider Shawnee religion, to ascertain whether or not it was at all consistent with the conclusions drawn by Gregg, Tylor, and many others from the alleged Tecumseh statement. (There are some surprises in this story.) But even more important is the second issue. What in American history, in the American ethos, motivated the strong attachment to the Tecumseh story and to the imagery of a brave Indian chief sitting resolutely on the bosom of his mother, the earth, in defiance of the great white father, General Harrison? To answer this question, a much longer view of American history and the imaging of Indians must be presented.²

And I proceed to consider these two issues.

W. C. intentionally misrepresents my study so that he may show his true colors, his special style of hate: he, supported by the quotation of an *unnamed* historian, likens my study of Tecumseh to Arthur Butz's *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century: The Case Against the Presumed Extermination of European Jewry*; he, supported by an *anonymous* Indian scholar, brands me "a lunatic, not worth the time and energy to argue with." Such shenanigans are utterly irresponsible, obnoxious, and vulgar. They have no place in a serious scholarly journal, but represent only one current example of McCarthyism.

In some respects the most confounding, yet certainly the most humorous, of W. C.'s ridiculous conclusions is his identification of me and *Mother Earth* with the group of authors he identifies as New Age. It is humorous to me, since if this is correct, I surely made a huge economic mistake by seeking The University of Chicago Press as my publisher.

I am well aware that the term "Mother Earth" is frequently used in New Age literature. While writing *Mother Earth* I was aware that those who would read it expecting it to be about these New Age ideas would likely be disappointed. I am not sure I know the ideological boundaries of those who are referred to by the term New Age, but some at least must be identified as the present generation of those Americans described in *Mother Earth* who are trying to identify themselves as Americans in the American landscape, often in terms appropriated from Native Americans, if not through the creation of outright fiction about them. W. C. is severely critical of New Age thinkers and, in one respect, I agree with him. That was made clear in *Mother Earth*. Though I would defend the rights of any people to be inspired by and influenced by other traditions, to do so superficially and to claim special knowledge of the source traditions is to engage in what can only be termed domination and conquest. But keeping separate the stories (the discourses), especially where they hold common imagery like Mother Earth, is one possible way that traditions may continue to be legitimately inspired and influenced by one another without also participating in a discourse of domination. This is one thing that *Mother Earth* attempts to show. That is why, upon examination of the scholarship concerning Mother Earth, I concluded that there are unfortunate consequences when the scholars' story of Mother Earth is not acknowledged as separate from the various tribal and pan-tribal conceptions of the earth and of Mother Earth. Of the scholarly understanding of Mother Earth, I wrote that

It is a story that not only reflects, but effects, an understanding of the world and its many peoples. It is a story of the oneness of humankind, but a story in which the many peoples of the world are hierarchically inter-related with one another. It is a story that makes Native Americans primitives when compared with European-Americans. It is a story that supports a range of social, economic, and political relationships, very likely oppressive, among peoples in America.³

Lest W. C. seize this as another opportunity to misrepresent, I emphasize the obvious: that I deplore these consequences.

This notion is elaborated in an article "Mother Earth Mythology," *World & I* (July 1987), in which I wrote that "It must be

acknowledged that a logic of domination and conquest has motivated and shaped even this academic study [i.e., of Native Americans]."⁴ I elaborate upon this in terms of Mother Earth as well as even the common terms "trickster" and "myth."

W. C. repeatedly uses such phrases as: "the Mother Earth concept;" "the original indigenous meaning of it [i.e., 'the Mother Earth concept'];" "a well-developed indigenous Mother Earth concept operant in North America before contact;" "an ongoing and autonomous Native American conceptualization of Mother Earth;" and, speaking of the thesis of *Mother Earth*, "the thesis that its subject had never been a *bona fide* element of indigenous tradition at all." W. C. holds that there is, and has been since before the European presence, a single conception—he calls it the "Mother Earth concept"—held by what he considers a single indigenous tradition. One concept, one tradition. Notably W. C., who identifies himself as Creek/Cherokee, makes not a single reference to Creek or Cherokee traditions, nor to any other tribal traditions. He does not give so much as a single sentence to provide content to what he calls "possibly the most central of all Native American spiritual concepts." We likely learn much of W. C.'s story in observing that he makes not a single reference to a tribal tradition, yet he makes extensive reference to a whole commercially successful literature on Indians, to numerous political works, to Buddhism (of which he claims expertise beyond those of the Naropa Institute), and to several politically-oriented statements by contemporary Indians. Ironically, this is not the case with Russell Means. In an interview conducted by M. Annette Jaimes that accompanied her review of *Mother Earth*, Jaimes leads Means to make comments about me and *Mother Earth*. It is obvious that Means has not read the book. At one point the following exchange takes place:

JAIMES: Could you explain the Indian concept of Mother Earth?

MEANS: No, I couldn't. And the reason for this is that there isn't one. What there is are several hundred different Indian concepts concerning the Earth and its feminine characteristics. Each Indian people, each Indian culture, has its own concepts and traditions. We were never so homogenized as Europeans became. Oh, I'm sure that at some level or another these concepts and traditions have commonalities, but there are

dramatic differences, culture by culture. The traditions and concepts of each Indian culture belong to that culture. Such things are theirs. No one appointed me to speak for them, just as no one appointed Sam Gill. It would be just as wrong for me to purport to have some sort of mystical right to speak in this way as it is for Sam Gill or anyone else. Unlike some people, I chose not to make my living as a culture thief.

JAIMES: Well then, could you describe Mother Earth just from the perspective of your own people, the Lakota?

MEANS: Only up to a point. . . . First, there's nothing in our tradition which remotely resembles some sort of "earth goddess." Never has and never will be. What we are acknowledging in the concept which has become known in English as Mother Earth is an elemental force of nature, a tangible fact, which is that the earth itself gives birth to and nurtures all life. All life flows directly from the earth, and that's a feminine principle. It's that simple. All you have to do is watch a blade of grass come up or a bulb sprout to understand.⁵

I fully agree with Means's insistence that every tribal tradition must be taken in its own right, on its own terms. I am distressed that Means falsely accuses me of being a "culture thief." W. C. indicates in his essay that in *Mother Earth* I referred to material he had "ghost-written for others." He was referring to Russell Means's "Fighting Words on the Future of the Earth," *Mother Jones* (December 1980).

In terms of the stories told in *Mother Earth* we can see that Means, at least in the cited interview, speaks as a Lakota (although not in tribally specific terms but in those virtually indistinguishable from those who speak for the New Age) and hence places himself within one of the hundreds of distinct tribal traditions. Yet he acknowledges the effect of English and the artificial construction of the general category referred to by the English term "Mother Earth" which I am claiming was influenced by Americans of European ancestry. Means agrees by acknowledging that the very language of the term Mother Earth is not Native American. W. C., on the other hand, who acknowledges but one monolithic Indian tradition and a single commonly held "Mother

Earth concept," stands within the story tradition I have identified as "the Indians," those Native Americans who, as a result of a history of oppression, find at least one dimension of their identity in the terms of their common struggle against oppression—i.e., their identity is in part dependent upon distinguishing themselves from what they perceive as "white" Americans. Though W. C. presents no tribally-based content for or exemplification of his understanding of the Mother Earth concept—though he presents no content for it at all—he passionately defends Mother Earth against what he perceives as the enemy. From the perspective of the story he tells, in the terms of his tradition of discourse, any non-Indian writing about Native Americans is labeled a "culture thief" and requires an acrid response. The book *Mother Earth* and I as its author represent the new enemy. Enemies of whom? The coterie of hangers-on who claim special responsibility for protecting an orthodox view about Native American peoples and cultures. W. C. writes with the kind of passion that, though it is contrived and is assumed as a political device, attests to the fact that, in the context of his story, Mother Earth is a term of power and emotion, a term whose defense is inseparable from defending one's very identity, personal and cultural. Had he a basic integrity even with respect to his own story, I could appreciate the political motivation of W. C.'s endeavor. I recognize that the challenge to one identified as an oppressor must be made as radically and powerfully as possible. Still, W. C.'s spirit of meanness is but an impairment in a world where many peoples must learn to coexist in peace and with mutual respect.

Though W. C.'s comments on my ideas about teaching are only tangential to the issues at hand, I gleefully take the opportunity to respond to them. In W. C.'s view of teaching, to admit to an area of ignorance is inappropriate to a university teacher. He holds that one should teach not from ongoing research interests but from a pre-existing body of knowledge, though I suspect that were I to claim any knowledge at all of Native Americans, W. C. would deny such an accomplishment is possible for a non-Indian. So much for modern racist thinking. To be attentive to student questions and concerns, even as a stimulus for developing a research agenda, is in his terms to "pitch your presentation to a crowd," by which I take it he is saying that I only cater to popular knowledge. His statement also reveals his view of students

as a mob, where no one person is distinguishable from any other. In light of my understanding of Mother Earth there is a certain irony in W. C.'s misunderstanding of my teaching approaches. Any careful reader of *Mother Earth* will know that the conclusions of this book challenge the unquestioned orthodox views of the broad American populace, including dedicated scholars and persons like W. C.

Again, lest I be thought to be concocting a revised position, especially since the lecture to which W. C. refers is relatively obscure in its published form, I want to quote several passages from this lecture, entitled "The Continuity of Research and Classroom Teaching, or How to Have Your Cake and Eat It Too."

I believe that student questions and concerns may be important in shaping research. I have tried to listen carefully to student questions, especially those that seem most naive or those I find most difficult to answer. It is notable that in our own [speaking to faculty] advanced education the questions we ask become increasingly narrow. . . .

I find it puzzling that for such a long time I did not appreciate the enormous significance of the discontinuity of learning styles demanded of students compared with those learning approaches used in research. I think that the whole teaching environment, including the grading system and faculty course/questionnaires, fosters this discontinuity. We may see this development beginning at the lowest levels of public school education. In undergraduate teaching, as in teaching from the primary grades through high school, we tend to present information, to lecture, to explain, to assign readings, to expect students to acquire mastery of information, as well as to gain competence in writing and speech. Students are examined and evaluated primarily on this basis. By our very style of teaching and evaluating students, even if we make every effort to demonstrate the fragile and volatile nature of knowledge, we present our subjects as though they are fully known and unchanging; as though they are constituted by facts that are so secure as to be subject to simple examination, often using bubble forms.

We usually see that our task, particularly at the undergraduate level, is to clarify, to systematize, to resolve conflicts, to codify, to present principles, to encompass, to simplify. We are judged by our ability to do these things. We find ourselves uncomfortable or threatened if we can't meet the demands of students to simplify, to clearly systematize, to declare right from wrong, to give answers. We fear to reveal our own misgivings, our own sense of confusion, our own gaps in understanding. We feel that were we to do so, we would suffer in the students' and our colleagues' view of us, in our ability to control students, to be authoritative.

However, if we really believe that the world is as we present it to students, we would have no motivation to do research. To engage research one must have a problem, a dissatisfaction, something unexplained, the perception of a crack or void in a system, a code that doesn't compute [in other words, an acknowledged ignorance]. All basic research stems from dissatisfaction, discontinuity, gaps of reason, failed principles, and omissions. As researchers we are driven by feelings of disharmony to learn, to test, to examine, to think, to ponder, to lose sleep. While our objective is the resolution of this disharmony, we know in our hearts that any achieved harmony is but temporary and not in itself our goal. Our objective is to acquire problems and incongruities not so much to resolve them as to motivate the formulation of hypothetic constructs and theories that we might by means of them investigate the world or some tiny aspect of it with the hope that we might see more fully, more *wonderfully*.

Yet, in our approach to teaching, we deny our students access to what motivates us as researchers. It seems we do all we can to push them as far away as possible from the learning methods we ourselves depend upon for our very lives. As I am trying to think about this now, it seems to me that this disparity in style and method between classroom teaching and research is what, more than anything, inhibits our effectiveness as teachers. Thus it is, I believe, that through introspection the researcher, whose life is devoted to

learning, may tap the resources and methods that can lead to the most effective teaching. I believe that if we take ourselves at all seriously as researchers we must greatly revise our approach to undergraduate teaching. This also means that active research is essential not simply to have something to say to students, but because for the most effective teaching there must be a continuity of academic skills and perspectives from research to the classroom. . . .

I am now thinking that teaching should be a more collegial, more personal, more mutually engaging activity; one where teacher and students join in the often fumbling, but always stimulating, learning process. . . . Students must be seen as fellow learners. The main difference between students and faculty is that the faculty person has had more experience and more practice.⁶

I am proud that some of my ignorances are revealed in the dynamic process of teaching, that I may learn along with students, that I may share my research process as well as results with students at every level.

Mother Earth is a book about the power of story. We all live by stories. They give context and substance to the vitality of the meaning we find in life. The shared stories of the communities to which we belong give us cultural identity. The stories of our personal lives give us individual identity. The English term "Mother Earth" appears simultaneously in several separate, but intersecting, distinctively American story traditions. We might understand Mother Earth in terms of discourse theory which holds that words have no meanings apart from the particular discourses in which the words, the language, are used. A word that means one thing in the context of one discourse (story) means something different in the context of another discourse (story). Meaning is created in the use of language in discourse. Such analysis is foundational to peaceful tolerance in a world comprised of many discourses, a world full of different story traditions. *Mother Earth* attempts to untangle several story traditions that intersect at the words "Mother Earth." These stories heretofore have been more or less merged. To see them anew as several discourses in which the common term "Mother Earth" means

many different things provides a base for peaceful understanding and tolerance. To know one's own story as well as the stories of others permits fuller understanding and greater acceptance without fear.

NOTES

1. Sam D. Gill, *Mother Earth: An American Story* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 151-58.
2. *Ibid.*, 26.
3. *Ibid.*, 128.
4. Sam D. Gill, "Mother Earth Mythology," *World & I* (July 1987): 591.
5. M. Annette Jaimes, "On 'Mother Earth': An Interview with Russell Means," *The Bloomsbury Review* (September/October 1988): 26.
6. Sam Gill, "The Continuity of Research and Classroom Teaching, or How to Have Your Cake and Eat It Too," in *On Teaching*, ed. Mary Ann Shea (Boulder: Faculty Teaching Excellence Program, University of Colorado, Boulder, 1987), 70, 72-73, 75.