AMERICAN INDIAN CULTURE AND RESEARCH JOURNAL 22:4 (1998) 199-225

The (Re)Articulation of American Indian Identity: Maintaining Boundaries and Regulating Access to Ethnically Tied Resources

ANGELA GONZALES

INTRODUCTION

Changes in the census data since 1960 point to the complexity of identity for American Indians today, a complexity that is even more pronounced in multitribal urban areas (see Table 1).[1] Influenced by the work of early anthropologists, much of our understanding about American Indians comes from the study of Indian tribes as static, rigidly bound, and identifiable entities based on the observable characteristics of physiognomy, language, religion, customs, behaviors, and material culture, a dated model not applicable to urban Indian communities.[2] Even among reservation tribal communities where ceremonial traditions are still practiced and tribal languages are still spoken, most bear little resemblance to the static images "captured" by anthropologists. Moreover, since the 1970s, more than half of all American Indians live in cities.[3] While many

Angela Gonzales is an assistant professor of American Indian Studies at San Francisco State University. She is an enrolled member of the Hopi Tribe and former director of the Hopi Tribe Grant and Scholarship and Adult Vocation Training Programs.

continue to maintain ties with tribal communities, others are second- or third-generation "urban" Indians whose identity evolves around pan-Indian activities and multitribal urban communities.[4] Complicating this are individuals who, by virtue of being able to recall an Indian ancestor, are now identifying as American Indian.

Table 1: Comparative Census Enumeration: American Indians and Total U.S. Population, 1950-1990[5]

	American Indian		Total United States	
Date	Population	Percentage Change	Population	Percentage Change
1950	357,499		151,325,798	
1960	523,591	+ 46.5	179,323,175	+ 18.5
1970	792,730	+ 51.4	203,302,031	+ 13.4
1980	1,366,676	+ 72.4	226,545,805	+ 11.4
1990	1,959,234	+ 43.3	246,750,639	+ 8.9

Since 1960, when the U.S. Bureau of Census changed its enumeration procedures from ascription to self-identification, the American Indian population has grown nearly threefold (see Table 1). Unable to attribute the population growth to the usual factors (improved enumeration procedures, immigration, births), researchers have concluded that much of the growth results from "ethnic switching" by individuals changing their racial self-identification to American Indian.[6] As one U.S. Census Bureau official flatly stated: "Apparently, people who did not call themselves Indian in an earlier census are now doing so."[7]

Given the willingness of Americans to identify as Indian, it should come as little surprise that many of these "new Indians" are regarded with suspicion by others who have identified as Indian since birth. Questions of individual identity and ethnic "authenticity" has become particularly contentious when these individuals are seen as accruing benefits earmarked for American Indians. A pejorative term used to describe those suspected of identifying as American Indian for personal advantage is "ethnic fraud."[8] Based on how it is most com-

monly used, I define ethnic fraud as *the deliberate attempt to achieve personal gain by individuals who falsify or change their ethnic identity*. Perceptions of ethnic fraud, whether real or imagined, have spawned a debate among American Indians as to what constitutes legitimate identity and has resulted in regulatory practices requiring individuals to prove their identity.

To understand the complexity of American Indian identity today, particularly within a multitribal urban context, the first part of this paper examines changes in the aggregate data on American Indians recorded by the U.S. Bureau of Census, the concept of ethnic identity from a sociological perspective, and the criteria used by the federal government to identify American Indians.[9] The second part of this paper will consider current American Indian identity debates and the political economy of ethnic boundaries. Having provided an interpretive context, I conclude with an examination and discussion of the regulation of American Indian identity in college admissions and financial aid decisions.

CHANGES IN THE AMERICAN INDIAN POPULATION

As used by the census bureau, race does not denote a scientific definition of biological stock. The data for race reflect patterns of self-identification to those categories listed on the census questionnaire and with whom the individual most closely identifies. Under the racial category "American Indian" are persons who indicated their race as Indian, entered the name of an Indian tribe, or reported such entries as Canadian Indian, French-American Indian, or Spanish-American Indian.[10]

The increase in the American Indian population that began in 1960 was initially explained as a past failure to correctly identify Indians living in urban areas.[11] In his analysis of 1970 census data, Passel found that while some of the difference was due to undercounts in 1960, the leading cause of the increase was attributed to a shift in racial self-identification among persons "designated as white in earlier censuses and records [who] chose to classify themselves as Indian in 1970."[12]

Snipp's analysis of 1980 census data, the first in which respondents were asked questions on both race and ancestry, points to the increasing heterogeneity within the American Indian population.[13] Based on different patterns of self-identified race and ancestry, Snipp classified the American Indian

population into three subcategories: *American Indians*, *American Indians of Multiple Ancestry*, and *Americans of Indian Descent*. Included in the category *American Indians* were persons who had exclusively self-identified their race and ancestry as American Indian. The category *American Indians of Multiple Ancestry* included persons who reported their race as American Indian but identified other non-Indian ancestry. The third group, *Americans of Indian Descent*, were persons who did not racially self-identify as American Indian but listed it as part of their ancestry.[14]

At one end of the continuum are *American Indians,* most of whom reside on Indian reservations and conform to common perceptions of Indians as culturally distinct and economically disadvantaged. At the other end are *Americans of Indian Descent,* 93 percent who racially self-identified as white, speak no other language than English, and score higher on most measures of socioeconomic status (education, earnings, employment). According to Snipp, *Americans of Indian Descent* differ from other segments of white mainstream American society "mainly by virtue of recollecting an Indian ancestor in their family tree."[15] Between these two groups are *American Indians of Multiple Ancestry* who vary on socioeconomic indicators and, like many Indians living in urban areas, do not easily conform to American Indian stereotypes, but the degree to which these individuals are socially recognized as Indian or actively involved in urban Indian community organizations is difficult to assess.[16]

Between 1970 and 1980, the American Indian population in California increased 128 percent, surpassing two states long enumerated with the largest Indian populations, Arizona and Oklahoma.[17] What makes this increase so striking is that by the middle of the nineteenth century, the Native California Indian population was nearly extinct as a result of the discovery of gold in 1849 and the near genocide of California tribes in the decade that followed.[18] According to Snipp, much of the increase in California is the result of the Bureau of Indian Affair's relocation program during the 1950s and 1960s that resettled more than 100,000 Indians from other regions into Los Angeles, San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose and other metropolitan areas.[19] Consistently undercounted by the census, urban Indians have been referred to as "invisible minorities" because they are difficult to identify, often blending with other ethnic groups, and their relative numbers are too small to form an identifiable ethnic enclave.

Analyzing 1990 census data, Eschbach examined regional patterns of identification among American Indians to locate those regions with the greatest population increase.[20] What he found was evidence that contradicted earlier assimilation models which attributed reservation-to-city migration as the leading cause of increase in areas historically without large Indian populations. In 1990, two states with the largest population increases were Alabama (117 percent) and New Jersey (78 percent), states not known to have large Indian populations. This finding supports the notion of "ethnic switching," as a significant portion of those newly identifying as American Indian were also native to these regions and not migrants from other areas.

CONCEPTUALIZING ETHNIC IDENTITY

An early assumption by sociologists was that as industrial societies developed and matured, race and ethnicity would become increasingly irrelevant as principles of group formation, collective identity, and political action.[21] Following the social and political events of the 1960s—student activism, ethnic militancy, civil rights legislation—sociologists shifted their focus from the study of ethnic groups and their culture towards one that focused on ethnic identity as an individual phenomenon with an emphasis on its cognitive, behavioral, and strategic aspects.[22]

As ethnic pride movements among racial minorities increased in number and visibility, Americans of European ancestry began similar ethnic revivals. Cities with large immigrant populations of Irish-Americans began organizing St. Patrick's Day parades, and Italian-Americans held celebrations on October 14 honoring Christopher Columbus and their link to the "discovery" of the Americas. According to sociologists, ethnic revival among these later generations of Americans of European descent were considered to be "symbolic" and "situational," having little to do with their daily lives and only occasionally recalled.[23] Unlike their parents and grandparents, ethnic identity for later generations was no longer bound by culture, religion, language, or primary relations, but had become voluntary and a matter of personal volition.[24] Seen as a conscious and rational decision, the choice of ethnic identities was described by Patterson as instrumental and situationally determined, based on those individual identity choices that rendered the greatest social, economic, or personal gain.[25]

Ethnic identity as a matter of personal choice, however, runs the risk of emphasizing agency over structure and obfuscates how identity continues to be ascribed to both groups and individuals.[26] Structural constraints can define a situation and limit an individual's ability to invoke or claim certain identities. For example, despite having been discredited by sociologists, the concept of race continues to be expressed and reinforced by public policy and persists as a powerful force in the way Americans identify themselves and others based on skin color, hair texture, and other physical characteristics. According to Waters, the ability for white ethnic Americans to choose from a range of "ethnic options," is not so for non-whites who continue to be ascribed identity based on race.[27] Today, ethnic identity grows increasingly more complicated as intermarriage becomes the norm rather than the exception, and ethnic boundaries once taken for granted become ambiguous and difficult to define.[28] Moreover, intertribal marriages create an additional dimension of identity for children who, rather than identifying generically as American Indian, are faced with the choice of several tribal backgrounds with which they might identify.

The apparent willingness of individuals to change their self-identification, described by sociologists as "ethnic switching," has been used to explain increases in the American Indian population since 1990. According to this perspective, we now live in a world where individuals are supposed to be able to decide—in some active sense—who they are. Even once irrevocable personal characteristics are now imbued with an element of choice, of which ethnic identity is but one example. This is a pervasive cultural shift, associated with increased urbanization and individualization, and consistent with ethnic switching.[29]

ETHNIC BOUNDARIES AND IDENTITY

As outlined in the introduction to his book, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries,* Barth argued that to better understand the social organization of ethnic groups, one must examine the boundaries that differentiate and keep groups distinct rather than their cultural content.[30] As the centerpiece of Barth's formulation, boundaries extend beyond the physical to include the social, ideological, conceptual, or symbolic—and can be permeable and flexible, or rigid and impenetrable.

Most studies of ethnic boundaries focus on interethnic boundaries that distinguish between groups, but boundaries can also be internal, marking differences within an ethnic population and differentiating between members of the same ethnic group. Internal boundaries can mirror criteria imposed from outside or can be concepts that members hold of what constitutes legitimate identity.[31] However, as the federal government has become a dominant institution in society, its policies have increasingly shaped ethnic boundaries and influenced patterns of identification.

ETHNICITY AND THE STATE

In the United States, the strategic choice and efficacy of certain ethnic identities results from state policies that employ ethnic categories as the basis for certain rights, entitlements, and benefits. These "official" categories not only enhance ethnic identification by designating certain groups as legitimate, but encourage identification "consistent with official boundaries rather than with more traditional or culturally relevant units."[32]

Like other ethnic groups in the United States, American Indians are classified as a racial group with "minority" status. However, unlike other ethnic groups, American Indians are also defined through their relationship with the federal government as a result of enacted policies, laws, and statutes that are specific to American Indians. In the following section I selectively review some of these policies that define American Indians and the mechanisms used to determine identity.

TREATIES AND TRIBES

Motivated by the need for land, early relations with Indian tribes were guided by the European philosophy of the "right of preemption"—the right to acquire title to land from Natives, by purchase or conquest, or to gain title should the Natives voluntarily leave or become extinct.[33] To secure title to land, the United States entered into treaty negotiations with Indian tribes (similar to those signed with the nations of France and Britain), which acknowledged tribes on the aggregate as political entities.

Treaties are instrumental to the foundation of the legal status of Indian tribes and their members. Today, the federal government recognizes Indian tribes as groups that the Congress or the

executive branch have created a reservation for by treaty, agreement, statute, executive order, or valid administrative action.[34]

BLOOD QUANTUM

When treaty making ended in 1871, the prevailing attitude of the federal government was that Indians should be assimilated and transformed into productive members of society.[35] To hasten this transformation, Congress passed the General Allotment Act in 1887, aimed at the dissolution of collectively held tribal lands into individual land allotments.[36] The criteria used to determine allotment eligibility was based on individual Indian "blood quantum."[37]

Reflecting the scientific ideology of the time, blood was believed to be the carrier of genetic and cultural material.[38] The amount of blood that an individual possessed of a particular race would determine the degree to which that individual would resemble and behave like persons of similar racial background. Inferred from the racial background of the parents, if both parents were of 100 percent Indian blood, their offspring would also be 100 percent and quantified at four-fourths Indian blood quantum. Children of mixed parentage, for instance, if the father was white and the mother was Indian, would possess one-half Indian blood quantum.

Determining blood quantum, however, required a benchmark, so beginning shortly after passage of the act, federal enumerators began canvassing Indian lands, counting Indian households, and recording the number of adults and children and the blood quantum of each. Given that few Indians possessed "official" birth certificates, enumerators had to rely on subjective judgment, individual self-report, and information supplied by neighbors, friends, and relatives. Compiled into what became known as the Dawes Rolls, these records continue to be used by Indian tribes for enrollment decisions and determination of eligibility for special programs and services provided by the federal government for American Indians.[39]

TRIBAL ENROLLMENT

In 1934, Congress passed the Wheeler-Howard Act, more popularly known as the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA), which, among other things, stopped allotment, made provisions for

the return of Indian lands, provided money for reservation economic development, and encouraged tribes to organize formally into tribal governments.[40] Under its provisions, tribes were conferred the right to determine membership, a right which has been consistently recognized as one of the most basic powers of Indian tribes.

While tribal membership requirements vary, there are three basic types: base enrollees, automatic enrollees, and adoptees.[41] Base enrollees are those persons living on the reservation in the year that the base roll was established and, in most cases, did not have to meet any other requirement for enrollment. Today, base enrollees are central to enrollment decisions and provide the benchmark used to determine ancestry and blood quantum of their descendants.

Automatic enrollment is determined primarily by birth—where you were born, who your parents are, and your Indian blood quantum. Not all tribes require blood quantum, but most that do have set one-fourth as the minimum, usually distinguishing between "general Indian blood" and "tribal Indian blood." The final way to gain tribal membership is through adoption. Similar to naturalization of a foreigner into U.S. citizenship, some tribes provide procedures for adoption that might include marriage to a tribal member, residency on the reservation, and approval by a majority of tribal members or tribal council.

SUMMARY

The variation, vicissitude, and contradiction in criteria used to define American Indians were reported by the American Indian Policy Review Commission in its 1977 annual report to Congress:

> The Federal government, State governments and the Census Bureau all have different criteria for defining "Indians" for statistical purposes, and even the Federal criteria are not consistent among Federal agencies. For example, a State desiring financial aid to assist Indian education receives the aid only for the number of people with one quarter or more Indian blood. For preference in hiring, enrollment records from a Federally recognized tribe are required. Under regulations for law and order, anyone of "Indian descent" is counted as an Indian. If the Federal criteria are inconsistent, State guidelines are even more chaotic. In the course of preparing this report, the Commission contacted several

> States with large Indian populations to determine their criteria. Two states accept the individual's own determination. Four accept individuals as Indian if they were "recognized in the community" as Native American. Five use residence on a reservation as criteria. One requires one quarter blood, and still another uses the Census Bureau definition that Indians are who they say they are.[42]

Promulgated by the federal government and independent of ways that Indians defined themselves, definitions were referential and strategic to U.S. polity and society. Treaties recognized Indians on the aggregate as tribes, blood quantum made Indian identity a matter of degree, and tribal status made both individual and tribal identity a matter of political recognition. As social constructs, shaped and crafted by the trajectories of history, science, and politics, to equate percentage of Indian blood or tribal enrollment with ethnic authenticity reifies these constructs, replacing and devaluing relational ties based on kinship, clan, and other patterns of social interaction.

CONTESTING IDENTITIES

Insofar as American Indians have internalized the rules of inclusion and exclusion, characterizations used to describe themselves and each other reveal this dichotomy—reservation/urban, traditional/assimilated, full-blood/mixed-blood, dark skinned/light skinned, federally recognized/non-recognized, enrolled/non-enrolled, and "authentic"/"wannabe." Their internalizations of boundaries are manifest in the ways individual identity is contested:

> [This] internalization … makes our own people the Other. We shun the white-looking Indian, the "high yellow" Black woman, the Asian with the white lover, the Native woman who brings her white girlfriend to the Pow Wow, the Chicana who doesn't speak Spanish, the academic, the uneducated. Her differences make her a person you can't trust … she must pass the ethnic legitimacy test we have devised. And it is exactly [this] internalized whiteness that desperately wants boundary lines (this part of me is Mexican, this Indian).[43]

The debate among American Indians over what constitutes legitimate identity has spawned a vocabulary of terms used to

describe individuals whose ethnic identity is considered to be dubious. The term *wannabe* is applied to individuals who publicly avow themselves to be Indian and attempt to pass themselves off as Indian through conspicuous style of dress or other symbols associated with American Indians. Similarly, the term *pretender* describes the non-Indian who falsely claims to be Indian or to have some vast knowledge of Indian culture or spirituality. The recent popular interest in American Indian spirituality has spawned a buyers' market of "plastic medicine men" (both Indian and non-Indian) who peddle their services to the unsuspecting consumer willing to pay for an "authentic American Indian" sweat or vision quest.[44]

Not surprisingly, a number of terms have emerged that describe Indian individuals who, in asserting their authority and ethnic legitimacy, claim to be "more" Indian by virtue of certain personal characteristics. *Regionalist* describes individuals who believe their particular tribe or region to be the source of authentic Indian culture, and *reservationist* applies to Indians who believe you have to be from a reservation in order to be a "real" Indian. Among the latter, the term *urban Indian* may be used derogatorily to imply that an individual is, in contrast to oneself, less Indian or not "authentically" Indian. Individuals may also label themselves as elders or traditional Indians as another way to establish their authority and/or greater degree of Indianness. As a positive self-portrayal, the value of self-labeling is in its ability to confer to the individual a greater sense of self-importance.

Identity disputes often digress into arguments over ethnic authenticity with critics legitimizing their views based on their greater degree of Indianness which then, supposedly, confers to them authority on all matters relating to American Indians. For example, following a lecture given by American Indian performance artist James Luna, an individual identifying himself as a "pure-blood" criticized Luna for what he deemed to be a negative portrayal of American Indians. This was made in reference to an installation by the artist in Los Angeles, a city with one of the largest urban Indian populations. The installation, *Dream Hat Rituals*, was composed of twelve sculptural Indian figures, some in cowboy hats, others in boots, all fashioned out of crutches and walkers. The installation examines what Luna sees as major health problems affecting both urban and reservation Indians from alcoholism, diabetes, and violence.[45] Intended to confront both non-Indian and Indian conceptions of cultural identity, Luna's work was criticized by an

individual identifying himself as a "pure blood" who challenged Luna's "Indianness" and criticized his work as a bad example of Indian art for reinforcing negative stereotypes about American Indians.[46]

Points of view among American Indians on matters of identity are so polarized that they make discussion nearly impossible. Public debate, while limited, has tended to be among those who have realized both the substantive and symbolic value of being American Indian—scholars, writers, artists, activists—many of whom have parlayed their place within the dominant society to establish their personal authority and promote their political agenda.[47]

THE ESSENTIAL INDIAN

Given the myriad definitions used throughout history to define American Indians, it should come as little surprise that they have irrevocably influenced American Indian self-understanding. To be considered a "real" Indian, then, an individual must meet the following criteria:

- Residence (current or previous) on an Indian reservation.
- Enrolled member of a federally recognized Indian tribe.
- Documented Indian blood quantum—the higher the percentage, the greater the individual's Indianness.
- Stereotypically identifiable Indian features or style of dress—long, straight black hair; dark eyes; brown skin; "chiefly looks" or "doe-eyed comely beauty"; leather moccasins; ribbon shirt; or beaded, silver, or turquoise jewelry.
- Ability to speak a tribal language or demonstrable use of Indian colloquialisms, such as "mother earth," "the great spirit," "the two-legged," "the four-legged," "the winged," "a-ho," and so forth.
- Publicly practice what is believed to be American Indian spirituality—wearing a medicine bag, participating in sweats, burning sage or cedar, or sprinkling corn pollen.

Markers of ethnic authenticity are a result of American Indians having reified the criteria used by the federal government and stereotypes that exist within larger society. As a litmus test for identity, the extent to which individuals meet these criteria is used as a measure of their Indianness. This internalization of

stereotypes creates expectations of how "real" Indians are supposed to look, act, talk, and dress, but also creates norms with which individuals must conform, any deviation signifying a diminished or a lesser degree of Indianness. The significance of a particular criterion in matters of identity varies according to context. For example, among urban Indians, the importance of tribal-specific knowledge or cultural practices might be devalued in favor of pan-Indian ones, such as the powwow.[48] For those without tribal membership, emphasis might instead be placed on recognition by the "Indian community."[49] Individuals without stereotypical identifiable features may instead establish their Indianness through a conspicuous style of dress or hair color.

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF INDIAN IDENTITY

Conflict over what constitutes legitimate identity is greatest when benefits are seen as accruing to individuals newly identifying as American Indian. Not unique to American Indians, ethnic fraud afflicts other groups as well.[50] Consistent with sociological views discussed earlier, ethnic identity choices can be strategic and selected for their ability to render the individual the greatest personal, political, or economic advantage.[51]

The perception that individuals benefit as the result of falsifying their ethnic identity riles many American Indians who see these individuals as free-riders and opportunists:

> These are people who have no business soaking up jobs and grants, people who have made no claim to being Indian up to their early adulthood, and then when there is something to be gained they're opportunists of the rankest stripe, of the worst order . . . we resent these people who just come in and when the going's good and skim the riches off the surface.[52]

Those newly identifying as American Indian become targets of the "identity police" and others who position themselves as gatekeepers protecting American Indian interests from ethnic frauds and others who seek to benefit from identifying as Indian:

> The pseudo-Indians, and those who never claimed to be Indian until it was convenient, have escaped discrimination against themselves as Indians, have cashed in on the advan-

> tages of being Indians, then have discriminated against the very people whose cultures and achievements they have copped. It's no wonder that Indian people, and more than just a few have decided to do something about it, rather than just complaining to each other.[53]

As discussed earlier, changes in racial self-identification beginning in 1960 account for significant increases in the American Indian population. According to some, the plethora of federal aid programs directed at American Indians and other minority groups is the overwhelming motive why many choose to newly self-identify as American Indian:

> It was in the 1970s that people claiming to be Indian began to take jobs intended for Indians and to write books claiming to be authorities on Indians. These instant "wannabes" did us far more harm than good. Not only did they often give out misleading information about Indians, but they also took jobs that left many qualified genuine Native Americans out in the cold.... Before you can truly be considered an Indian you must be an enrolled member of a tribe. I think most Indians would agree that this is the only way you can truly be accepted as Indian.[54]

Tribal enrollment, as *the* determinant of individual identity, has the ability to make questions of identity a simple matter of documentation. Arguing from a somewhat nationalistic perspective, proponents of tribal enrollment, in claiming that this trumps all other forms of identity, devalue and replace relational ties linking the individual to the tribe or community as a whole with one based on political status.

Having outlined an interpretive context, the following examines the regulation of American Indian identity in college admissions and financial aid decisions. Central to these policies is the perception of ethnic fraud by individuals who check the box American Indian in order to gain affirmative action advantage in admissions and financial aid consideration.

REGULATING AMERICAN INDIAN IDENTITY IN THE UNIVERSITY

Beginning in the early 1990s, American Indian college students and faculty began to express a growing concern that affirma-

tive action benefits had resulted in large numbers of students fraudulently identifying as American Indian on their admissions applications. In April 1992, the *Detroit News* ran a two-part series on ethnic fraud and college admissions. Under the headline, "American Indian College Students Hurt by Admission Abuses," the series began with the story of a student who checked the box American Indian and received over 15,000 dollars in grants and scholarships earmarked for American Indians. In its 1992 Annual Report to Congress, the National Advisory Council on Indian Education (NACIE) reported that the data on Americans Indians in higher education was "suspect considering the widespread incidence of ethnic fraud on college and university campuses."[55]

In 1993, at the annual conference of the Association of American Indian and Alaskan Native Professors (AAIANP), ethnic fraud was the topic of both formal and informal discussions. After emotional personal testimonies and much heated discussion, the decision was made to draft an official statement that association members could take back to their home institutions and use as a model for policy change. In part, the statement stressed the importance of official tribal enrollment for classifying students and faculty as American Indian. Intended to register the organization's concern about ethnic fraud and offer recommendations to ensure the accuracy of an applicant's identification as American Indian, the statement urged colleges and universities to require evidence of enrollment in a state or federally recognized nation/tribe with preference given to those able to provide documentation.[56]

The fact that matters of identity would arise within the university is not surprising. Programs such as affirmative action confer preference on members of designated minority groups in both admission and financial aid. As in the broader context, decisions over what constitutes "legitimate" identity are not capricious; they can have significant economic import to individuals meeting the criteria. Consider, for example, the scholarships available to American Indians in 1992. The Bureau of Indian Affairs provided 27 million dollars in scholarships and grants, the U.S. Department of Education's American Indian Fellowship Program awarded 1.6 million dollars, the American Indian Graduate Center awarded 2.1 million dollars, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services awarded 8.7 million dollars under the Indian Health Services (IHS) fellowship program. All totaled, 39.4 million dollars in federal monies

were available exclusively to American Indian college students in 1992.[57] Added to this is the fact that nearly every public and private college and university has its own special grants or scholarships for American Indian students. At a time when the cost of a college education is increasing, federally subsidized college grants and loans are diminishing, compelling students and their parents to seek other sources for financial assistance.

Led by the efforts of American Indian students and faculty, several colleges and universities have amended their admissions and financial aid criteria for American Indians to include some form of ethnic verification. At the University of Colorado, Boulder, American Indian students are classified into two groups based on whether or not they have documentation of tribal enrollment. While any student who self-identifies as American Indian is classified as such for federal and state reporting purposes, only those who can provide documentation—tribal enrollment card or certificate of Indian blood—are eligible for race-based grants and scholarships as American Indian.

Prior to the passage of proposition 209 in California, the University of California, Los Angeles' general admissions application asked students to identify their ethnicity. Instructed to select one of sixteen ethnic categories, students were told to "choose the one category with which the individual most closely identifies." Here, all ethnic minority applicants were treated the same. For graduate affirmative action fellowships aimed at increasing the enrollment of students from underrepresented U.S. minority groups, students must be either: "American Indian/Alaskan Native/Native Hawaiian, Black/African American, Chicano/Mexican American, Filipino or Puerto Rican." However, unlike all other students in the broad category, those applying as "*American Indian, Alaskan Native, and Native Hawaiian graduate students must provide documentation of status*" (original emphasis).[58]

Not all colleges and universities regulate American Indian identity, and among those that do, methods and criteria differ. At Stanford University and Dartmouth College, for example, students self-identifying as American Indian are contacted only after having been admitted. Referred to as the "heritage form," Indian students admitted to Dartmouth College are sent a questionnaire inquiring about their tribal background and community involvement. Though not mandatory, students are

encouraged to complete the form and are informed that the information they provide will be used to connect them with campus programs and services and other possible sources of financial assistance.

A more extreme variant of the practice to regulate identity is the one used at the University of Oklahoma. In what many American Indians have lauded as a model for other universities, the University of Oklahoma enacted a policy in 1995 that requires students who identify themselves as American Indian to provide verification of tribal affiliation before being permitted access to university programs, resources, and services aimed at assisting American Indian students.[59] The following statement was given in support of the university's verification policy:

> American Indian/Alaskan Natives are not only a racial group. Due to their unique relationship with the federal government, Native Americans maintain a political status which affords them certain rights. Because of this relationship, the various Native American tribes, pueblos, bands, and villages are sovereign entities which have as their inherent sovereign right the ability to determine their membership.... [Therefore] it is the policy of the University of Oklahoma to require those students who wish to use those services, programs, activities, and resources committed to American Indian/Alaskan Natives to verify their affiliation with these sovereign entities. An individual identifying as such must provide official tribal, national, pueblo, band, or village identification.[60]

While legal definitions easily resolve questions of identity, any regulation of American Indian identity requires both a sensitivity to the problems of documentation and an awareness of local population demographics. In contrast to the practice at the University of Oklahoma, San Francisco State University chose instead to rely on student self-identification for a scholarship aimed at assisting American Indian students. Cognizant of the large urban Indian student population that attends SFSU, many of whom are not enrolled with their tribe but are active in campus and local Indian communities, the ethnic definition used on the scholarship application is "a person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition." Underneath, applicants are asked

to list their enrolled or principal tribal affiliation. While concerns about ethnic fraud remain, rather than apply a rigid definition that might exclude many ethnically qualified applicants, it was decided to err on the side of caution and to allow students to self-identify, though some continue to attach copies of tribal enrollment certification.[61]

CONCLUSIONS

The salience of ethnicity as a form of personal identity and political action in the modern state continues to vex some social scientists who see modernity as generally opposed to ethnicity. Today, the efficacy of ethnic identity is a result of state policies that use ethnicity to classify groups and individuals and for allocation of certain economic and social resources. Official classifications legitimize groups and influence patterns of identification, but the convenience with which official classifications group individuals as Asian American, Hispanic/Latino, or Native American belies the difficulty faced by individuals of mixed heritage for whom no single category applies. Today, individuals are considered members of ethnic groups to which they self-identify, but as the census data indicates, the ability to self-identify racially has resulted in a substantial number of people changing their racial identity to American Indian. In the 1990 census, nearly two million Americans racially self-identified as American Indian. If we consider this in relationship to the blood quantum projections in Table 2, by the year 2080, the American Indian population will have grown to 15.8 million—a nearly twelvefold increase.

Among those who racially self-identified as American Indian in the 1980 census, 49 percent of Indian men and 41.6 percent of Indian women are married to non-Indians.[62] This, however, obfuscates the fact that for Indians residing on reservations (particularly in the southwest), racial endogamy is the norm—nearly 99 percent of Indians marry other Indians, with a greater percentage of interracial marriages occurring among urban Indians. In California, 77 percent of all married American Indians have non-Indian spouses.[63] One cause is the relative size of the American Indian population in relation to other groups, which means that the overwhelming percentage of potential marriage partners will be non-Indian.

Table 2: Population Projections by Blood Quantum, 1980-2080[64]
(Percentage of Population in Parentheses)

	Percentage Blood Quantum			
Year	***50% and Above***	***25%-49.9%***	***Less than 25%***	***Total***
1980	1,125,746 (86.9%)	123,068 (9.5%)	46,636 (3.6%)	1,295,450 (100%)
2000	1,722,116 (77.8%)	345,309 (15.6%)	146,092 (6.6%)	2,213,517 (100%)
2040	2,188,193 (36.1%)	2,418,528 (39.9%)	1,454,754 (24.0%)	6,061,475 (100%)
2060	1,866,738 (18.8%)	3,971,782 (40.3%)	4,090,935 (41.2%)	9,929,455 (100%)
2080	1,292,911 (8.2%)	5,187,411 (32.9%)	9,286,884 (58.9%)	15,767,206 (100%)

During the next century, while the American Indian population will increasingly be made up of mixed-blood Indians of less than 25 percent Indian blood quantum, reservation communities will most likely continue to show high rates of racial endogamy. For American Indians in urban areas, however, high rates of intermarriage will lead to diminishing degrees of Indian blood with each successive generation, requiring both individuals and groups to rethink how it defines ethnic identity, group boundaries, and what it means to be American Indian.

While the willingness for many Americans to identify as part Indian or having Indian blood may be little more than their ability to recall an Indian ancestor, such self-declarations are a source of personal pride and rooted in family history. But for the many American Indians who have heard countless stories about someone's great-great-great Cherokee grandmother (a favorite), it is little wonder that these assertions are greeted with suspicion. The possibility remains, of the 6.8 million Americans who identified as having Indian ancestry on the 1980 census,[65] any number may choose, at some point in the future, to identify as American Indian for any number of purposes.

Contrary to how sociologists conceptualize ethnic identity, the debate among American Indians over what constitutes legiti-

mate identity remains more than an academic or personal matter. Directly affected by the recognition of legitimate identity are issues of political and criminal jurisdiction, child custody rights, health benefits, land claims, taxation, and a myriad of other legal and financial matters. Many of those newly identifying as American Indian do so based on an awareness (real or imagined) of Indian ancestry; their identification differs from others whose education and earnings, rates of unemployment, and standard of living are circumscribed by their identity as American Indian.[66] For many of those newly identifying as American Indian, this "ethnic option" may be more a matter of personal choice, independent of tribal affiliation, cultural traditions, or community relations that are so vital to the Indian identity of others.

NOTES

1. Unlike the practice to use the terms *American Indian* and *Native American* interchangeably, I limit my use to *American Indian* and *Indian* when referring to the descendants of the aboriginal inhabitants of North America resident in the United States. I use the term *Native American* only when referring to policies or sources that make use of the term.

2. The view of American Indians as "primitive" and culturally "pure" derives from early anthropologists who attempted to salvage Indian cultures and ways of life through photographs and detailed ethnography that portrayed Indians in a primitive state untouched by civilization. These characterizations and images have created an ideal type of American Indian against which Indian tribes and peoples are today compared, and any deviation from this is seen as evidence of cultural assimilation and/or biological amalgamation. See Annie E. Coombes, "Ethnography and the Formation of National and Cultural Identities," in *The Myth of Primitivism: Perspectives on Art*, ed. Susan Hiller (London: Routledge, 1991), 189-214; Elizabeth Edwards, ed., *Anthropology and Photography 1860-1920* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); George W. Stocking, Jr., *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (New York: Free Press, 1968).

3. U.S. Bureau of Census, *Census of Population, Subject Reports, and Characteristics of American Indians by Tribes and Selected Areas* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989).

4. For a discussion of intertribal, urban Indian communities, see Joan Weibel-Orlando, *Indian Country L.A.: Maintaining Ethnic Community in a Complex Society* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1991).

5. Sources for the census data from 1950-1980 were found in Russell Thornton, *American Indian Holocaust and Survival: A Population History Since*

1492 (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), 160. Census data for 1990 was taken from U.S. Bureau of Census, data base, C90STF1C (1996).

6. Karl Eschbach, "Shifting Boundaries: Regional Variation in Patterns of Identification as American Indian," Ph.D. dissertation (Harvard University, 1992); ibid; "Changing Identification among American Indians and Alaskan Natives," *Demography* 30:4 (1993): 635-652; Joane Nagel, "American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Politics and the Resurgence of Identity," *American Sociological Review* 60 (1995): 947-965; ibid., *American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); Jeffrey Passel, "Provisional Evaluation of the 1970 Census Count of American Indians," *Demography* 13 (1976): 397-409; Jeffrey Passel and Patricia A. Berman, "Quality of 1980 Census Data for American Indians," *Social Biology* 33 (1986): 163-182; Lawrence Rosen and Kurt Gorwitz, "New Attention to American Indians," *American Demographics*, (April 1980): 21; Matthew C. Snipp, *American Indians, The First of This Land* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1989); Russell Thornton, *American Indian Holocaust and Survival: A Population History Since 1492* (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1987).

7. Dirk Johnson, "Census Finds Many Claiming New Identity: Indian," *New York Times*, March 5, 1991, A1.

8. For several examples specific to American Indians, see Crystal Cage, "Claims of American-Indian Heritage Become Issue for Colleges Seeking to Diversify Enrollments," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 29, 1992, A29; Joe Nelson, "University Must Protect Against Ethnic Fraud," *Daily Bruin Online*, February 20, 1996; Michelle Quinn, "Ethnic Litmus Test a Problem for American Indian Artists," *Los Angeles Times*, June 18, 1992, F1; Jerry Reynolds, "Indian Writers: Real or Imagined," *Indian Country Today*, September 8, 1993, A1; Page St. John, "American Indians Hurt by College Admission Abuses," *Detroit News,* April 12, 1992, P1.

9. By limiting this discussion to American Indian identity as a broad category is not to say that tribal identity is of lesser importance. On the contrary, many of the same issues raised in the discussion apply equally well to matters of tribal identity, but are beyond the scope of this paper.

10. Persons identifying as American Indian are asked to report their tribal affiliation; however, this data should not be misinterpreted as tribal enrollment since the information is based on individual self-report. In 1980, three racial categories permitted "native North Americans" to identify themselves as either American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut. See also Snipp, *American Indians,* 45.

11. Rosen and Gorwitz, "New Attention to American Indians," 21.

12. Passel, "Provisional Evaluation," 407.

13. See also Jack Forbes, "Undercounting Native Americans: The 1980 Census and the Manipulation of Racial Identity in the United States," *Wicazo Sa Review* 6 (1990): 1-20.

14. Snipp, *American Indians,* 50-52.

15. Ibid., 57.

16. Ibid., 57

17. Ibid., 77. According to 1990 census data, California fell to second place with an American Indian population of 242, 164, second to Oklahoma with 252, 420. U.S. Bureau of Census, 1990 Census Counts of American Indians, Eskimos or Aleuts and American Indian and Alaskan Native Areas (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991).

18. Thornton, *American Indian Holocaust*, 107-109. While estimates vary, according to Thornton, the Native California Indian population decreased by nearly two-thirds between 1849, when gold was discovered, and 1860.

19. As a result, while California has the largest American Indian population, only a small number are Native California Indians; most are Indians relocated from other regions through the BIA's Direct Employment Program. See Snipp, 58-59, 76-84.

20. Eschbach, "Changes in Identification."

21. For two examples, see Peter Blau and Otis Duncan, *The American Occupational Structure* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967); Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964).

22. See Herbert Gans, "Symbolic Ethnicity: the future of ethnic groups and culture," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2:1 (1979): 1-20; Andrew M. Greeley, *Ethnicity in the United States: A Preliminary Reconnaissance* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1974); Howard Stein and Robert Hill, *The Ethnic Imperative: Examining the New White Ethnic Movement* (University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 1977); Stephen Steinberg, *The Ethnic Myth: Race, Ethnicity, and Class in America* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1981).

23. For a detailed discussion of white ethnicity, see Richard D. Alba, *Ethnic Identity: The Transformation of White America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

24. Waters found that later-generation white Americans of European ancestry, when given a choice, tended to choose the most ethnic of their ancestries. Interestingly, in her study of white, suburban, middle-class Catholics, the only non-European group ancestry identified by respondents was American Indian. Mary C. Waters, *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 14. The willingness of later-generation white ethnic Americans to reclaim ethnic ancestry has been described as "third generation return"; see Marcus L. Hansen, "The Third Generation in America," *Commentary* 14 (November 1952): 492-500.

25. Orlando Patterson, "Context and Choice in Ethnic Allegiance: A Theoretical Framework and Caribbean Case Study," in *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience*, ed. Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), 305-349. See also volumes edited by Abner Cohen, *Urban Ethnicity* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974); Leo Despres, *Ethnicity and Resource Competition in Plural Societies* (Mouton: Hague, 1975); Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975).

26. The characterization of American Indian identity as a matter of personal choice and linked to the individual's psychological development was recent-

ly examined using a model developed by William Cross to explain African American identity formation and development. Unfortunately, the use of this model begins with the presupposition that identity for American Indians of mixed heritage is diminished because of miscegenation, which then becomes a constant source of confusion for these individuals. By relying on excessive "assertions based on personal observation," one cannot help but question the reliability of the author's assertions and the validity of her conclusions. Though many of us have witnessed similar events and shared similar experiences, the uncritical use of personal observation as a form of evidence only adds to an issue rife with personal aspersions on individuals' identity claims and/or degree of Indianness. Both arbitrary and highly subjective, all claims of Indian identity, then, are subject to challenge. This tendency to privilege personal opinion, moreover, makes discussion of American Indian identity nearly impossible when those with differing views or dissenting opinions are summarily dismissed as either not Indian, "not really" Indian, or the wrong kind of Indian. See Devon A. Mihesuah, "American Indian Identity: Issues of Individual Choice and Development," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 22:2 (1998): 193-226.

27. Waters, *Ethnic Options*, 157.

28. Among the growing literature on mixed race, several excellent collections include Maria P. Root, ed., *Racially Mixed People in America* (New Berry Park: Sage, 1992); Naomi Zack, ed., *Race and Mixed Race* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993); Zack, *American Mixed Race: The Culture of Microdiversity* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institutional Press, 1995). For a discussion of mixed race and the problems associated with American Indian racial boundaries, see C. Matthew Snipp, "Some Observations About Racial Boundaries and the Experiences of American Indians," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 20:4 (1997): 667-689.

29. Though sociologists see ethnic switching as a recent phenomenon, during the 1890 census, enumerators reported that "certain legal and proprietary claims leads persons of very slight Indian blood connections, or even pure white by birth, to call themselves Indians by hereditary or acquired right, and there are those of pure white blood who wish to be called Indians, in order to share in pecuniary advantage, who are not acknowledged by any tribes," U.S. Bureau of Census, *Report on Indians Taxed and Indians Not Taxed in the United States (except Alaska) at the Eleventh Census, 1890* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1894), 131. In their 1932 annual report, the Board of Indian Commissioners appealed to Congress to define as Indian only those persons with one-fourth or more Indian blood, citing that, "in years past persons of varying degree of Indian blood have been enrolled and become entitled to share in the property and rights of different tribes. As long as a person has shown an appreciable amount of Indian blood, no matter how small the percentage may have been, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has enrolled him and granted him rights of full tribal membership…. Thousands of persons, more white than Indian and often with but a trace of Indian blood, have thus received rights … and other benefits as Indians and wards of the Federal

Government." U.S. Department of the Interior, *Annual Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners to the Secretary of the Interior, Fiscal Year 1932* (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1932). More recently, profits by Indian casinos have spawned a surge in applications for tribal enrollment. When the Mashantucket Pequots of Connecticut opened Foxwoods Casino, there were only about 180 tribal members. According to tribal clerk Deborah Frankovitch, "Almost every time a news story appears about Foxwoods, as many as 100 more people call into claim a Mashantucket Pequot ancestor," quoted in Mitchell Zuckoff, "More and More Claiming Indian Heritage," *Boston Globe*, April 18, 1995.

30. Fredrick Barth, "Introduction," *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference* (Oslo: Norwegian University Press, 1969).

31. For a discussion on internal markers among African Americans based on skin tone, see Kathy Russell, Midge Wilson, and Ronald Hall, *The Color Complex: The Politics of Skin Color Among African Americans* (New York: Doubleday, 1992). Among Hispanics and Latinos, differences are frequently made on the basis of migration status, country or origin, class, ability to speak Spanish; see Suzanne Oboler, *Ethnic Labels, Latino Lives: Identity and the Politics of (Re)Presentation in the United States* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995).

32. Glazer and Moynihan, *Ethnicity*, 10; Joane Nagel, "Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture," *Social Problems* 41:1 (1994): 154.

33. Among the countless books on Indian treaties and the history of American Indian-U.S. relations I have relied on is Francis Paul Prucha, *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984).

34. Thornton, *American Indian Holocaust*, 194.

35. Ibid., 164, 198-201.

36. Introduced by Senator Henry L. Dawes, the General Allotment Act became more popularly known as the Dawes Act, and was later amended and extended in 1891 by the Amendment to the Dawes Act and the creation of the Dawes Commission in 1893.

37. For a discussion of blood quantum, see Snipp, 32-35. For a general discussion of racial theories and their application to American Indians, see Robert E. Bieder, *Science Encounters the Indian, 1820-1880* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986).

38. In theories of the time, race was generally agreed to be founded in biology, and blood was spoken of as the agent of transmission of racial and behavioral characteristics. In the same way that ideologies about race were used to define American Indians, the "one-drop rule" was used to define as black a person with any known black ancestry. See James F. Davis, *Who is Black? One Nation's Definition* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1991), 4-5.

39. The passage of the General Allotment Act required that accurate tribal rolls be established before allotment could proceed. Given the history of

Indian/U.S. relations up until this time, and the failure to consult tribes in the decision to dissolve tribal lands, many were suspicious of the government's intentions and were reluctant to be listed on the rolls. For an examination of the problems associated with the rolls of the Five Civilized Tribes and the arbitrariness of blood quantum and enrollment decisions, see Kent Carter, "Deciding Who Can be Cherokee: Enrollment Records of the Dawes Commission," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 69:2 (1991): 174-205.

40. Prucha, *The Great Father*, 321-325. The IRA provided guidelines on how tribes were to organize formally, but the issue of which groups were to be considered "tribes" was not clear-cut. This confusion led to the Federal Acknowledgement Project in 1976, which specified seven mandatory criteria for federal recognition, with the burden of proof resting on the tribe in question; see Thornton, 195-196.

41. Bureau of Indian Affairs, *Tribal Enrollment* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1978), 57-69. Most tribal constitutions include criteria for membership in their articles. One source for specific tribal enrollment information can be found in a multi-volume set that contains tribal constitutions for most tribes recognized by the federal government. For part I, see George E. Fay, "Charters, Constitutions and By-Laws of the Indian Tribes of North America," *Occasional Publications in Anthropology* (Greely: Colorado State University, 1967).

42. American Indian Policy Review Commission, *Final Report* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977), 12.

43. Gloria Anzaldua, ed., *Making Faces, Making Soul: Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Press, 1990), 143.

44. Examples of this are numerous, and even a brief perusal of American Indian subject matter at most bookstores will yield plenty of books on shamanism, vision quests, and other topics of American Indian spirituality. For a discussion of new age shamans and plastic medicine men, see Wendy Rose, "The Great Pretenders: Further Reflections on White Shamanism," in M. Annette Jaimes, ed., *The State of Native America: Genocide, Colonization, and Resistance* (Boston: South End Press, 1992), 403-421. See also the video, "White Shamans and Plastic Medicine Men," distributed by Native Voices Public Television, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana.

45. James Luna, *The Dream Hat Ritual* installation at the Santa Monica Museum of Art, Santa Monica, California, 1996.

46. This event occurred on March 10, 1996 at the Los Angeles Central Library following a presentation by James Luna. For a description of the installation and an interview with the artist, see Leah Ollman, "Confronting All the Demons," *Los Angeles Times Calendar*, June 16, 1996, 58-59.

47. For a few examples, see Sandra D. Atchinson, "Who is an Indian, and why are they asking?," *Business Week* (December 26, 1988): 71; Ward Churchill, "Nobody's Pet Poodle, Jimmie Durham: An Artist for Native North America," in *Indians Are Us? Culture and Genocide in Native North America* (Monroe, Maine:

Common Courage Press, 1994), 89-113; Reynolds, "Indian Writers: Real or Imagined," and Candelora Versace, "What is Real Indian Art? Does it Matter?," *Indian Artist* (Winter 1996): 58.

48. Pan-Indian identity can be loosely defined as an Indian identity that cuts across tribal lines. As both an identity and a culture, it draws heavily from popular images based on Plains tribes, namely the Lakota (Sioux). The hegemony of these images is manifested in powwow dancing and music, vision quests and sweat lodges, tipis, and feathered headdresses. Long ingrained in the American imagination, these images gained renewed popularity following the movie, *Dances with Wolves,* and its lesser acclaimed spinoffs, *The Last of the Dogmen, Thunderheart,* and *Incident at Oglala.* For a historical analysis of the roots of pan-Indian identity, see Hazel Hertzberg, *The Search for an Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1971). For a detailed examination of these images, their historical basis and influence on non-Indian perception and attitudes towards American Indians, see Robert F. Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Knopf, 1989); Roy Harvey Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian in the American Mind* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

49. The difficulty with the term *Indian community* is that it presupposes an agreed upon, single group, which includes all American Indians in a particular area. This, of course, is not the case in most large urban areas when "communities" are loosely bounded and based on associations between groups of individuals that, in most cases, are self-selected and recognized only by their members. However, in most urban areas, questions of identity often hinge on whether or not an individual is "recognized by the Indian community," a criterion difficult to satisfy and nearly impossible to prove.

50. See Angelo Figeroa, "Switch in Ethnicity Helps Gain Promotion," *San Francisco Examiner*, 11 November 1990, B1; Steve Marantz, "Two Fired in Firefighter Eligibility Probe," *Boston Globe*, 1 June 1990, A21; David Tuller, "Ethnic Fraud Stirs up Furor Over Standards," *San Francisco Chronicle*, 14 January 1991, A1.

51. See volumes edited by Cohen, *Urban Ethnicity*; Depres, *Ethnicity and Resource Competition*; Glazer and Moynihan, *Ethnicity*.

52. Alfonso Ortiz as quoted in Reynolds, "Indian Writers," A3.

53. Ibid., quote by Suzan Harjo.

54. Tim Giago, "Big Increases in Census Not Necessarily Good for Tribes," *Lakota Times*, March 12, 1991, 4

55. National Council on American Indian Education, "Indian Education: A Federal Entitlement, Fiscal Year 1992 Annual Report" (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1993), 215.

56. Press Release, Association of American Indian and Alaskan Native Professors, June 28, 1993.

57. As quoted in St. John, "American Indians Hurt," 12A.

58. 1995-96 UCLA Graduate School Application, 2.

59. Efforts to regulate American Indian identity gained momentum with the passage of the Indian Arts and Crafts Act. Signed into law on November 29, 1991, the act states that in order to sell art as "Indian made," the artist must be a member of an "Indian tribe, band, nation, Alaskan Native village, or other group or community recognized as eligible for special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians." Criminal penalties of up to one million dollars and/or imprisonment up to fifteen years may be imposed on individuals or galleries who display or offer for sale any work "which falsely suggests it is Indian produced"; see Indian Arts and Crafts Board, *Fact Sheet: Questions and Answers about Title I of P.L. 101-644, The Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990* (Washington, DC: Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1994).

60. University of Oklahoma, "American Indian/Alaskan Native Verification Policy," 1992. Copies of this policy were distributed at a session of the National Indian Educators Association meeting in Tucson, Arizona, in 1995.

61. 1998-99 Jacques Johnet Scholarship Application for Native American Students. The scholarship committee consists of American Indian staff and faculty at San Francisco State University who reached this decision after many hours of discussion. The author is an ex-officio member and was instrumental in developing the application and elgibility criteria.

62. Snipp, *American Indians*, 158.

63. Eschbach, "The Enduring and Vanishing American Indian," 95.

64. U.S. Office of Technology Assessment, *Indian Health Care* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986), as taken from Snipp, 167.

65. Snipp, *American Indians*, 48.

66. Snipp, 53-56.