AMERICAN INDIAN CULTURE AND RESEARCH JOURNAL 7:4 (1984) 51-68

American Indian Political Participation: From Melting Pot to Cultural Pluralism

SILVESTER J. BRITO

American Indians have never played a viable role in the political arena of the United States. They have never been afforded the socio-economic strength by Anglo-American society to establish a powerful political base. This essay, then, will provide an explanation of why political power has eluded American Indians and what chance they have in becoming a participating and policy-making force in mainstream American society.

The crux of the problem of Indian-White relationships in the United States seems to lie in two opposing visions of what American society should be. The first of these, the melting pot vision, assumed the assimilation of people of diverse cultures into a single homogeneous society, generally dedicated to Judeo-Christian religion, republican government and financial opportunity. That vision of American society, implicit from the time of the American Revolution and popularized in 1908 by Israel Zangwill's enormously successful play "The Melting Pot," was taught in the schools and was the dominant ideal through the 1950s. The second vision of American society, that of the cultural pluralists, was one in which diverse cultures were to coexist in peace and mutual respect under a common national government.

Ethnic minorities from Europe, such as the Germans, Irish, Italians, Jews and Poles, achieved early political success in the

Silvester J. Brito is a member of the English Dept. at the University of Wyoming, Laramie.

United States because they tended to accept the process of assimilation. They came to America willing to change their languages and their lifestyles in order to become participating members of the newly created nation. However, with the exception of the Jewish immigrants, they already shared the Christian faith and linguistic roots with the society they entered. In addition they often sought representative government and economic opportunity. Jews, though they shared religious roots with Christians, found assimilation more difficult, but they had achieved local political power as early as the 1930s. Even Blacks, culturally if not racially assimilated, have been more successful since the 1960s in affecting American policy than have American Indians.

Unlike the European immigrants and Black arrivals, American Indians were already here and participating in ongoing established societies with their own religions, customs and laws to guide their life styles. Indians were active in self-government within their own nations or tribes. They had formed autonomous societies. And during the Europeans' period of settlement and expansion, the Indians did not depend upon European sovereigns to grant them the privilege of self-government. In the early colonial era they did not seek the sanction of the expansionist nations, such as England, France and Spain, for the right to own their own land and govern themselves. They considered themselves independent nations and were dealt with as such by the governments to which they sold land or made treaties of alliance. Thus, at the onset, because of their great land base and larger populations the Indians had bargaining power with these European nations.

During the colonial era, however, Indian tribes were caught in currents of European wars; i.e., in order to preserve their lands they found it necessary to ally themselves with one European nation in order to resist aggression by another. In consequence, the fate of Indian nations such as the Iroquois rested on the outcome of wars they neither began nor controlled. In 1763, when the English established control over eastern North America, the six nations of the Iroquois confederacy, who had been England's chief allies in the preceding half century, appeared to have preserved their lands and way of life. Twelve years later however, at the outbreak of the American Revolution, the Iroquois' continued adherence to England was to result in the devastation

of many of their towns and their removal from some of their traditional lands. In brief, Indian nations and tribes lost their political bargaining power after the American Revolution. They were not treated as sovereign nations by the United States "but were relegated to the status of 'dependent nations,' whose lands were subject to confiscation or forced sale, . . . "[they] were considered [as] . . . 'wards' of the new American government."[1]

It appears that this attitude toward the Indians as a subjugated people was inevitable. "By an act of May 1783 North Carolina simply declared that all lands within her jurisdiction, with the exception of some between the French Broad and Tennessee rivers, had been forfeited by the Indians."[2] Moreover, Jackson's signing of The Removal Act on May 28, 1830, set the stage for the American's disposition of the Indians.

The reality of the Indians' helpless position as a viable political force in American society, by virtue of their ancient possession, either of soil or sovereignty, was illustrated in the subjugating power of the Trade and Intercourse Act of 1834. "Although President Jackson had promised the . . . (removed Indians) . . . self-rule and sovereignty in the West, the 1834 act stated that American laws would take precedence over Indian Laws and customs in all cases involving Indians and Whites."[3] In essence, the ruling set forth by the Trade and Intercourse Act was applicable to all Indian nations or tribes. The Civil War did not offer the Indians a way out of this precarious dilemma.

Despite tribal alignments with either the North or the South, the Civil War turned out to be a disaster for the Indians. Both the Union and the Confederacy shared similar objectives: to recruit the aid of the more settled eastern Indians and make peace with the independent warlike Plains tribes. In essence, the Indian policies of the Americans were just another phase in the White man's overall effort to divide and conquer the tribes. "The chief results of the Civil War for the Indians was that it settled the sectional questions dividing the Whites, and prepared the way for the settlement of the West and the final defeat of the Indians."[4] Thus White politics, for war is only the most violent form of political action, began to shape Indian politics.

After the Civil War, when slaves could not be returned to Africa and land beyond the Mississippi was in demand for White settlement, a "Melting Pot" program was developed to solve the

Indian question. Initiating this new line of Indian policy reform were William Penn and the Friends of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, a concerned group that was set upon Americanizing the Indian. This acculturationist group who called themselves "the friends of the Indian" dominated American Indian policy for more than three decades (1868–1900). As crusaders for Christianity and the American way of life, they set forth a three part reform: "First . . . break up the tribal relations and their reservation base and . . . individualize the Indian on a 160 acre homestead by the allotment of land in severalty. Second . . .make the Indians citizens . . . and third . . . provide a universal government school system that would make good Americans out of the rising generation of Indians."[5] There were four major factors which would support this acculturation process: one, most of the Indian agents, during President Grant's two term administration, were members of the above Indian reform organization; two, the passing of the Dawes Land Allotment Act in 1887; three, the passing of the Curtis Act of 1897 (it dissolved the governments of those tribes who refused allotment); and four, with full support from eastern humanitarians and "the friends of the Indians," the Indian Bureau was set upon civilizing the tribes. By dispossessing the Indians of their tribal lands (these being the base for the Indians' political power) and subjugating them to western education, the Americans completed their basic Indian reformation goal, Americanization of the Indians. Consequently, until the future passing of the 1932 Indian Reorganization Act, there were no more Indian nations as political entities within the United States.

With status neither as dependent nations nor as enfranchised citizens, all the Indian tribes were without political power. Even as representatives of Indian "nations" such as that of the Cherokee, they had the power to lobby, but they had no effective vote in the legislative halls either of the state or nation. White legislators sought the votes of a White electorate, and the Indian; but the Indian, being designated as either the ward of the U.S. Government or as a citizen of a separate Indian nation, had no vote. There was little political profit, therefore, in having enclaves of Indians within a state. Hence, removal of the Indians, with governmental support and promise of governmental payments for a period of years after removal, was analogous in some ways to the colonization scheme advanced to solve the early Black slave

problem. Both rested upon the assumption that these peoples were unassimilable and must be separated from White American society for their own good and that of the society.

The Indian policy which resulted from these situations may have had some remote aspects of cultural pluralism. Indian tribal life might have been recognized and tolerated, provided it existed in the remote regions beyond the Mississippi. Unfortunately, this progressive venture was not realized, for the Americans were set upon complete subjugation of the American Indian. "Following the Indian Removal Act of 1830, . . . the United States . . . got into tribal politics by deposing antagonistic head men and replacing them with secondary leaders amenable to actions proposed by the United States."[6] Indian agents beleaguered non-progressive chiefs. "To accomplish anything they had to work either through real chiefs who happened also to be progressives or through progressives promoted to chieftainship by the agent."[7] This type of internal Indian-White political contamination appears to continue into the latter part of the twentieth century. According to the views of two Hopi Indian traditionalists (one from 1st Mesa, the other from 2nd Mesa), who I interviewed in 1972, matters have hardly changed for the American Indian since the beginning of the aforesaid progressive era (1830 and into the latter half of the 1900s) of American imperialism. They said that traditional head men from all three Mesas (for each Hopi Mesa was an autonomous political unit) would not acknowledge the concept of a "Hopi Tribal Council," and therefore they would not attend those council meetings that were generally held with an agent from the BIA (Bureau of Indian Affairs). Only Hopi who were members of less politically powerful clans (such as the Coyote Clan, versus the more powerful Bear Clan in Hopi society) agreed to become part of the tribal council which was formed by Federal Government Agents. Based upon the dictates of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, "a Hopi Tribal Council was organized, but the traditionalists or conservatives among them never recognized the legitimacy of this organization and have refused to elect representatives to it."[8]

From another perspective, though similar to the aforesaid one, the viable political power of the Indian in Anglo-American society has not been vastly enhanced. Up to the present period, most members of White American society have habitually seen the social universe as oriented around the states which they control.

Some of them, such as "the friends of the Indian," may have viewed the American Indian with sympathy but always from an imperialistic frame of reference, one which expects the Indian to adjust to the dictates of White political institutions. "The BIA [after World War II] controlled the Indians both directly and subtly, because government officials thought Indians could not manage their own affairs, and the more the bureau made decisions, the less the Indians could do so, for they never got any practical experience."[9] This era marked a new change in Indian policy; both people of authority as well as Congress believed that the Indian should be assimilated.

Adding to the complexity of these matters, numerous Whites continue to be under the old illusion that Indian societies are vanishing. Whites who are not in contact with reservations still view the Indian as the noble, vanishing American. They do not realize that Indian societies still continue. They fail to recognize that Indians are no longer in the old colonial state, but have changed and are capable of becoming effective, participating members of the greater society. Those Whites do not recognize that there is a continuity in Indian societies; neither do they realize "the various frames of reference in terms of which Indians view themselves and the people with whom they are in contact."[10] Not only have Indians survived conquest, dispossession, dislocation and genocide, but they have continued to adapt in their own styles to successive changes in their social and political environments. In fact there has been a unique development of circumstances which has brought about an unusual ethnic continuity among Indians; these circumstances are more prevalent than ever. Fred Eggan sums up the establishment's view of this phenomena.

> . . . the basic conflict between the goal of full participation in American life *and* the maintenance of Indian identity is a difficult problem. In American society we find it hard to treat societies as different but equal —differences are usually evaluated as superior and inferior. And Indians themselves are divided as to how much of traditional life they wish to maintain and how it can be accomplished. In the last analysis it is the Indians themselves who will make the basic decision. There is currently a great ferment on many reservations

> and increased communication between different Indian groups and between Indians and Whites. Out of this dialogue will come a greater realization that the future of the Indians is in their hands and that they must decide their own destiny. For it is their dependent status that is their greatest problem, as it is with all the new nations in our post-war world.[11]

Eggan believes that American Indians occupy a paradoxical position: they want to be participating members of the greater society while at the same time maintaining their identity as Indians. Eggan suggests that if American Indians take the road of preserving and maintaining what is left of their Indian culture, they will continue to be inferior in the eyes of American society—which is not conditioned to allow for cultural differences; rather, it prefers to support the old Melting Pot theory. Philip Gleason states that as far back as 1915 this point of view was attacked "as betrayal of true Americanism . . . and most other progressives agreed that what Kallen called cultural pluralism offered a much more attractive model."[12]

It is true that Indians are divided in their political views. The older traditionalists wish to be let alone to live their lives out as close to the old ways as possible, and the younger group of militants aspire to return to the life styles of their forefathers. On the other hand, the educated class and also the more progressive middle-aged Indians wish to adapt to the dictates of Western American society, to become better educated, and also to submerge their older archaic traditional ways. Consequently, these socio-cultural ideals tend to work against each other and the American Indians lose a cohesive base as a viable political force in Anglo-American society.

This writer feels that it is important for Indians to become better educated, because by doing so they have both a defensive measure against complete acculturation and also a means of attaining equal political status within American society. Margaret Nick, a young mother from Alaska stated, "One thing I know is, if my children are proud, if my children have identity, if my children know who they are and if they're proud to be who they are, they'll be able to encounter anything in life. I think this is what education means."[13] Senator Edward M. Kennedy reasserts and supports Nick's point of view. "From a history of neglect and despair

the Indian is beginning to emerge and to demand his own identity and share of American life. It has been a long time in coming, this new Indian self-consciousness."[14] Furthermore, education is a significant factor for maintaining the cultural identity of Indians because no matter how hard they try to blend in, unless they become washed out through the process of intermarriage with Whites, they will always be viewed in the eyes of White American society as Indians. They cannot go back to living in the old Pre-Columbian life style, for there is not enough land available to them for the economic support of the growing Indian population. They must, therefore, find an alternative which will allow them the privilege of being participating members of Western society, while at the same time having the autonomy to make their own rules of governance within the particularistic nation, tribe or group. Actively implementing these ideas are the Seneca Indians. "In 1976 the Seneca of the Allegheny Reservation signed an agreement with the State of New York as equals. This was the first time since the early 1800s that the state recognized the sovereign or national status of the Seneca.[15] The significance of this transaction is that the Seneca, operating with power from their land base, were able to exert political pressure upon a decision making process which involved members from the great society.

Indian scholars such as Vine Deloria, Jr. and D'Arcy McNickle believe that American Indian people should have the right to make their own decisions. This point of view is based on the premise that tribal leaders are in a better position than the outsider to make such decisions because such decisions will be based on their collective experiences. If tribal leaders had this autonomous power, the people would support their decisions. And if the decisions turned out to be dysfunctional, they would have the power to revise them or discard them in favor of some which are more operational.

Vine Deloria, Jr. suggests that Indian people should be allowed the privilege of group sovereignty, that this type of political power is essential to the welfare of the American Indian. He states that in the past decades this type of collective group power has been lost in the "quicksand of assimilationist theories which destroy the power of the group to influence its own future."[16] The American Indian people within their own respective nations,

tribes or groups must exercise the power of their sovereignty. This is the only political avenue by which they can ever hope to change those policies which currently prevent them from realizing their privilege as equal participating members in the greater society. Deloria believes that it is absolutely essential for the group to take the basic position of a "sovereign, autonomous nation which must be treated as an equal entity [by] the federal and state governments."[17] Deloria's political views fall within the scope of the principles of cultural pluralism, calling attention to the would-be role of the subdominant group and its power to affect the political machine of the greater society.

D'Arcy McNickle, on the other hand, raises the question of what is to be done with those diverse Indian groups who have accepted part of the White man's ways but do not wish to participate in the full social order of White society. He believes that, even though this particular position would present a problem, there should be some way for American society to allow for this type of nonconformity.[18] McNickle, however, raises the poignant question, "can a political democracy, which is organized to permit its participating citizens to enjoy freedom of conscience and action, extend its scope to include citizens who, because they live differently, are not fully participating?"[19]

McNickle's query is answered in Robert A. Manner's statement that American Indians must shed their subdominant position as second class citizens and thus partake of the privileges held by members of the dominant society. In order for this goal to be realized, Indians must detach themselves from their wardship status (with the Federal Government) even though it has provided them with some form of security and protection.[20] This point of view reiterates the older principles of the melting pot theory. In essence what this means is that in order for all American citizens, especially the Indians, to be able to participate in the greater society and enjoy the same socio-economic and political privileges as others, they must abandon their position as a group distinct from the mainstream of American society.

Manners also believes that it is idealistic for academics and other supporters of Indian justice to believe that non-conforming Indians may be provided the same opportunity as other Americans to choose their ways of life.[21] He believes that even if the Indian was legally allowed such a special privilege, there is slight

probability of having the laws implemented. He supports his argument against a multicultural society by saying that the supporters of the Indians' cause have placed so much emphasis on "what the group shall be guaranteed, or what the group shall be aided in doing," [22] that the Indians' freedom of choice has been hindered. In essence, Manners believes that the American Indian would be better off shedding his Federal wardship status and throwing off his traditional ways, and by so doing, become so assimilated that he will become a full participating member in American society.

Manners' argument against a multicultural society is also based on the premise that even though it is an idealistic matter, it tends to exploit and create a subordinate status for the subdominant group. This point of view is in agreement with that of Fred Eggan, that in American society the recognition of another people as being different places them in an inferior status.

In his fervent argument against a multicultural society, Manners states that if the Indian is to survive in current American society, he must undergo the loss of his group identity as "others have had to pay this price before." [23] He seems to forget that "these others" (assuming he is referring to the early pilgrims and later immigrant minorities) came to the New World for the purpose of either creating a new society, and in this process abandoned their native traditional ways, or adjusting to the norms of their newly adopted society.

Tom Bethell, a Washington editor for *Harper's* magazine, is a traditional advocate of the melting pot ideal. In fact he opposes education that would lead to a multicultural society. He objects to bilingual-bicultural education in the public schools. Bethell believes that this form of education would prevent minority children from becoming proficient in the English language. Furthermore, "our educational system is finding it increasingly difficult today to teach English-speaking children to read their own language." [24] Bethell's main concern, then, is that the promotion of bilingual-bicultural programs will hinder the needs of Anglo-American students. He also implies that putting Anglos into bilingual-bicultural programs is a negative move. This exposes them, he states, "to the kind of cultural revisionism that is the covert purpose behind so much of the bilingual program. Put more simply, Mary Beth and Sue Anne would at last learn the truth: the Indians, not the cowboys, were the good guys, Texas

was an ill-gotten gain, and so on."[25] In essence, Bethell objects to having Anglo-American children exposed to alternative historical views. But despite his objections, and those of others who agree with him, the school systems are becoming the testing grounds of a multicultural society. Some educators, at least, are hospitable to the experiment.

John Aragon, for example, feels that the change in policy toward the establishment of a multicultural society must begin in the public education system. He states that "the true impediment to cultural pluralism is that we have had culturally deficient educators attempting to teach culturally different children."[26] Unlike anthropologist Fred Eggan, he places the responsibility for achieving cultural compatibility upon the Anglo-American establishment and not on the Indian. Such compatibility would then lead to a more equal exchange of cultural values by both societies. Furthermore, the irony in Aragon's statement is that if educators continue to work in such a state of naivety, then we become culturally deficient by not acknowledging other cultural differences. The core of Aragon's statement suggests, I believe, that Americans must come to terms with the realities of the world. Anything short of this will lead to spiritual destruction. Sticking to one belief system when others are being placed before our eyes is a failure to come to terms with the realities of the world. On the Medicine Wheel lie all of the parts of creation: those that we know and love and those that we fear and hate; these views are manifest in our philosophy and the others' philosophy of the world. Hence, the proper condition for the growth of any society, more especially that of American society, is to acquire a point of view of open-mindedness. This is a progressive state which will allow us to let all aspects of reality flow freely in and out of our consciousness, thus providing us with a more complete picture of the universe. Understanding words, concepts and ideas from other cultures will help us achieve this goal.

Don Davies and Miriam Clasby, both educators, recognize and support the positive value of a multicultural society. They believe that it is in the best interest for the future of the Nation to move in the direction of a pluralistic society. Education is the best place for the beginning of this development. Not only is education interested in promoting an awareness of multicultural values, but, moreover, it must have an explicit goal to teach for participation

in decision making. An effective multicultural education program must prepare its members to make judgements which affect their lives and to understand those contradictions that arise from newly created situations. This point of view is in agreement with Vine Deloria and D'Arcy McNickle's argument that the Indian is in the best position to determine the needs of his particular nation, tribe or group.

Students of Indian history such as Deloria and McNickle realize that there is political factionalism among all Indian tribes. Moreover, it is evident that the tribes cannot resolve their internal differences unless they have the autonomy to do so. Davies and Clasby support this point of view, for they state that "a focus on decision making and on contradictions within individual or group experiences clarifies basic questions about where exploitation is, where advantage flows." For "if education is to be other than indoctrination and adaptation to the existing system, it must utilize all means to prepare for participation in decision-making."[27] Hence, it is clear that the key to solving tribal differences, internally and externally, is education. The following cases are prime examples of how education can be used as a vehicle to serve the socio-cultural needs of the American Indian. As a result of intertribal cooperative efforts in Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Minneapolis, Minnesota, those cities have alternative schools for Indian children; and since July 1966, the Navajos in Rough Rock, Arizona have a fine elementary school program in bilingual education. Also, in Shiprock, New Mexico the Navajo nation has an alternative high school program for students who have been forced out of state and BIA operated schools. The Ojibwa at Lac Courte Oreilles, Wisconsin are unique among the various tribal operated school programs for they have both, an elementary and a high school. Rick St. Germaine, superintendent of the Lac Courte Oreilles Indian schools, states why Indian schools, run by Indians, are necessary: "We don't want our kids to lose their culture. We don't want them to lose the essence and meaning of their heritage, and we want to reinforce positive self-identity and self-images for themselves and their families and their people."[28] In time, more tribes will follow their example. With education as their new survival weapon, Indians will be able to better participate in American politics.

Notwithstanding the overall slow developmental process in which Indian people have worked to gain more political strength

within the American system, there are a few areas where they have made significant progress. Since the 1930s, Indians have learned the strengths and weaknesses of the court system and have become more adept in using the courts as a political tool to protect their civil rights and various aspects of their traditional ways. As one major example, on September 25, 1980 the U.S. District Court in Tacoma, Washington upheld a decision to preserve the fishing rights of the Northwest coast tribes.[29] An older piece of litigation played an important part in laying the groundwork for the operational effectiveness of these court actions. This was the Indian Claims Commission (ICC) established on August 13, 1946. This legislative act made it possible for Indians to file suits against the government.[30]

Within the context of religious freedom the action taken by the Supreme Court to support the Peyote religion[31] has preserved religious pluralism among Native American societies and the greater American society; and though the passage of the Indian Reorganization Act (Howard-Wheeler Act) of June 1934 was not entirely beneficial for all Indians, as seen in the aforementioned Hopi case, tribal government was reestablished for several tribes.[32] The significance of this action is that it provided the Indians with an economic land base, a foundation for political power. And, since the passage of the "Indian Self-Determination and Educational Act," a few tribes, notably the Zuni, have assumed the responsibility for decisions affecting their reservations.[33] The Menominee of northern Wisconsin have also been active in handling the internal and external problems which face their three major communities. In 1961 these acculturating people attempted to live and govern themselves like the White man, thus dissolving their tribal status. But within a year's time, they realized that they were not culturally prepared to make this change. Shortly thereafter, they applied to the United States Congress to be reinstated as a tribe, and in 1973 it was so granted. Not only have the Menominee been successful in bringing about reinstatement of their tribal status, but they also hold elections for tribal leaders and representatives to the greater society.

Since urban Indians are isolated and composed of many people from different tribal groups, it appears that their greatest political strength lies in united Pan-Indian movements. The Native American Church of North America is a corporate group which provides Indians with socio-political and religious support.

Other Indian organizations which provide a forum for political activities are the National Tribal Chairmen's Association, the National Congress of American Indians, the National Council on Indian Opportunity and the more militant American Indian Movement. These organizations not only help to strengthen the Indians' morale and provide them with an incentive to assert control over their people, but also encourage them to exercise a greater initiative in the areas of self-determination and tribal sovereignty. Henceforth, as Indian movements organize, present their social issues and gain representatives in legislature, they will gain voice and a greater decision making role in the American political arena.

Having explored some of the affects of cultural pluralism with regard to the Indians' viable role in affecting American policy, let us turn our attention to some of the general political views held by American Indians. The younger generations have become more militant than the older traditional leaders who pursue their political endeavors through those avenues open to them such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, state and national legislatures, as well as the local, state and federal courts. By their militancy the younger generations have attempted to bring their plight before the eyes of the Nation. Examples of such activism are the conflict between Indian leaders and Whites which occurred in Wounded Knee, South Dakota in 1973 and the political march to Washington, from the west to the east coast, during the Presidential campaign of 1976. These endeavors did not bring about the desired results because many of the people involved in these campaigns were restrained by law enforcement agencies. This type of political activity is still in its developmental stage; therefore, its direction and effectiveness remains to be seen.

Data on political identification and ideology for American Indians is difficult to come by, probably because they constitute only .04 percent of America's total population. When surveys are conducted in either American Indian urban communities or on reservations, they are only minimally effective, chiefly because of language and cultural barriers. In the 1980 census, figures reflected "a drastic undercount of Chicago's Indian population."[34] During this initial census process, members of the Chicago Indian community recognized that there were many Indians who were not being counted. Thus a lack of coordination between the Indian community and Census Department staff resulted in a

gross undercount.[35] In addition to this type of communications problem, White sociological concepts and terminology are meaningless to most Indians. Furthermore, "those researchers who would be most interested in this kind of data, e.g., political scientists, have not been concerned with the American Indian."[36] Nevertheless, there are a few social scientists, such as Harold E. Driver (1972) and Wendall H. Oswalt (1978), who are interested in and utilize this kind of statistical information.

Since information on Indian political behavior is so scarce, the following data are very general. Indians across the nation tend to identify as independents. Leonard Ritt believes that "this tendency toward weak partisanship . . . [can be] corroborated . . . [with] the fact that ideologically they tend to be moderates and shy away rather obviously from . . . [a] liberal label."[37] This particular behavior may also result from a high degree of tribal identity, which is more important to Indians than their identification as either Democrats or Republicans. Voter turnout has been below the national average, but this is partially because Indians in large cities share little except their identity as Indians. They do not share a common religion, a place of origin or a language—except English, the lingua franca. They lack a personal commitment to a cause such as experienced in the gay communities. Moreover, it has not been in their tradition to vote, for this right was not granted to them until the passing of the Indian Citizenship Act, June 2, 1924. Even after this right was granted to them a number of western states did not permit Indians to vote until several subsequent Supreme Court rulings (for example, those affecting Arizona and New Mexico in 1948),[38] when the right became a reality.

Indian women appear more progressive than Indian men because they are more willing to support social change.[39] This writer also believes that Indian women, at least in Menominee society, take the greater initiative in socio-political affairs, men following their lead; such behavior is typical on and off the reservation. Finally, Indians are generally supportive of the United States' role in world affairs.[40] But at the national level Indians are not enthusiastic about participating in Third World movements. This dual position probably exists because even after so many years of being exposed to the pressures of Western acculturation, they still favor tribal identity and allegiance to their traditional society over that which the outside world would offer. It is also

quite likely that in the years to come there will be greater numbers of educated Indians. As these numbers continue to build, Indian political views may broaden and Indian political activities may become more sophisticated.

In order for these humanistic goals to be realized American society must become flexible enough to accept the American Indian on an equal basis. It would be to the advantage of all peoples concerned if they learned to accept each other and work together for the benefit of the whole. Groups need not love one another, but they must learn to be compatible with each other. Each group must have autonomy over its internal matters and also represent its collective needs to the greater society. In such a pluralistic society, all members would potentially have the necessary tools to share equally the privileges afforded within the framework of America's socio-political and economic world.[41] This would be a society that could pride itself on the freedom granted to diverse groups to preserve different cultural heritages, support various religions, speak different languages and develop independent associations. This freedom would be qualified only by the requirement of loyalty to the prevailing political and economic system. However, if America does not inculcate a pluralistic society, at least a multicultural one, then she is bent on a dangerous path which will lead to the destruction of a diversity of human cultures. Not only will the American Indian lose, as well as other diverse cultures, but America as a symbolic image of a democratic nation will be the greatest loser.

NOTES

1. Fred Eggan, "Beyond The Bicentennial: The Future Of The American Indian in The Perspective Of The Past," *Journal Of Anthropological Research*, ed. J. N. Spuhler, Summer, No. 2, Vol. 34 (Albuquerque, N. M.: The University of New Mexico Press, 1978), p. 165.

2. Reginald Horsman, *The Frontier In The Formative Years: 1783–1815* (Albuquerque, N. M.: The University of New Mexico Press, 1975), p. 9.

3. Ronald N. Satz, *American Indian Policy In The Jacksonian Era* (Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1975), p. 143.

4. Virgil J. Vogel, *This Country Was Ours; a Documentary History of the American Indian* (New York, N. Y.: Harper Torchbooks-Harper and Row, 1974), p. 149.

5. *Americanizing The American Indians: Writings by the "Friends of the Indian," 1880–1900*, ed. Francis Paul Prucha (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), p. 6.

6. D'Arcy McNickle, "Process Or Compulsion: The Search For Policy Of Administration In Indian Affairs," *The Emergent Native Americans: a Reader in Culture Contact* ed. Deward E. Walker, Jr. (Boston, Mass.: Little Brown and Company, 1972), p. 121.
7. Robert M. Utley, *The Last Days Of The Sioux Nation* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1966), p. 29.
8. Wendell H. Oswalt, *This Land Was Theirs: A Study Of North American Indians,* 3rd edition (New York, N. Y.: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1978), p. 410.
9. Merwyn S. Garbarino, *Native American Heritage* (Boston, Mass.: Little Brown and Company, 1976), p. 482.
10. Edward H. Spicer, *A Short History Of The Indians Of The United States* (New York, N. Y.: D. Van Norstrand Company, 1969), p. 3.
11. Fred Eggan, op. cit., p. 179.
12. Philip Gleason, "Melting Pot In The 1960s and 1970s," *Ethnicity,* ed. William C. McCready, March, Vol. 6. No. 1 (New York, N. Y.: Academic Press, 1979), p. 11.
13. "Edward M. Kennedy: Let The Indians Run Indian Policy," *Native Americans Today,* eds. Howard M. Bahr, Bruce A. Chadwick, and Robert C. Day, (New York, N. Y.: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1972), p. 533.
14. Ibid. p. 533.
15. Wendell H. Oswalt, op. cit., p. 452.
16. Vine Deloria, Jr., *We Talk, You Listen* (New York, N. Y.: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1974), p. 123.
17. Ibid., p. 124.
18. D'Arcy McNickle, op. cit., p. 123.
19. Ibid., p. 124.
20. Robert A. Manners, "Pluralism And The American Indian," *The Emergent Native Americans,* ed. Deward E. Walker, Jr. (Boston, Mass.: Little Brown and Company, 1972), p. 125.
21. Ibid., p. 124.
22. Ibid., p. 127.
23. Ibid., p. 135.
24. Tom Bethell, "Against Bilingual Education," *Harper's,* ed. Lewis H. Lapham, February, Vol. 258, No. 1545 (New York, N. Y.: Harpers Magazine Company, 1979), p. 32.
25. Ibid., p. 32.
26. John Aragon, "An Impediment To Cultural Pluralism: Culturally Deficient Educators Attempt To Teach Culturally Different Children," *Cultural Pluralism In Education. A Mandate For Change,* eds. Madelon D. Stent, Williams R. Hazard, Harry N. Rivlin (New York, N. Y.: Meredith Corporation, 1973), p. 78.
27. Don Davies and Miriam Clasby, "The U.S. Office of Education and Cultural Pluralism," *Cultural Pluralism in Education. A Mandate for Change,* eds. Madelon D. Stent, Williams R. Hazard, Harry R. Rivlin (New York, N. Y.: Meredith Corporation, 1973), p. 138.
28. "Bridging Two Worlds," *The Milwaukee Journal,* September 21, 1980. pp. 42–44.
29. "Fishing Rights Upheld," *Indian Affairs,* ed. Steven Unger, March, No. 102 (New York, N. Y.: Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., 1981), p. 3.

30. "Any 'identifiable' group of Indians within the U.S. or Alaska could press for adjudication suits arising from (1) claims in law or equity, (2) tort claims, (3) claims based on fraud, duress, unconscionable consideration, mutual or unilateral mistake, (4) claims based on the taking of lands without payment of the agreed compensation and (5) claims upon fair and honorable dealings not recognized by existing rules of law or equity." Shirley Hill Witt, "Nationalistic Trends Among American Indians," *The American Indian Today*, eds. Stuart Levine, Nancy O. Lurie (rev. ed.; Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books Inc., 1968), p. 106.

31. Ibid., p. 119.

32. *Ibid.*, p.102.

33. Fred Eggan, op. cit., p. 178.

34. "From The Director's Desk," *Redletter*, Native American Committee, Inc., Chicago, Illinois, March-April, 1981, Vol. 1, No. 11, p. 9.

35. Ibid., p. 9.

36. Leonard G. Ritt, "Views Of American Indians," *Ethnicity*, ed. William C. McCready, March, Vol. 6, No. 1 (New York, N. Y.: Academic Press, 1979), p. 47.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 54.

38. Harold E. Driver, *Indians Of North America*, second edition, revised, (Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1969), p. 493.

39. Leonard G. Ritt, "Views Of American Indians," *Ethnicity*, ed. William C. McCready, March, Vol. 6, No. 1 (New York, N. Y.: Academic Press, 1979), p. 57.

40. Ibid., p. 66.

41. Pluralism. "A state of society in which members of diverse ethnic, racial, religious or social groups maintain an autonomous participation in and development of their traditional culture or special interest within the confines of a common civilization.'' *Webster's Dictionary*, ed. Henry Bosley (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1974), p. 885.